

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF THE SEPARATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES
BETWEEN SCHOOL BOARDS AND SUPERINTENDENTS

by

Donald Thomas Alvey

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

Dr. Kenneth E. Underwood
Chairman

Dr. Jim C. Fortune

Dr. Wayne M. Worner

Dr. Ronald L. McKeen

Dr. William F. Keough

Dr. A. Bernard Hatch

May, 1985

Blacksburg, Virginia

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my parents,
and _____, for their love, encouragement,
advice, and support, not only in the completion of
this endeavor, but also in the more painstaking process
of striving for maturity and wisdom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses his appreciation to those whose assistance, cooperation, time, and expertise made this dissertation possible.

Dr. Kenneth Underwood, Chairman of the writer's committee, is due the sincerest gratitude for his counseling, guidance, encouragement, and interest in the writer's progress and career. Also, further recognition is due Dr. Underwood for acquiring support of the study from The American School Board Journal.

Appreciation is extended to other members of the writer's dissertation committee: Dr. Wayne M. Worner for his efforts in critiquing and editing this study; Dr. Jim C. Fortune for his assistance in the conceptualization and resolution of the survey device and analyses; Dr. Ron McKeen and Dr. A. Bernard Hatch for their support and assistance throughout the study; Dr. William F. Keough for his invaluable insights and experience in suggesting and selecting the issues to research.

Special recognition is due Gregg Downey, Editor and Assistant Publisher, and Sally Zakariya, Senior Editor, of The American School Board Journal for their expertise in editing the survey device and in providing complete logistical support.

Acknowledgement is especially due to my parents for providing me with the love, support and opportunity to undertake this study and to my wife, , and daughter, , for their understanding, love and encouragement.

The writer wishes to express personal gratitude to for his friendship, support, and advice during our educational journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	STATEMENT OF NEED.....	3
	STATEMENT OF PROBLEM.....	4
	RESEARCH QUESTION.....	4
	DEFINITIONS.....	6
	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM.....	6
	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	7
	OUTLINE OF THE STUDY.....	7
2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
	THEORY AND PRACTICE OF POLICY MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION.....	9
	RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL BOARDS AND THEIR MEMBERS.....	24
	RESPONSIBILITIES OF SUPERINTENDENTS.....	48
	WORKING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SCHOOL BOARDS AND SUPERINTENDENTS.....	75
	SUMMARY.....	85
	CONCLUSION.....	87
3	METHODOLOGY.....	92
	SAMPLE.....	95
	INSTRUMENTATION.....	97
	COLLECTION OF DATA.....	100

Chapter	Page
	METHOD OF ANALYSIS..... 101
	SUMMARY..... 102
4	RESULTS..... 103
	DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES..... 103
	DEMOGRAPHIC AND PERSONAL DATA
	RELATIVE TO RESPONDENTS REGION..... 103
	FINDINGS FOR EACH RESEARCH
	QUESTION..... 110
	RESEARCH QUESTION 1..... 112
	RESEARCH QUESTION 2..... 118
	RESEARCH QUESTION 3..... 125
	RESEARCH QUESTION 4..... 130
	RESEARCH QUESTION 5..... 138
	RESEARCH QUESTION 6..... 148
	RESEARCH QUESTION 7..... 153
	RESEARCH QUESTION 8..... 160
	RESEARCH QUESTION 9..... 170
	SUMMARY..... 187
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMEND-
	ATIONS..... 189
	SUMMARY..... 189
	BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 210
	APPENDIX A 214

	Page
APPENDIX B.....	219
APPENDIX C.....	220
APPENDIX D.....	251
APPENDIX E.....	282
APPENDIX F.....	313
APPENDIX G.....	344
APPENDIX H.....	360
VITA.....	361
ABSTRACT.....	362

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number	Page
Table 1.....	99
Table 2.....	104
Table 3.....	106
Table 4.....	108
Table 5.....	109
Table 6.....	111
Table 7.....	113
Table 8.....	115
Table 9.....	116
Table 10.....	117
Table 11.....	119
Table 12.....	120
Table 13.....	122
Table 14.....	123
Table 15.....	124
Table 16.....	126
Table 17.....	129
Table 18.....	131
Table 19.....	132
Table 20.....	133
Table 21.....	134
Table 22.....	136
Table 23.....	137
Table 24.....	139

Table Number	Page
Table 25.....	140
Table 26.....	142
Table 27.....	143
Table 28.....	145
Table 29.....	146
Table 30.....	147
Table 31.....	149
Table 32.....	151
Table 33.....	152
Table 34.....	154
Table 35.....	156
Table 36.....	157
Table 37.....	159
Table 38.....	161
Table 39.....	162
Table 40.....	164
Table 41.....	166
Table 42.....	167
Table 43.....	169
Table 44.....	171
Table 45.....	175
Table 46.....	176
Table 47.....	178
Table 48.....	180

Table Number	Page
Table 49.....	183
Table 50.....	184
Table 51.....	186
Table 52.....	188

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Resolving problems between board and superintendents usually comes down to deciding whose game it is - policy or administration (Zakariya, 1983, p. 29).

Many writers and researchers have discussed, reviewed and analyzed the topic of the division of role responsibilities between a school board and a superintendent. It was recognized that the words "role" and "responsibilities" have distinct and different psychological meanings, but in this study they were used synonymously. Carroll F. Johnson, Professor Emeritus at Columbia University, has written that a clear understanding of each other's role and responsibilities is one of the basic elements which forms a sound relationship between a school board and a superintendent (Johnson, 1980, pp. 2-3). Sally B. Zakariya, an associate editor of The American School Board Journal, has written that if there is one thing that boards and superintendents agree on in theory, at least, it is that the board's proper role is to set policy while the superintendent's proper role is to implement that policy (Zakariya, 1983, p. 29). Ronald G. McIntire, Associate Dean of the College of Education, University of Houston, has asked the question, "What's the difference between the school board and

administration?" (McIntire, 1982, p. 34). He answers that question by reporting that most people would say the board adopts policy while the administration puts policy into motion. McIntire continues by saying that those ideas are fine in theory, but that the real world is entirely a different matter. Another writer, Dean Smith, Superintendent of Schools in Kennewick, Washington, has stated that, "One of the chief sources of trouble between a superintendent and a board is the failure to reach mutual understanding about who does what and how" (Smith, 1982, p. 38). Cunningham and Hentges have reported from their survey of superintendents, conducted for the American Association of School Administrators, (AASA), that serious tensions exist between boards and superintendents in many communities and that questions involving executive and policy functions are perennial in those tensions (AASA, 1982, p. 59). Richard Meyer, a freelance writer, has stated that the school board and superintendent should be clear about who makes each kind of decision-budget, personnel, curricular, and so forth (Meyer, 1983, p. 29). The collective reading of these writers and researchers points out the fact that the understanding of the responsibilities of the school board and the superintendent is a key issue in the partnership that should exist in the operation of a school district.

Statement of Need

According to the American Association of School Administrators, "It is increasingly important for the board and superintendent to delineate their respective roles" (AASA, 1980, p. 1). Coy F. Hollis, Director of Extended Services and Institutional Research, University of Tennessee, has stated that everything that happens in a school system must be the responsibility of someone within the system (Hollis, 1972, p. 4). More recently, Luvern L. Cunningham, Novice G. Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, has written that, "The time has come for a general inspection of the scope of the school board's responsibility" (Cunningham, 1983, p. 494).

Research could provide additional information into the actual current practice in school districts as to who the school board or the superintendent does and should assume the various responsibilities of leadership in the school system. The purpose, then, of this study is to discover which areas of leadership are being performed by the school board members or by the superintendent and what are the respondent's perceptions concerning who should perform those areas of leadership decision-making. This research could provide useful information which would assist in the possible avoidance or decrease of tensions between

the school board and the superintendent when responsibility assumption is unclear or ill-defined. This research could also provide basic information for a dialogue between school board members and superintendents concerning the scope of the responsibilities they face.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate the inconsistencies and similarities of two groups of school system leaders-school board members and superintendents-toward who does and who should assume the responsibility of leadership in the school system on selected issues and the relationship of these attitudes to certain demographic data.

Research Questions

The research questions to be addressed were:

1. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do school board members identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility?
2. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do school board members identify as ones for which they should assume responsibility?
3. Are there significant differences between the issues or categories of leadership that school board members identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility and ones

for which they should assume responsibility?

4. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do superintendents identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility?

5. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do superintendents identify as ones for which they should assume responsibility?

6. Are there significant differences between the issues or categories of leadership that superintendents identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility and ones for which they should assume responsibility?

7. What are the issues or categories of leadership where school board members and superintendents differ on their identification as ones on which each group does assume responsibility?

8. What are the issues or categories of leadership where school board members and superintendents differ on their identification as ones on which each group should assume responsibility?

9. What are the relationships between attitudes about the separation of responsibilities held by school board members and superintendents using demographic data for comparisons and analysis?

Definitions

The following terms used in this study have certain restrictions placed on their usage:

School Board Member

The term school board member, as used in this study, identifies an individual either elected or appointed who is a member of a local or regional board of education.

Superintendent

The term superintendent, as used in this study, identifies an individual who is the chief executive officer of a local or regional school system. He or she is charged with administering the schools in accordance with the policies adopted by the school board.

Significance of the Problem

This study will provide current information about school board members and superintendents opinions towards issues of responsibility for operating a school system. Carolyn Mullins, in an article for the American School Board Journal, has stated that, "the awareness of the duties and responsibilities of both the school board and the superintendent is considered a crucial area in the relationship between those parties" (Mullins, 1975, p. 25). "Both school boards and superintendents can become too involved in guarding their own turf, their own prerogatives, and, if you do that, you're bargaining for problems" (Zakariya, 1983, p. 29). Identification of which sets of issues of responsibility

could cause problems between school boards and their superintendents could aid those parties involved in the more efficient, less stressful operation of the school system.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study were:

1. The population of this study was composed of school board members and of superintendents who subscribed to The American School Board Journal.
2. A follow-up survey to those not responding was not possible as the National School Boards Association required absolute anonymity.
3. The responses to the questionnaire were assumed to be the true attitude of the respondents based on personal observation, experience, or preference. †

Outline of the Study

This study of the separation of responsibilities between school boards and superintendents is divided into five chapters. The first chapter includes the following sections: Introduction, statement of need, statement of the problem, research questions, definitions, significance of the problem, and limitations of the study. The second chapter presents a review of the related literature pertaining to this study. The third chapter describes the procedures

used in devising the data collection instrument, the administration of the questionnaire, the selection of the sample, and the methods used to organize and analyze the data. The fourth chapter describes the data and the findings of the survey. The fifth chapter includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature relevant to the separation of responsibilities between school board members and superintendents in the operation of a school system. This chapter is divided into a series of sections, each arranged historically, which include the theory and practice of policy-making and implementation, the responsibilities of the school board, the responsibilities of a superintendent, working relationships between school boards and superintendents, conclusions, and recommendations.

The sources reviewed included books, periodicals, journals, dissertations, and newspaper articles.

Theory and Practice of Policy-Making and Implementation

How the problem of a proper relationship between a board of education and its superintendent has developed can be understood from the historical perspective of several of the important statements that have been made about the differences between the theory of that relationship-the board establishes policy and the superintendent implements those policies-and the actual practice. This distinction between the school board being policy-making and the superintendent being the chief administrator of

those policies became prevalent in the literature during the first three decades of the twentieth century.

Analysis of the word "policy" as it is used in the field of administration reveals that it is intended to signify a decision, or set of decisions, whether definitely formulated or not, as to how given problems and jobs shall be solved and administered. The term "administrative detail", on the other hand, invariably has reference to a single case or some aspect of an individual case (Olsen, 1926, p. 9).

Earlier, Ellwood P. Cubberly wrote that the work of a board of education was legislative and not executive:

Boards of education should act as legislative, and not as executive bodies, and a clear distinction should be drawn between what are legislative and what are executive functions. The legislative functions belong, by right, to the board, and the legislation should be enacted, after discussion, by means of formal and recorded votes. The board's work, as the representative of the people, is to sit in judgment on proposals and to determine the general policy of the school system.

(Cubberly, 1916, p. 119).

Jesse Earle, a member of the Janesville, Wisconsin Board of Education was quoted as saying, "a misconception of what things are within the province of the superintendent, and what things are within the province of the board is where we sometimes come to grief" (Earle, 1924, p. 42).

In the First Yearbook of the National Education Association Department of Superintendence George D. Strayer wrote:

The right relationship between boards of education and superintendents of schools will come to exist when boards of education cease to think of their function as having to do with the execution of the policies they adopt (Strayer, 1923, p. 162).

Hans C. Olsen, Director of Teacher Training at State Teachers College, Kearney, Nebraska, summarized an earlier work (1917) by William W. Theisen of Teachers College, Columbia University, which said that a board of education should endeavor to discover its own proper duties and those that should be delegated to professional executive officers. He made it clear that a school board should determine the policies and that it was the function of the superintendent to execute the policies of the board. He emphasized the principle that the board should always confine its work to seeing that the schools were properly

administered. Never should the board itself administer the schools (Olsen, 1926, p. 5). Olsen also quoted from a 1913 work done by Arthur H. Chamberlain entitled The Growth of Responsibility and Enlargement of Power of the City School Superintendent which stated that the superintendent from the first has been a leader educationally, that a proper relation must be established between the superintendent and the school board, and responsibility must be definitely fixed (Olsen, 1926, p. 2).

The concluding statement for this section comes from George D. Strayer:

Much remains to be done in defining clearly the relationship which should exist between boards of education and their chief executive officer. It would be well if this definition were made so clear and so commonly accepted by members of the profession that no competent man would be willing to accept the position of superintendent of schools without having it understood that the board of education accepted the relationship as defined by the profession (Strayer, 1923, p. 160).

During the next three decades of the twentieth century -the 1930's, 40's, and 50's- efforts were made to address and define the distinction between policy-making and

implementation.

An examination of the school laws of all states shows that school boards have been given practically every power and duty pertaining to the administration of the schools, whereas superintendents and other school employees have been given only a few powers and duties. Although school boards possess practically all powers, all progressive boards delegate most of their powers to their professional experts, that is, the superintendent and his co-workers, and hold them responsible for efficient performance.

The proper duties of a school board are (1) to adopt policies for the school system, (2) to provide adequate means for executing them, and (3) to see that they are efficiently executed. The execution or the actual carrying out of the policies should be left to the employed experts of the board, that is, the superintendent and his co-workers. School boards do not have the time to execute policies; moreover, such work usually requires special training and experience in school administration and these qualifications are not often possessed by board members. Policies should be made by

boards only when they are in possession of all the available facts pertaining to the policies. One of the chief duties of superintendents is to procure such facts for boards and to make recommendations based upon such facts.

The efficient administration of a school system requires considerable technical knowledge which cannot be secured except by long study and observation. School board members do not have sufficient time to give to such study and observation, and must largely depend upon "the ears and the eyes," and sometimes the "nose," of the superintendent of schools to obtain their information. A school board member is most efficient when he does not attempt to run the schools, but sees that they are run efficiently by the employed experts of the board. (Reeder, 1944, pp. 22-23).

Maurice Stapley summarized the results of a study conducted in sixty small school districts located in the midwest.

...in only a few instances did the board and the superintendent sit down together and plan cooperatively. Decision-making

and even the execution of policies often were divided arbitrarily between board and superintendent. Sometimes a board would reserve to its membership the execution of even minor administrative details, and yet the same board might leave major policy matters in other areas entirely to the discretion of the superintendent (Stapley, 1957, p. 17).

Stapley reported the results of another study concerning policy-making:

Boards which have committed their basic policies to writing are much more effective than those which have not done so. Although adoption of such a written code is hardly a panacea for all the problems encountered in relationships with the executive, it is one step which can be taken to improve working conditions and at the same time increase understandings on the part of both the administrator and the board.

Haste in formulating a set of written policies can be disastrous. Policy adopted without complete understanding by the board and without adequate debate may increase, rather than decrease, friction between board

and administrator. It is an unhappy board member who finds that he has subscribed to some lofty sounding phrases and unwittingly put himself in a position of condoning an action of which he otherwise would not approve. Likewise, unhappy is the superintendent who carries out what he considers to be a clear-cut mandate, as prescribed by an adopted policy, only to find that the board is unable to read into the statement the meaning which he thought was clear (Stapley, 1957, p. 54).

These statements were indicative of the attempts during the thirty year period from 1930 to 1959 to solve the problem of the separation of policy-making from policy administration.

At the very beginning of the final and current three decades of the twentieth century--the 1960's, 70's, and 80's--the American Association of School Administrators wrote:

Throughout America, school boards, school administrators, and professional certified personnel are faced squarely with the need of agreeing on ways of working together which are harmonious and effective. Particularly is there need for agreement on roles and responsibilities, together with mutually acceptable policies and machinery governing

working relationships (AASA, 1960, p. 3).

Lloyd W. Ashby reviewed the role of the local board: The role of the local board has changed and evolved over the years. In earlier times, school board members assumed administrative as well as policy-making roles. They interviewed and hired the teacher, bought fuel and supplies, and acted in a supervisory capacity. However, the days of the one-room school and the tiny school system are now largely a matter of history.

As schools grew larger the principalship evolved out of necessity. Then, as cities and school systems grew, the superintendency came into being in due course, with the first such office being created in 1837. Buffalo and Louisville share the honors for the first superintendency. School systems rapidly became too large and too complex for volunteer lay board members to handle. Gradually, a division of duties came about with the board making general policies and employing an administrative head, the superintendent, to administer the policies of the board. (Ashby, 1968, p. 26). An often found comment in other sources contained in

this review of literature was summarized best by Ashby:

Policy making is distinct from administration. The board member as an individual has no more authority, in general, than the man on the street. As a board member, acting in concert with the total board in public sessions, he has complete authority and responsibility under the law. There is an old expression which speaks clearly to this point, "It is not the business of the board to run the schools, but to see to it that they are run effectively." Administration in its entirety should be delegated to the superintendent and his staff. If the board lacks confidence in the chief administrator, then it is wiser and infinitely better to make a change in the superintendency as soon as possible. Where board members tend to dabble in administration, either inadvertently or intentionally, there is almost certain to be friction and a fatal lack of confidence all around. (Ashby, 1968, pp. 30-31).

Peter J. Cistone edited a book entitled, Understanding School Boards, which contains a section written by William L. Boyd which addressed the problem in this section:

The long-standing complaint, and one that is still frequently heard, has been that school

boards too often have interfered in the administration of the schools. But why should board-staff relationships be so problematic? Is it just that the policy-making and administrative functions are so hard-some would say impossible-to separate in practice? Or does the problem run deeper than that? Can it be that representation and administration are inherently at odds, that there is an inescapable tension between the needs of the two functions, i.e., for democratic deliberation on the one hand, and efficient, expeditious action on the other hand (Cistone, 1975, p. 103)?

A Joint Position Statement of the National School Boards Association (NSBA) and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) contained the following comments:

Working together is especially important for those who serve our public schools. And the primary example for cooperation should come from the top...the relationship between the school board and the superintendent.

Basic to this relationship is an acceptance by the board and the superintendent that the board is a policy making body and the

superintendent is the chief executive officer. Since lines between policy and administration are sometimes unclear, teamwork is also essential (AASA, 190, p. iv).

The same Joint Position Statement continued with a statement about how the division of policy making and administration can be achieved:

It is increasingly important for the board and superintendent to delineate their respective roles. A superintendent is expected to display excellence as an educational leader, to be politically sophisticated, to be aware of and active in legislative developments, and to have an extensive knowledge of federal and state laws. A school board is asked to be responsive to its constituencies in governance; sensitive to the special needs of all learners in the district; a more active advocate for learners to the people, other local governmental entities, and state and federal levels of government; and a vigorous ambassador explaining the instructional programs to the people.

To accomplish these tasks, the board must serve as a legislative body in the development and evaluation of policies. The superintendent

must be primarily responsible for the administration of the school district in accordance with board policies.

The board and superintendent must recognize that the distinction between strictly legislative and strictly administrative functions is not always clear-cut. If ambiguity is to be kept to a minimum in the working relationship between the board and superintendent, each should be aware of three influences that bear on this important division of responsibility:

1. The nature of policy development and administration. Serving as a professional adviser to the school board is one of the key roles played by the superintendent. While the board is not bound to accept the superintendent's advice, it nonetheless should not establish policy without first consulting the superintendent, its chief professional adviser. In the same vein, the superintendent should not institute far reaching administrative procedures without first affording the board an opportunity to review proposed rules and their adherence to board policy. Moreover,

the board should be given a regular opportunity to review existing administrative procedures to test whether they do conform to policy. The emphasis must be on communication...the sharing of information between board and superintendent. The process should not focus on approval to be sought or won, but on the development of mutual understanding.

2. The increasing influence of external factors on local school district governance and on the board-superintendent relationship. Legislative mandates, for instance, frequently require the board to adopt detailed rules in implementing new laws or mandated curriculum. And the superintendent must meet unanticipated events with actions that establish policy by precedent in areas in which the board has no formal written policy.
3. The discretionary authority boards grant their chief administrators. The board by law is responsible for school programs and operations. Nevertheless, all boards delegate some portion of that authority to the district superintendent. Without sufficient authority

delegated from the board, the superintendent's ability to discharge responsibility is diminished. Where to draw the line of delegated authority is a matter each board and superintendent must determine individually and review periodically. Here is one guideline: The board must give the professional school administrator enough authority to carry out designated responsibilities, and the administrator must give the board adequate assurance that the job the board designated is being accomplished. (AASA, 1980, pp. 1-2).

Finally, Sally Zakariya provided an appropriate conclusion to this section concerning the distinction between policy making and administration:

The distinction between the two is by no means clear, of course, and that's the rub. "We've been fighting for years over where to draw the line between policy and administration," comments Atlanta's June Coffer.

A general rule is that board policy spells out the what, why, and how much; the superintendents handles the who, where, when, and how. The real answer to the policy-versus-administration question, however, is something your board and

superintendent must hammer out (Zakariya, 1983, p. 29).

Responsibilities of School Boards and Their Members

The literature concerning the responsibilities of school boards has had some consistency-yet has shown some evolution-during the twentieth century. This section is arranged historically to illustrate the consistency and evolution of the responsibilities of school boards and their members.

During the first three decades of the twentieth century several educational administrative theorists and practitioners studied the responsibilities of school boards. One of the first in that time frame was Dr. William Theisen in his study entitled The City Superintendent and the Board of Education conducted in 1917 and summarized by Hans C. Olsen:

1. That a board of education should endeavor to discover its own proper duties and those that should be delegated to professional executive officers.
2. That its own function is first of all
 - a. to choose a professionally trained chief executive, centralize authority and responsibility for results in him, and expect him to initiate all policies; and then

- b. to debate such proposed policies with him in the light of definite objective evidence and to provide the legislation necessary to secure efficient results.
3. That a board of education need wait for no precedent to adopt a form of administrative organization in which the professional superintendent is made the administrative leader and chief executive of the system, and in which the board itself serves in an advisory and legislative capacity and acts only through its chief executive. Such precedent is amply provided by successful business organizations. (Olsen, 1926, p. 3).

Olsen reviewed many of the studies conducted during the early 1920's and concluded that, "The general functions of a board of education may be summarized as follows:

(1) Select the superintendent of schools. (2) Determine the policies of the school system. (3) See that these policies are carried out by the superintendent and his associates (Olsen, 1926, p. 8). Reeder has given a more complete view of Dr. William W. Theisen's findings on the duties and responsibilities of school boards:

In a nationwide investigation, W. W. Theisen found that authorities in the field of school

school administration agree that the following are proper duties of a school board:

1. Select the chief executive officer and support him in the discharge of his duties.
2. Pass upon the annual budget for maintenance prepared by the chief executive and his assistants (budget including sources and amount of revenue available, as well as expenditures).
3. Debate and pass upon recommendations of chief executive for additional capital outlays-- buildings, sites, improvement--and determine the means of financing such outlays...
4. Advise with the chief executive, affording a group judgment, on his recommendations for extensions or readjustments of the scope of educational activities. (Reeder, 1944, pp. 23-25).
5. Appoint (upon nomination and recommendation of the chief executive) teachers, principals, and supervisors.
6. Determine, after consultation and discussion with the chief executive, the schedule of salaries.
7. Require and consider report of the business

transacted or pending and of the financial status of the system.

8. Require and discuss report of the chief executive concerning progress of the schools, in terms of achievements of pupils, teachers, supervisors.
9. Adopt, upon consultation with the chief executive, a set of by-laws or rules for the government of school system...
10. Pass upon architect's plans, approved by the chief executive and his assistants, for buildings that have been authorized.
11. Represent needs of the schools before city authorities or the legislature.
12. Approve the list of bills for expenditures previously authorized and approved by executive officers.
13. Consider recommendations of executive officers on legal matters, and decide steps to be taken...
14. Approve textbooks selected by the chief executive and approve courses of study recommended by him.
15. Represent needs of the schools before the public...

16. Serve as laymen, ready (even after retiring from the board) to champion school needs and to further public support of the schools...
17. Act as a court of final appeal for teachers, supervisors, and patrons in cases which the superintendent has not been able to dispose of or which may be appealed from his decision.
18. Hear communications, written or oral, from citizens or organizations on matters of administration or policy.
19. Visit the schools, observe or investigate the efficiency of instruction. (Reeder, 1944, pp. 23-25).

The next thirty year period--the 1930's, 40's, and 50's--saw an expansion and codification of the duties and responsibilities of school boards. A school board member's creed was developed by the Epsilon Field Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, Los Angeles, California, in 1939 and reprinted in a later yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators.

THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER'S CREED: In Working
with the Superintendent of Schools and His
Staff

I will hold the superintendent of schools
responsible for the administration of the schools.

I will give the superintendent of schools authority commensurate with his responsibility.

I will expect the schools to be administered by the best trained technical and professional people it is possible to procure.

I will elect employees only on the recommendation of the superintendent.

I will participate in board legislation only after considering the recommendation of the superintendent and only after he has furnished complete information supporting his recommendation.

I will expect the superintendent of schools to keep the board of education adequately informed at all times through both oral and written reports.

I will expect to spend more time in board meetings on educational programs and procedures than on business detail.

I will give the superintendent of schools friendly counsel and advice.

I will refer all complaints to the proper administrative officer or insist that they be presented in writing to the board as a whole.

I will present any personal criticisms of employees to the superintendent.

I will provide adequate safeguards around the superintendent and other personnel so they may perform their proper functions on a professional basis. (AASA, 1946, p. 62).

The same AASA yearbook presented a classified list of the respective functions of the school board and superintendent in order to better clarify the distinction between legislative or policy-forming functions and executive functions. They contended that the list does not approach completeness, but was deemed long enough and diversified enough to be adequate. The section of the list pertaining to school board functions was:

I. General Functions

Board: Legislates and establishes general policies, such as the scope of the educational offerings to be maintained, from nursery school to junior college; sets length of school year and vacations; decides extent of expenditures to be made for education; decides upon buildings to be provided; uses effort to secure state legislation to meet local needs; employs a professional school executive to administer the schools and evaluates and appraises his services.

II. Functions in Connection with Major Phases
of the System

A. Professional and nonprofessional employees

Board: Adopts pay scales; elects or rejects employees on the nomination of the superintendent; determines principles of treatment for employees, such as those in connection with sick-leaves, leaves of absence, preservice and inservice training, retirement, and so on.

B. Curriculum offerings

Board: Decides the general scope of the local educational offerings, in addition to those required by law, and passes upon instructional procedures related to controversial matters, such as those sometimes connected with religion, science, social and governmental organization, and so on, within the limits of the law and the requirement of adequate academic freedom of instructors.

C. Finances

Board: Approves and adopts an annual budget; votes tax levies if fiscally independent or, if not, recommends adequate levies to those

who have the final power in the matter;
decides upon the size and the time of
bond levy proposals to the electors;
adopts regulations for the accounting of
all school funds; and so on.

D. Plant

Board: Decides what buildings shall be
built, when and where, and what equipment
shall be purchased for them; decides upon
extensions of buildings and any major
alterations; selects and purchases school
sites for future plant expansion; selects
and employs school architects as needed;
decides the number of caretakers for the
buildings and the general quality care to
be given--all with the counsel of the
superintendent.

E. Pupils

Board: Determines policies regarding age
of school entrance, within the law;
authorizes the establishment of special
schools or classes or other facilities
for pupils who are physically or mentally
handicapped; determines the general
requirements for graduation from the various

units of the system; provides for protection of health by use of school lunches, medical and dental clinics, and school nurses; makes regulations regarding corporal punishment, truancy, and delinquency.

F. Public relations

Board: Represents the community's attitude toward the kind of facilities to be provided for education and interprets these to the superintendent; upholds the administration of the schools before individual citizens and citizen groups; intercedes for proper and adequate state legislation and financial support for schools. (AASA, 1946, pp. 49-51).

Charles Reeves, an educational consultant, gave the nature and classification of school board activities:

It is impossible to list or classify precisely all of the functions, powers, and responsibilities of school boards. They vary according to state and the several kinds of school districts in each state. Legally, some activities are mandatory; some are permissive at the discretion of the board; and some are implied in the general legal provisions for

the maintenance of public schools (Reeves, 1954, p. 138).

Reeves continued with a classification of the activities of school boards in seven headings:

1. Complying--which includes those activities of boards necessary to effectuate the laws of the state and the regulations to such matters as school elections, taxation, budgeting, purchasing, contracting debt, constructing school buildings, transporting pupils, school attendance, pupil health, length of school terms, teacher qualifications, teacher salaries, employment and dismissal of teachers, the curriculum and instruction, athletics, and scores of others.
2. Policy making--which includes board actions establishing basic formal rules and regulations and the directives and authorizations addressed to teachers, pupils and others. These are not contrary to the provisions of state laws and the rules, regulations, and directives of state authorities, but extensions or applications of them.
3. Executing--which is the work of the

superintendent of schools and his administrative staff. The board is made legally responsible to the state for this work, and its members are morally responsible to the community that selects them.

4. Operating--which includes the work accomplished by teachers, supervisors, custodians, and others performed in accordance with the adopted policies of the board.
5. Observing and evaluating the condition of the schools--which includes their activities relating to the curriculum and instruction, special services, pupil enterprises to determine their effectiveness and needs, and the inspection of buildings and equipment. This is done as a basis for future educational planning.
6. Interpreting--or the activities of the board with regard to reporting its stewardship to the public and planning and maintaining good public relations.
7. Judging--or the activities requiring the adjudication of disputes between executives of equal rank under the board, where such

form of organization exists; or appeals of a subordinate or of the public over the head of the superintendent; or hearing the appeal of an employee on the board's decision. (Reeves, 1954, pp. 139-140).

A more detailed list was developed the following year by the California School Boards Association. It outlined the functions and responsibilities of school boards, but stated that it was not to be considered complete-merely a guide:

General Functions

Governing Board

Establishes general policy and rules and regulations regarding:

Employment of superintendent

Employee personnel functions

Instructional program

Pupil personnel functions

School plant functions

Public relations functions

Personnel Functions

Adopts pay scales

Elects or rejects employees upon the recommendation of the superintendent

Determines sick-leave policies

Passes on leaves of absence

Determines policies for inservice education,
sabbatical leave, etc.

Determines the policies of general personnel
management

Instructional Program

Functions

Determines the general scope of the
instructional program in accordance
with state laws and regulations

Discusses and evaluates reports presented
to it by the professional staff members
relative to the instructional program

Recommends areas requiring additional
evaluation for study by the staff

Financial Functions

Approves and adopts an annual budget which
determines necessary tax levies

Proposes bond issues to the public for vote

Adopts regulations for purchasing supplies
and equipment

Adopts standards and passes upon the
procedures of financial accounting

Approves all bills against the district

Reviews an annual audit of the school

district accounts and business procedures

School Plant Functions

Decides what construction should be undertaken

Passes upon the purchase of equipment for buildings

Decides upon building renovations, maintenance policies, and additions

Purchases school sites

Employs school architects, as needed

Employs consultants to advise it on plant needs

Pupil Personnel Functions

Determines general policies affecting students

Authorizes the establishment of special classes or schools for atypical children or children with special needs

Determines general requirements for graduation in accordance with the law

Provides for the protection of health through school lunch programs, medical examinations, employment of nurses and medical advisers

Makes regulations regarding corporal punishment, truancy, vandalism, attendance, etc.

Public Relations Functions

Represents community attitudes and values in educational planning and policy development

Supports the school administration before critical groups in the community

Represents the schools in various community functions (California School Boards Association, Inc., 1955, pp. 95-98).

The last thirty year span of the twentieth century-the 1960's, 70's, and 80's-continued the listing and expansion of duties and responsibilities of school boards. Lloyd Ashby listed his version of the duties of a school board members which would lead to effectiveness:

- o "Brings to the task an open mind and a willingness to learn;
- o Finds deep satisfaction in this type of community service;
- o Thinks for himself, but is willing to accept the fact that the task is one requiring team work and wide use of group processes;
- o Clearly differentiates between policy making and administrative roles;
- o Has high aspirations for his community
- o Is capable of conveying these aspirations to the community at large;

- o Does his homework before board meetings;
- o Understands the aims and objectives of the school system;
- o Is capable of interpreting the school system to the public;
- o Does some reading of educational periodicals;
- o Attends a reasonable number of educational conferences for board members or school administrators;
- o Can absorb the criticism of individuals or community pressure groups without losing a sense of perspective;
- o Does not take criticism as a personal issue;
- o Can keep a sense of humor in good times and bad." (Ashby, 1968, p. 111).

Joan S. Kowalski of the Educational Research Service wrote that educators and laymen generally agree that school boards serve the public best when they undertake and fulfill the following responsibilities:

- o Formulate policies reflecting broad principles that will guide staff members in the education of the children in the district

- o Determine the goals of public education in the school district
- o Select the superintendent for the district and employ school personnel upon the recommendation of the superintendent
- o Appraise the performance of executives to whom responsibilities have been delegated
- o Inform the people of the district about the schools
- o Evaluate the activities of the school district regarding previously established goals (Kowalski, 1976, p. 9).

In a manual for Virginia School Board Members edited by Frank E. Barham and George W. Holmes, III, a summary of the duties, an enumeration of the duties, and a code of ethics for school board members were given. The duties were summarized under three general headings:

1. To adopt policies for the school system,
2. To provide adequate means for executing them,
and
3. To see that they are executed (Barham and Holmes, eds., 1977, p. 12).

They listed some of the important duties and responsibilities as follows:

1. Appointing a division superintendent of schools. This is listed first because no other duty of the board is more important or more far-reaching in results;
2. Determining educational policy and program of the system;
3. Adopting rules and regulations governing board procedures and the entire administration of the system;
4. Controlling school finances, which includes examining and approving the budget, capital outlays, awarding contracts, fixing salary schedules and wages, overseeing all business transactions and regular auditing of all accounts;
5. On recommendation of the division superintendent, employing teachers and other personnel and assigning their duties;
6. Maintaining and improving the school plant;
7. Presenting the needs of the schools to appropriating bodies;
8. Representing the schools and the education program, as opportunity occurs, before the public generally;
9. Hearing and acting upon communications,

written and oral, from citizens and organizations;

10. Acting as a "court of appeals" for teachers, other employees, and citizens who may have grievances that already have been heard by appropriate administrative officials;
11. Appraising the work of the superintendent and his or her subordinates to determine whether or not the results obtained meet with the approval of the board; and
12. Assisting the superintendent by advice and counsel, supporting him or her loyally and vigorously so long as his or her work conforms with what is expected of him or her at the proper time and in the proper manner if he or she fails. (Barham and Holmes, eds., 1977, pp. 12-13).

The following code of ethics was adopted by the Board of Directors of the National School Boards Association on October 9, 1975, and was included in the Virginia School Boards Manual as appropriate for adoption by local school boards:

CODE OF ETHICS

FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

As a member of my local board of education I will strive to improve public education, and to that end I will:

Attend all regularly scheduled board meetings insofar as possible, and become informed concerning the issues to be considered at those meetings;

Recognize that I should endeavor to make policy decisions only after full discussion at publicly held board meetings;

Render all decisions based on the available facts and my independent judgment and refuse to surrender that judgment to individuals or special interest groups;

Encourage the free expression of opinion by all board members and seek systematic communications between the board and students, staff, and all elements of the community;

Work with other board members to establish effective board policies and to delegate authority for the administration of the

schools to the superintendent;

Communicate to other board members and the superintendent expressions of public reaction to board policies and school programs;

Inform myself about current educational issues by individual study and through participation in programs providing needed information such as those sponsored by my state and national school boards associations;

Support the employment of those persons best qualified to serve as school staff, and insist on a regular and impartial evaluation of all staff;

Avoid being placed in a position of conflict of interest, and refrain from using my school board position for personal or partisan gain;

Take no private action that will compromise the board or administration, and respect the confidentiality of information that is privileged under applicable law; and

Remember always that my first and greatest concern must be the educational welfare of the students attending the public schools. (Barham and Holmes,

eds. 1977, pp. 16-17).

The most current listing of specific responsibilities of school boards was developed by a Joint AASA-NSBA Committee in 1980. They listed the specific responsibilities of a school board as:

- o To delegate to the superintendent responsibility for all administrative functions, except those specifically reserved through board policy for the board chairperson. Those reserved areas might include: conducting board meetings and public hearings, approving the agenda and minutes and other activities incidental to, and associated with serving as presiding officer of the board.
- o To support the superintendent fully in all decisions that conform to professional standards and board policy.
- o To hold the superintendent responsible for the constructive written and oral evaluations of the superintendent's work. Effective evaluation is an ongoing effort and should be linked to goals established by the board with the assistance of the superintendent.

- o To provide the superintendent with a comprehensive employment contract.
- o To give the superintendent the benefit of the board's counsel in matters related to individual board members' expertise, familiarity with the local school system, and community interests.
- o To hold all board meetings with the superintendent or a designee present.
- o To consult with the superintendent on all matters, as they arise, that concern the school system and on which the board may take action.
- o To develop a plan for board-superintendent communications.
- o To channel communications with school employees that require action through the superintendent, and to refer all applications, complaints, and other communications, oral or written, first to the superintendent in order to assure that the district processes such communications in an effective, coordinated fashion and is responsive to students and patrons.

- o To take action on matters only after hearing the recommendation of the superintendent.
- o To establish a policy on the effective management of complaints.
- o To provide the superintendent with sufficient administrative help, especially in the area of monitoring teaching and learning.(AASA, 1980, pp. 3-4).

All of the sources in this section of the review, illustrate how the duties and responsibilities of school boards and their members have developed and evolved during the twentieth century.

Responsibilities of Superintendents

The purpose of this section is to historically trace the development of the important statements of the responsibilities and duties of the superintendent made by various researchers, writers, organizations, and commissions.

The work of the first thirty years of this century in the area of the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent can best be summarized by Bennett C. Douglas in the First Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence:

Most favorable conditions for performing the superintendent's work: (a) All the educational

activities of the city should be centered in the office of the superintendent of schools;

(b) The administrative work of the superintendent should be based upon principles of business administration. Certain authorities should be delegated to competent subordinates;

(c) The superintendent should have power to initiate and execute the appointments of assistant superintendents, business managers, principals, teachers, and all other employees whose work is vital in the development of an educational program. He should also have the privilege of recommendations for transfer and dismissal of these educational workers;

(d) The budget should be prepared under the direction of the superintendent for presentation to the board of education.

(e) The superintendent should have power to initiate new policies and to make rules and regulations governing routine matters.

(f) Supervision of instruction should be carried on through supervisors and principals under the leadership of the superintendent. The superintendent's leadership in supervision should be based upon a first-hand knowledge of conditions in the schools.

(g) Textbooks and instructional supplies should be available through the superintendent or through an official who is responsible to him. (h) Enforcement of compulsory attendance laws should be under the direction of a chief attendance officer who is responsible to the superintendent. This official should have charge of the continuous school census. (i) Authorities having to do with buildings and grounds should center in the office of the superintendent of schools or in the office of the official who is responsible to the superintendent. (Douglas, 1923, p. 152).

Just as has been illustrated in the preceding section of the responsibilities of school boards and their members, the middle period of the twentieth century-the 1930's through the 1950's-was a time of increased expansion of the definitions and classifications of the responsibilities of the superintendent. In 1946, the American Association of School Administrators listed an extensive classification of the functions of the superintendent:

I. General Functions

Superintendent: Assumes immediate charge of the entire school system, as the board's chief executive officer in large school systems and

often as its only executive officer in smaller school systems; coordinates the work of all administrative departments, preferably as a superior officer under whom business and other executives in the system serve; executes the policies of the board or assumes responsibility for seeing that they are executed and recommends policies for the board to consider in improving the system and its educational service to the pupils and the community.

II. Functions in Connection with Major Phases of the System

- A. Professional and nonprofessional employees
- Superintendent: Nominates all certificated and noncertificated employees; recommends for discharge any employees rendering unsatisfactory service, within the limits of the law and board regulations; with his staff assigns, directs, and supervises the work of all employees with due respect for any individual rights involved; proposes adequate salary scales for different classes of employees.

B. Curriculum offerings

Superintendent: With his staff purchases approved textbooks and other instructional guides and equipment; schedules classes for the various types of training and assigns space for them; assigns appropriate instructors for the various curriculum offerings; decides the general methods of instruction to be used; provides for the continuous revision of courses of study to meet changing conditions, by appointing teacher and possibly citizen course-of-study committees and directing the work of any curriculum experts the system may employ.

C. Finances

Superintendent: Presents his proposed annual budget and interprets it for the board; administers the budget after it is adopted and keeps expenditures within its limits; provides for all possible economies that do not endanger educational results; directs the accounting of all school funds; makes proper financial reports to the board.

D. Plant

Superintendent: Directs the planning of all

educational features of new buildings or alterations of old buildings and counsels the architects in the general plans for such building erection; assigns caretakers to all buildings and maintains general supervision over their work; provides for needed experimentation in determining economical and otherwise efficient methods for building care and upkeep.

E. Pupils

Superintendent: Administers all schools and classes established by board action; directs the instruction, guidance, and discipline of all pupils; directs classification, promotion, and graduation of pupils; directs research to determine resulting effects of instruction upon pupils; promotes organizations, such as pupil or student councils and Junior Red Cross, for training pupils in democratic and socially adjusted living.

F. Public relations

Superintendent: Directs a program for reaching the citizens of the community with adequate information about the activities of the schools, the reasons for the activities, and the

results obtained; interprets the schools and the policies back of them in addresses before civic groups when called upon and as available time permits; works with parents' organizations and other groups interested especially in school welfare and progress; fits himself, with his family, into the civic, social, and religious life of the community in a constructive way. (AASA, 1946, pp. 49-51).

Several years later in this period, Charles Reeves gave a list of the more usual duties and responsibilities of the superintendent, some of which were subject to specific approval by the board:

Serve as executive and chief administrative officer of the school board in the conduct of the schools and their auxiliary activities.

Enforce the state laws in the school system and the rules and regulations of the state board of education and the school district board of education.

Attend school board meetings and, in some districts, serve as secretary of the board.

Prepare rules and regulations for consideration for adoption by the board.

Furnish the board with information relating to the schools, advise the board on professional and business matters, and recommend changes in, additions to, and deletions from policies.

Initiate or pass along from his assistants, educational, financial, physical plant, and other policies for board consideration and action.

Make special reports to, and surveys for the board.

Keep the board informed on the execution of adopted policies.

Accept requests and complaints, submitted by patrons and the staff for official presentation to the board.

Prepare agenda for board meetings.

Make and send to board members copies of minutes of meetings prior to their approval.

Provide employees with copies of board rules and regulations.

Keep official files and have custody of official documents.

Prepare the annual report of the board to the public.

Direct the school's public relations program.

Address community organizations.

Co-operate with parent-teacher and other organizations interested in the public schools.

Provide for administering the use of school facilities by outside agencies, in accordance with the provisions of school board regulations.

Organize the personnel of the school system with clear lines of authority and responsibility, subject to approval by the board.

Issue administrative directives in supplementation and amplification of the board's rules and regulations.

Plan and conduct education research.

Recommend textbooks for adoption and specify kinds of equipment and supplies needed for instruction.

Recommend subjects and courses of instruction to the board.

Organize the professional staff for developing curricula, teaching guides, courses of study, and other materials for use in teaching.

Recommend worthy courses of study for adoption by the board.

Prescribe and direct programs for testing and examining pupils.

Supervise the enforcement of the compulsory school attendance laws and the issuance of work permits.

Direct the administration of a guidance and counseling program.

Direct the school health program.

Direct the pupil transportation program.

Direct the athletics program and the programs of other extra-curricular activities.

Direct the operation of special schools and special classes for atypical children.

Plan the physical plant construction program.

Recommend sites and kinds of school buildings required after school building studies and on the advice of the school staff.

Report to the board the condition of school property and recommend plans for new buildings and alterations.

Provide for the supervision of plant operation and maintenance.

Direct the business affairs of the school district.

Prepare with the help of assistants, the annual school budget for consideration, possible modification, and adoption by the board.

Administer and direct the administration of the adopted school budget in accordance with the provisions of law and the regulations of the board.

Direct the purchase of equipment and supplies.

Direct financial and pupil accounting. (Reeves, 1954, pp. 268-270).

The very next year, 1955, the California School Boards Association listed a similar, extensive list of the representative functions of a superintendent:

General Functions

Superintendent

Assumes charge of school system as the executive officer of the governing board

Co-ordinates the work of all schools and departments

Recommends policies to the Board, providing data which will permit the Board to formulate policy

Executes policies of Board and supervises the work of those who are responsible for the administrative activities of individual schools or departments

Reports to the Board relative to the execution of its policies and the general administration of the schools

Personnel Functions

Nominates all employees for board approval or disapproval

Recommends the discharge of employees whose services are not satisfactory

Assigns, directs, and supervises the work of all employees of the school district

Recommends all personnel policies for governing board action

Executes all personnel policies determined
by the Board

Instructional Program

Functions

Makes recommendations relative to the scope
of the instructional program

Assigns instructors for the various
instructional areas

Makes schedules of classes and activities

Develops inservice training programs for
the improvement of instruction

Develops testing programs and other procedures
for evaluation of the effectiveness of the
program

Develops procedures for the selection and
evaluation of textbooks, audio-visual
aids, and other instructional materials

Give leadership to the program for the
constant evaluation and revision of
the program of studies

Provides leadership for the study of the
adequacy of the program of studies and
the needs for additions or amendments
to it, freely using expert consultants

Financial Functions

Presents and interprets to the Board an annual budget proposal

Analyzes and interprets to the Board long-range financial needs and proposal

Administers the budget and keeps, in so far as possible, all expenditures within its limits

Directs the system of financial accounting and the activities of those involved in the business departments

Supervises the program for the purchasing of supplies and equipment

Makes regular periodic reports to the Board relative to financial conditions of the school district

School Plant Functions

Analyzes and recommends to the Board on school plant needs, using consultants as needed

Develops educational specifications for school buildings

Works with the architect in the planning of school buildings

Recommends regarding maintenance needs

Pupil Personnel Functions

Administers the activities of all instructional and guidance personnel

Directs the policies for pupil discipline

Directs the classification, promotion and graduation of pupils

Directs research programs to determine achievements and needs of pupils

Develops a program for providing needs for atypical children

Develops and directs an adequate pupil record system

Reports to the Board relative to the effectiveness of pupil personnel policies

Public Relations Functions

Directs a program for keeping the citizens of the community adequately informed of school developments and problems

Interprets the program and activities of the schools before various community groups

Works with parent groups and other organizations interested in and concerned for the welfare of the schools

Makes an annual report on the school program and policies for the governing board and the community

Meets with representatives of the press to provide information needed for keeping the people of the community informed (California School Boards Association, 1955, pp. 95-99).

During the present thirty year span of the twentieth century the responsibilities of the superintendent were further reviewed, listed, and clarified. The American Association of School Administrators drew a composite from the experiences of many successful superintendents and the judgments recorded in professional literature of the responsibilities of the superintendent:

1. The effective superintendent of schools is sensitive to the growing professional maturity of the teaching profession.
2. He is always concerned for the total welfare and for the just financial compensation of the entire staff.
3. He seeks assiduously to exercise professional leadership, but at the same time he encourages his associates-- administrators, supervisors, specialists, and teachers alike--to engage in the development of forward-looking proposals for study and adoption by the board in matters of professional growth and personal

welfare, including salaries and working conditions.

4. He knows that welfare gains take on much more value if they have been worked out cooperatively with all concerned.
5. He works with the board and staff to the end that a mutually satisfactory plan is adopted and practiced under which working conditions and compensations are continuously studied, and improved contractual and professional programs are presented at intervals to the board of education.
6. He participates, wherever possible and acceptable, with groups of his associates as they gather data, make comparative studies, and develop new and sounder proposals for salary schedules and other benefits. He enables individuals and groups within the staff to get the information they want and keeps them informed of board actions, both prospective and completed.
7. He works out with his associates, within the framework of board policy and staff organization, appropriate ways and means through which grievances can be appealed

to the board when such an appeal is sought by the aggrieved and through which the grievances can be satisfactorily adjudicated with no fear or form of retaliation.

8. He provides the board with a continual flow of information about workloads, working conditions, professional growth activities, evidences of professional and personal competence, and the complexity of the tasks of all of his professional colleagues, together with the comparative figures from comparable school districts.
9. He maintains conditions in which teachers and other staff members can readily come before the board in open board meetings without fear of retribution to discuss issues and to present their points of view on school matters under the same rules and procedures established to give any interested party a hearing before the board.
10. He brings the staff associates to meet with the school board to explain or demonstrate many aspects of curriculum, of instructional methods and materials, and of relevant

professional activities, as well as to present hoped-for gains in improved working conditions and compensation.

11. With the help of the school staff and school board, he keeps the community informed not only of good features of the school program but of system-wide weaknesses and needs, including the need for salaries to attract and hold the best teachers and other staff members, for continuous professional growth of all personnel, for relief from overcrowded and educationally inadequate rooms and buildings, for improvement in the kind and amount of instructional supplies and equipment, and for other improvements to help the schools serve better all the children and the community. He knows that only a well-informed public will insist that school boards, city councils, boards of finance, and other responsible public agencies secure the funds to remedy deficiencies.
12. He takes leadership to assure equitable representation of all and each of the entire staff on all matters affecting their professional and personal welfare.

He knows there is no one pattern--no single process--which is suitable for all the diverse school districts in the nation. He knows that the methods of choosing representatives, and the representation itself, must be the staff's own choice and that no teacher, supervisor, principal, or administrator should feel under-represented or left out.

13. He constantly exerts leadership to assure that board and staff have a well-founded mutual respect; that mutually satisfactory policies and procedures are established and used for presentation, study, and adoption; and that steps by which differences can be resolved are acceptable to all. Above all, he strives to see that matters are presented fairly, studied objectively, and supported by valid data. He seeks to establish an atmosphere in which differences of opinion are to be expected and respected and in which a community of goals and interests is stressed.
14. He shares his leadership with principals, supervisors, and specialists, as well as with teachers, in helping assure sound

policies and acceptable practices.

15. He plays a major role in helping staff members, the school board, and the public know where responsibilities for decision rest. The responsibilities of the board should be made clear to all concerned.
16. He seeks to develop, through cooperation with the staff and the board and with a maximum of satisfaction to all involved, a clear definition of the role of the superintendent himself as well as of the roles of teachers, principals, supervisors, and professional organizations in all personnel matters. Where regional, state, or national associations, other agencies of local and state government, or the people at large have roles, they should be known. He knows that clarification and agreement are more easily obtained before pressures or grievances arise.
17. He keeps the board informed about discussions and actions which may affect local policy, whether they are taking place in state and national capitals or in agencies and associations outside the district. He encourages

the board to make its voice heard wherever matters affecting the district's budget and program are under consideration, lest the freedom and strength of local action be lost.

18. The effective, professional superintendent of schools confidently and courageously serves as adviser to the board, as chief administrator of the schools, as devoted leader of his professional associates, and as staunch defender of the overriding rights of children to the best education possible (AASA, 1963, pp. 9-12).

The Education Policies Commission published a list of the most important functions and responsibilities of a superintendent:

1. The Supervisor of the Instructional Program of the Schools.

He uses the opinions and knowledge of the board, community, and school personnel to act effectively on the continuance and implementation of programs.

2. The Management Aspect.

This area constitutes the tasks of making decisions and carrying out these decisions

in a manner which best serves the purpose of the system.

3. The Administration of the School Budget.

The coordinating and preparation of the school budget to be presented to the board of education and community for acceptance.

4. The Solution of Day-to-Day Problems.

This involves the everyday working responsibilities for the general operation of the school system.

5. The Practice of the Art of Human Relations.

Dealing successfully with the board of education, school personnel, and community persons in the everyday operation of the school system is crucial. (Education Policies Commission, 1965, pp. 3-5).

D. Griffiths, while working at the Center for Applied Research in Education wrote that the superintendent's job can be divided into four areas of responsibility:

1. Improving educational opportunity. All aspects of the instructional program are included in this part; such questions as what shall be taught and how it shall be taught are considered here.
2. Obtaining and developing personnel. The divisions of the job concerned with

recruitment, selection, placement, and promotion of personnel are relevant here. All matters of personnel administration are likewise considered. Pupil personnel problems are considered under this head in addition to matters relating to professional and nonprofessional personnel.

3. Maintaining effective relations with the community. This part of the job is more broadly conceived than mere public relations. It includes interpreting the schools to the public and studying the community so as to further education.
4. Providing and maintaining funds and facilities. The business and housekeeping aspects of school administration are included in this part of the job. Included are budget planning, plant maintenance, construction and renovation of buildings, and similar functions.

(Griffiths, 1966, pp 70-71).

By the early 1980's, two separate Joint AASA-NSBA Committees had published responsibilities of the superintendent. The first Joint Committee stated in 1980 the specific responsibilities of the superintendent as:

- o To serve as the board's chief executive officer

and adviser.

- o To serve as the school system's educational leader.
- o To keep the board informed about school operations and programs.
- o To keep the community informed about board policies, programs and district procedures.
- o To interpret the needs of the school system to the board.
- o To present and recommend policy options along with specific recommendations to the board when circumstances require the board to adopt new policies or revise existing policies.
- o To develop and inform the board of administrative procedures needed to implement board policy.
- o To provide leadership for the district's educational programs.
- o To develop an adequate program of school-community relations.
- o To manage the district's day-to-day operations.
- o To evaluate personnel and keep the board informed about evaluations. (AASA, 1980, p. 5).

In 1984, a second Joint Committee addressed a suggested list of responsibilities within the province of the superintendent:

- o To serve as the board's chief executive officer and adviser.
- o To provide leadership for the district's educational programs.
- o To provide leadership for the district's long range strategic and short range operational plans.
- o To describe for the board the successes, needs, and challenges facing the school system.
- o To recommend policy options to the board with specific recommendations when circumstances require new policies or the revision of existing ones.
- o To keep the board informed through sharing timely and accurate information.
- o To recommend and assign members of the administrative team. (The superintendent generally oversees the development of appropriate job descriptions and ensures that they are followed. As a rule, the superintendent submits employment recommendations to the board for final approval.)
- o To ensure an adequate evaluation/performance

review system for district personnel and programs in accordance with district policies.

- o To develop, recommend for approval, and administer the school district's budget and overall financial plan.
- o To provide periodic progress reports on selected district policy.
- o To consult with the board as part of the process of developing districtwide goals and objectives.
- o To develop and inform the board, administration, and staff of administrative procedures needed to implement board policy.
- o To ensure the management of the district's day-to-day operations.
- o To provide an ever-present orientation that the overriding mission of the school system is education. (AASA, 1984, pp. 4-5).

This section has tried to serve the purpose of illustrating the development of the responsibilities of the superintendent by reviewing various sources in the three different thirty year spans of the twentieth century.

Working Relationships between School
Boards and Superintendents

This section reviews various authorities concerning the separation of responsibilities which forms the working relationship between a school board and superintendent. The previous sections have historically traced the development of the distinction between policy and implementation, responsibilities of the school board, and responsibilities of the superintendent. The first thirty year period of the twentieth century concerning the working relationship between the school board and superintendent has been alluded to in the previous sections. The literature specifically addressed this relationship of responsibilities starting in the the second thirty year span of this century. Ward G. Reeder, Professor of Education, Ohio State University, wrote about cooperation between a board and superintendent:

First of all, the school board should regard the superintendent as the leader of the school forces of the community and should seek his recommendation on all school matters. This does not mean that the board should become a "rubber stamp" for the superintendent. Rather, the board

should seek and carefully consider all such recommendations, but should reserve for itself the right to approve or to reject them. An intelligent and fair-minded superintendent will not object to having his recommendations rejected occasionally. If he does object, he deserves to be criticized for taking himself too seriously and for perhaps wanting to be a dictator of the educational destinies of the community. Superintendents should realize that practically all school board members are honest and public-spirited, and that they want to do everything possible for the schools. A superintendent should never forget that he is an employee of his school board, and that he must cooperate with the members of the board if he desires to continue to hold his position.

In the second place, the board should make an early agreement with the superintendent regarding his duties and the duties of the board. This agreement should be stated in writing as a part of the rules and regulations of the board. (Reeder, 1944, p. 64).

The American Association of School Administrators wrote

in its Twenty-Fourth Yearbook concerning the cooperation and teamwork necessary for school administration:

Even the regular duties and responsibilities of the board and the superintendent, which come to be differentiated in practice, require a high degree of cooperation, as has been shown. Many irregular problems also arise in the administration of schools, such as those connected with a building program, major complaints from employees or citizens, exigencies growing out of war or depression, and so on, for which there is often no predetermined division of responsibility.

In connection with such problems cooperation must reach a high level of teamwork. In all official relations between board and superintendent, in fact, cooperation and teamwork are the indispensable keynotes. (AASA, 1946, pp. 57-58).

Ralph V. Hunkins advised against too much concern about the differentiation of powers between the board and superintendent. We looked upon them as a team working together in the administration of the school. Any differentiation of powers and functions should come naturally out of the deliberations without dividing them

according to some preconceived formula (Hunkins, 1949, p. 16).

A slightly different picture was presented by Charles E. Reeves when he stated:

The division of functions between the board and superintendent is not only customary in the control and management of school systems but is in harmony with sound principles of control and management for industrial and for other public enterprises. A board of directors of a business corporation does not perform the administrative details of the enterprise and a board of a hospital does not attempt to perform operations, determine diets, or manage the laundry. Boards of various public and private enterprises employ a president or a superintendent as their executive officer, give him considerable freedom to manage the enterprise subject to the restrictions of their adopted policies and hold him responsible for results. A school board, consisting of laymen in education, should do likewise.

This is all very clear in theory, but the line between policy making and approval functions on the one hand, and executive and

administrative functions on the other is difficult to determine. The board's rules and regulations and other adopted policies can help to make the distinction clear. Executive and administrative functions can begin only where legislative functions end. Generally, it may be said that legislation should deal with principles; requirements should be general rather than specific; and methods of effectuating the required results should be left to administration. On the other hand, administration should be concerned with executing the laws and the boards regulations and orders in the most effective manner possible.

(Reeves, 1954, pp. 262-263).

In the Thirty-Fourth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators a list of matters which the school board and superintendent should talk frankly and at length concerning their responsibilities was:

1. Just what does each board member understand his job to be? Does he feel that he represents a particular group or cause? Or is he a member of a board representing the whole community? Or is he both?

2. What are the best ways to help all the children in the schools? How can policies be written that reflect the needs of the whole community?
3. Just what is the attitude of each board member and of the superintendent toward the handling of pressures from interested (and sometimes one-track-minded) groups or individuals?
4. Do the board members believe that the superintendent should be not only their executive, but also the representative of all members of the staff in the school system? What are his responsibilities as a member of a profession?
5. What kinds of written policies, covering the essential operations of the board and the schools, can be worked out?
(AASA, 1956, pp. 84-85).

The final and current period of the twentieth century in this review has continued with studies and discussions concerning the working relationships and responsibilities between the school board and superintendent. In a study conducted by Coy F. Hollis in the early 1970's, findings were presented which were strongly indicative of a state

of confusion concerning role responsibility between school boards and superintendents. He wrote that board members claimed responsibility 32% of the time, but were only assigned responsibility 21% of the time. Items on which there was the greatest difference concerned functional matters, rather than policy decisions. (Hollis, 1972, p. 6).

Frank Barham and George Holmes, III, included in their manual for Virginia School Board Members a section concerning the division of functions between a school board and superintendent:

Only when the board performs the functions of directors and the superintendent those of the executive, and neither usurps the duties of the other, will the important work for which they are jointly responsible be successful. Properly, the board directs and the superintendent executes; or, as it is usually expressed, the functions of the board are policy-forming and legislative and those of the superintendent administrative or executive. The board also exercises judicial functions in that it reviews and evaluates, i.e., judges the results of the superintendent's work and hears appeals from the decision of the superintendent under the grievance procedure mandated by the Board of

Education.

In no case does the board, or any member of the board, properly handle directly any executive or administrative details. It is not the duty of the board to "run the schools," but to see that they are efficiently run or managed. This cannot be accomplished if the board undertakes to attend to details that fall within the province of the general manager or superintendent. The board should not have direct administrative dealings with any officer or employee other than the superintendent. It should not purchase supplies. It should not directly attend to any one of the numerous administrative details that must be attended to in every school system, but it should see that all of these are attended to in conformity with board policy and good professional and business principles.

(Barham and Holmes, 1977, p. 30).

Carroll F. Johnson has stated:

Boards and superintendents have troubled relationships because they are from different tribes. Board members are amateurs in education, superintendents are professionals; board members are volunteers, superintendents

are paid; board members are part-time, superintendents are full-time; board members are usually elected, superintendents are usually appointed; board members hold their power collectively, superintendents hold theirs individually. Most important, while the board is, in a sense, the boss and the superintendent the employee, the superintendent is hired to be a leader. Both the board and the superintendent are in charge (Johnson, 1980, p. 1).

Finally, Thomas A. Shannon, Executive Director of the National School Boards Association has written:

It is easy to mouth the usual bromide: "The school board sets policy, and the superintendent implements it.: But there are three reasons this simple declaration masks a complex and dynamic relationship:

- (A) Policy development and administration are not strictly separate. Indeed they are more like a closed loop. It is difficult to ascertain with precision where one activity ends and the other begins. And when the issue at hand is tinged with controversy, the

ambiguity increases. Line up ten reasonable people serving as school board members and superintendents, pose a hypothetical problem, and ask them to identify whether or not policy or administrative issues are involved. Result: a multiplicity of answers.

- (B) Other branches and levels of government have a significant impact on school governance.
- (C) A superintendent must have general discretionary authority. School boards are not in continuous session. Consequently, the superintendent sometimes must act without school board approval. Your school board should sit down with the superintendent and formulate an agreement on the board/superintendent relationship that is applicable to the unique situations in your school district (Shannon, 1982, p. 35).

This section has attempted to garner and marshall various sources and authorities who have written on the

topic of school board and superintendent working relationships. One of the key themes in this section has been the concept of teamwork in the performance of the responsibilities of administering a school system.

Summary

This review of literature concerning the theory and practice of the separation of responsibilities between school boards and superintendents has focused on the three thirty years spans of the twentieth century. The review covered the initial short statements developed early in this century by educational theorists and practitioners as well as the extensive classifications of responsibilities developed for school boards and superintendents by professional organizations. Ralph Hunkins provided a statement which illustrates the dilemma of the separation of responsibilities:

A generally accepted principle of school administration is that the board of education should legislate the policies and appraise the results and the superintendent as the executive put the policies into operation.

In practice, however, it appears that this principle is not always kept inviolate (Hunkins, 1949, p. 15).

Coy F. Hollis presented general observations of his study which pertain to separation of responsibilities:

In summary, if the personnel are to initiate the activities that will fulfill the purpose of the organization, it is necessary that they have a clear perception of who is responsible for performing the various tasks. Clarity of perception is necessitated by that structural requirement of an organization that each person be responsible for certain tasks, but not all tasks. Perception of responsibility is the sine qua non of organizational efficiency. The natural consequence of the lack of a clear conception of responsibility is the lack of action or a conflict over duties (Hollis, 1972, p. 9).

Barham and Holmes, editors, offered a similar statement concerning the efficient and cooperative nature of the relations between the school board and the superintendent:

It is clear from analysis of the relation between the board and the superintendent that the control of the school is not the business of either acting alone, but is a cooperative enterprise in which the board, the superintendent, and the state authorities

Must work together harmoniously for the good of the pupils and the public whom they represent and serve. The division and distribution of powers and duties is not to relieve anyone of duties or exactions, not to minimize or to magnify one over the other, but to provide as nearly as may be, an efficient organization and to increase the chances for success in an important cooperative enterprise (Barham and Holmes, eds., 1977, p. 35).

Summary

The relationship that exists between school boards and superintendents has been the subject of many articles and studies. Gordon Cawelti, Executive Director of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development has written:

The lack of trust that still exists between some boards and superintendents seems to contribute unnecessary conflict. Local control of public education seems best guaranteed when both the superintendent and the board realize that their relationship is a delicate as well as important one. Working to keep that relationship

in constant repair is essential if decisions always are to be made in the best interests of students (Cawalti, 1982, p. 35).

Dean Smith, Superintendent of Schools in Kennewick, Washington provided the following advice for superintendents as essential to the establishment of a harmonious relationship between superintendent and school board:

Together with your board devise written guidelines that (a) specify how key issues will be handled and (b) demarcate the limits of your responsibility and authority. It is equally prudent to set forth at the same time precisely how and by what criteria your board will evaluate your performance as superintendent. Your aim should be to get a hidden agenda out in the open so both will know what to expect from one another (Smith, 1982, p. 32).

One method for resolving differences of responsibility between the school board and the superintendent has been developed by the Mount Diablo, California School Board with a Decision Analysis Chart which divides authority into five distinct levels. These levels have been defined in the following manner.

- Level One - The superintendent has complete authority to decide or act within the limits of law, board policy, propriety and conscience.
- Level Two - The superintendent has complete authority to decide or act, but he must keep the school board informed about his decision or action.
- Level Three - The superintendent has authority to implement or act only with prior approval from the school board.
- Level Four - The school board retains its decision-making authority, but permits the superintendent to make recommendations.
- Level Five - The school board retains its decision-making authority, and the superintendent virtually is excluded from decision-making.
(Hoover and Slezak, 1978, pp. 38-39).

This Decision Analysis Chart sets up a process by which both the board and the superintendent decide on:

1. Which decision situations to list on the chart,
and
2. The level of authority to be used in each.

To set the stage for this study, Professor of Educational Administration, Luvern L. Cunningham, The Ohio State University, has recently written:

The time has come for a general inspection of the scope of school boards' responsibilities. Local district policy bodies in the United States are variously titled. Some are called school boards, school trustees, boards of school directors, local school committees, and boards of education. "Board of education" is probably the most widely used term and, as such, is misleading, given what boards actually do. The amount of attention that boards devote directly to education is modest in contrast to the time given to questions of finance, personnel, collective bargaining, and contracts, all important in their own right. If boards are to address educational matters worthy of the title of "board of education," then the balance of the boards' attention must shift toward education and away from managerial and support issues.

From my perspective, school board members and professional educators, through their

associations and organizations, must invest time reviewing the performance of today's boards and searching for ways to improve the quality of school board service in the United States (Cunningham, 1983, p. 494).

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology of this study, explain the sampling technique, describe the data collection instrument and the administration of the questionnaire, and provide an explanation of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

Descriptive research methodology was utilized in this study.

Survey research studies large and small populations (or universes) by selecting and studying samples chosen from the population to discover the relative incidence, distribution and interrelation of sociological and psychological variables (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 410).

Mouly points out that the purpose of survey or descriptive research is to establish the status of the phenomenon under investigation (Mouly, 1970, p. 234).

Wiersma reinforced the preceding comments concerning survey research by saying that survey research deals with incidence, distribution, and interrelation of psychological and sociological variables (Wiersma, 1980, p. 15).

Sociological variables are attributes of individuals that spring from their membership in social groups: sex, income, political and religious affiliations, socio-economic status, education, age, living expenses, occupation, race, and so on (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 411). Kerlinger has clearly stated that survey research focuses on people, the vital facts of people, and their beliefs, opinions, attitudes, motivations, and behavior (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 411).

Good stated that the purposes of descriptive-survey investigations are as follows:

1. To secure evidence concerning an existing situation or current conditions.
 2. To identify standards or norms with which to compare present conditions, in order to plan the next step.
 3. To determine how to make the next step
- (Good, 1966, p. 208).

The preceding explanations are vital to this study; that is, to provide information and evidence concerning the condition of the separation of responsibilities between school boards and superintendents. As Sax has stated, research may also help point out the extent of the problem and indicate how serious and widespread it is. Once this information is available, educators can consider

methods of resolving the problem (Sax, 1979, p. 18).

This study surveyed a nationwide sample of superintendents and of school board members by means of a mailed questionnaire (Appendix A).

Among the major advantages of the questionnaire is that it permits wide coverage at a minimum expense both in money and effort. It not only affords wider geographic coverage, but it also reaches persons who are difficult to contact. This greater coverage makes for greater validity in the results through promoting the selection of a larger and more representative sample. Particularly when it does not call for a signature or other means of identification, the questionnaire may, because of its greater impersonality, elicit more candid and objective replies (Mouly, 1970, p. 242).

Sax states that another advantage claimed for the questionnaire is that each respondent receives the same set of questions phrased in exactly the same way (Sax, 1979, p. 245). Dillman cautions that the mail questionnaire, more than any other type of questionnaire, requires careful construction, for it alone comes under the respondent's complete control and the questionnaire must truly be its own advocate (Dillman, 1978, p. 119).

For the above reasons, the researcher selected survey procedures to determine the attitudes and opinions of school board members and superintendents toward the separation of responsibilities in school systems and to study relationships among the attitudes, opinions, and selected demographic variables.

Sample

In order to answer the research questions, it was necessary to identify and generate two samples—one of superintendents and the other of school board members. One stipulation was that the members of the two samples be from demographically comparable school districts. Another stipulation was that a superintendent and a school board member not be sampled from the same school district in order to eliminate any possibility of bias if they were to discuss their responses before completing the questionnaire. Similarly, the final stipulation was that there not be two school board members from the same school district in the sample, again to address the possibility of bias in the responses if comparisons were made before completing the questionnaire. Also, consideration was given to the significance of having the two samples be of the same size. In order to meet these stipulations, the samples were chosen in the following manner.

For this study the list of superintendents who subscribe to The American School Board Journal was utilized to aid in the selection of the two sample groups. On November 28, 1984, the subscriber list of The American School Board Journal contained 7,219 superintendents. The Circulation Director was able to separate those superintendents into two groups with similar demographic characteristics. The first group of 2,488 superintendents were actual superintendents which had from one to four of their school board members also as subscribers. This complete group comprised the superintendent sample for this study. The second group of 4,731 superintendents were actual superintendents which had five or more of their school board members also as subscribers. Two thousand four hundred eighty eight of the superintendents in this second group were randomly selected. Since it was possible to identify each of the five or more school board members by their subscriber superintendent, one school board member was randomly selected from each group. These 2,488 school board members comprised the school board member sample for this study. This procedure was utilized to insure that only one school board member from each district was selected to participate in this study.

Instrumentation

The same survey form used in this study was sent to both groups--school board members and superintendents-- and was composed of two parts. Part I of the survey form was designed to collect demographic data about the respondent's school system and to collect personal data such as sex and years of experience from each respondent. Part II of the survey form gathered data in reference to the attitudes of school board members and superintendents toward leadership responsibility on twenty-seven issues.

Twenty of the issues were obtained from a conference of several former distinguished superintendents at which the researcher was present as they discussed and reviewed various situations which they had experienced or perceived as initiating leadership responsibility concerns. These issues were presented to the editors of The American School Board Journal and selected prominent school board members for review. From this review seven additional items emerged. The researcher, chairman, and editors as a group reviewed the 27 issues for arrangement and completeness. A scale was devised to indicate who in the respondent's school system actually decided on that issue and who the respondent believed should decide on that issue.

Each of the 27 issues was placed into one of the four

following categories:

1. Organization and Administration of the School System,
2. Employee and Pupil Personnel Services,
3. Business and Financial Management, and
4. Curriculum and Instruction.

These categories were obtained from a review of the literature and the placement of each item in a category was determined with the assistance of several present and former school board members and superintendents (see Table 1).

Following the development of the questionnaire, a superintendent and his six school board members, not selected in the study sample, were asked to review the questionnaire for the following:

1. Were the directions to the questionnaire stated and explained clearly?
2. Were the questions of sufficient interest and appeal to insure the respondent would be inclined to respond and complete it?
3. Were the questions relevant to current leadership responsibilities so as to elicit accurate and realistic responses?
4. Were the questions asked in a way that would not be embarrassing to the respondent?

Table 1

List of Issues in Each Category

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>ISSUE</u>
Organization and Administration of the School System	1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 20, 24, 25
Employee and Pupil Personnel Services	3, 5, 9, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25
Business and Financial Management	2, 4, 11, 17, 27
Curriculum and Instruction	8, 10, 15, 18

5. Were the questions too restrictive, limited or narrow in scope?
6. Were the questions designed in a manner which would, when taken as a whole, answer the basic philosophy of the study?

Responses from these board members and superintendent were gathered and analyzed for possible misinterpretation of any items. There were no negative responses in regard to the philosophy or intent of the questionnaire or study.

Collection of Data

A total of 2,488 school board members and 2,488 superintendents within the United States were identified and requested to participate in this study. Questionnaires accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix B) and a self-addressed, postage paid return envelope were mailed to each person selected for the samples. The researcher received the first set of returns on March 14, 1985, a second set of returns on March 25, 1985, and the final set of returns on April 9, 1985.

No attempt was made to perform a follow-up survey to those who did not respond in order to study non-response bias. This was due to the stipulation placed by The American School Board Journal which requires anonymity in studies involving its subscribers and this anonymity

was maintained.

Responses to mail questionnaires are generally poor. Returns of less than 40 or 50 percent are common (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 414). Previous national studies of school board members reported returns of less than 30 percent (Meyer, 1982, p. 77). In this study a return rate of 27 percent was achieved.

Method of Analysis

The returned questionnaires were examined for correctness and completeness. Any questionnaires with one or more parts incomplete were discarded. A total of 1,413 questionnaires were received with 61 being discarded for one or both of the above reasons.

All data were coded and entered on a computer terminal by the researcher. The data were analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer routines. All questions from the survey instrument were analyzed using frequency distributions and the 27 issues, each containing two responses from both of the sample groups, were analyzed according to crosstabulation procedures with the Chi Square statistic for significance. The computer facility at the Northern Virginia Graduate Center of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University was utilized to process

the data.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methodology of this study, the development of the instrument, the data collection procedures, and the statistical methods used in analyzing the data.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this chapter is to present a description of the response data and the applied statistical techniques. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the demographic characteristics of the respondents involved in the survey. The second section presents the findings with respect to each research question. The third section presents a summary of the chapter.

Description of the Samples

The number of questionnaires sent to each of the two samples--school board members and superintendents--was 2,488. After six weeks, 535 or 21.5 percent of the survey forms were returned from the school board member sample and 817 or 32.8 percent of the survey forms were returned from the superintendent sample.

Demographic and Personal Data Relative to Respondents Region

The distribution of returned surveys from the two sample groups by region is reported in Summary Table 2 along with the national data from the Digest of Education

Summary Table 2

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Region with National Indicators*

Region	School Board No/%	Superintendent No/%	School Systems National No/%
Northeast	95/17.8	131/16.0	3023/19.3
Central	215/40.2	319/39.0	4671/29.8
Southern	91/17.0	124/15.2	2615/16.7
Western	52/9.7	145/17.8	3282/20.9
Pacific	82/15.3	98/12.0	2085/13.3
Total	535/100.0	817/100.0	15676/100.0

*National School Systems Data/Figures were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84, p. 57.

Statistics 1983-84. The school board responses by region were within 2 percent of the national data in three of the five regions. The greatest difference occurred in the Central Region where the school board responses were 10.4 percent greater than the national data. The superintendent responses by region were within 3.3 percent of the national data in four out of the five regions. The greatest difference occurred, again, in the Central Region where the superintendent responses were 9.2 percent greater than the national data. The grouping of states by region is reported in Appendix H.

Enrollment

The distribution of returned surveys by school system enrollment size is reported in Summary Table 3 along with the national figures from the Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84. The enrollment sizes reported by the school board member respondents depart from the national data by as much as 34.4 percent in the less than 1,000 enrollment category with the smallest deviation being 3.6 percent in the 25,000 or more enrollment category. The enrollment sizes reported by the superintendent respondents are within 0.5 percent of the national data in three out of five categories with the largest deviation in the less than 1,000 enrollment category with 10.6 percent difference between the national data and the superintendent responses.

Summary Table 3

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Enrollment Size with National Indicators*

Enrollment Size	School Board		Superintendent		School Systems	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	National No/%	National No/%
Less than 1,000	106/19.8	356/43.6	8421/54.2			
1,000 to 4,999	256/47.9	378/46.3	5501/35.4			
5,000 to 9,999	92/17.2	49/6.0	1012/6.5			
10,000 to 24,999	56/10.5	26/3.3	457/2.9			
25,000 or more	25/4.6	8/1.0	163/1.0			
Total	535/100.0	817/100.0	15,554/100.0			

*National School Systems Data/Figures were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84, P. 62.

Community Description

The frequency and percent of responses by community description from each sample group is reported in Summary Table 4. The largest percentage of school board member respondents indicated that their community was best categorized as Suburban with 31.8 percent of the total. In the Seventh Annual Survey of Board Members conducted in 1984, the school board members described their community as small town (30.5%), a suburb (30.3%), or a rural area (25.9%) (Underwood, et al, 1985, p. 29). The largest percentage of superintendent respondents indicated that their community was best categorized as Rural with 54.6 percent.

Sex of Respondent Groups

The frequency and percent of responses from the two sample groups by sex is reported in Summary Table 5. The figures for the school board sample were only slightly different from those reported by Underwood, et al, of 61.7 percent male and 38.3 percent female (Underwood, et al, 1985, p. 30). The figures for the superintendent sample compared with those reported in the American Association of School Administrators' 1982 Summary Report of 98.8 percent male and 1.2 percent female (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 16).

Summary Table 4

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Community Description

Description	School Board	Superintendent
	No/%	No/%
Urban	70/13.0	39/4.8
Suburban	170/31.8	139/17.0
Rural	132/24.7	446/54.6
Small Town	147/27.5	174/21.3
Other	16/3.0	19/2.3
Total	535/100.0	817/100.0

Summary Table 5

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Sex

Sex	School Board	Superintendent
	No/%	No/%
Male	358/66.9	790/96.7
Female	177/33.1	27/3.3
Total	535/100.0	817/100.0

Years of Experience

Both of the sample groups reported the largest percent of years experience in the 1 to 5 year category (see Summary Table 6). The school board respondent's average length of service was 5.9 years which falls within the 4 to 7 years of experience category for the average school board member reported in 1985 (Underwood, et al, 1985, p. 29). The average length of service for superintendent respondents was 6.7 years which is less than the 7.6 average years of experience reported by the American Association of School Administrators (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 23).

Findings for Each Research Question

This section presents the findings with respect to each research question. There were 27 issues that each respondent answered with two separate responses-"how the responsibility is separated" and "how the responsibility should be separated". Although there are many other issues that arise in the operation of a school system, the twenty-seven chosen were representative of those that occur in school systems which have the potential for causing difficulty in the separation of responsibility between school boards and superintendents. In order to analyze the responses

Summary Table 6

Distribution of Returned Surveys by Years of Experience

Category	School Board Members	Superintendents	
1 to 5 years	314/58.7	443/54.2	52 58
6 to 10 years	143/26.7	203/25.0	37.3
11 to 15 years	53/9.9	91/11.1	5.9
16 to 20 years	18/3.3	60/7.2	
Over 20 years	7/1.4	26/2.5	
Total	535/100.0	817/100.0	

across broad areas, the issues were grouped into four categories. Table 1 presented those categories and identified which issues were in each category. Additionally, the range of responses to each issue and category were recoded and grouped as: Board Responsibility, Shared Responsibility, and Superintendent Responsibility.

Research Question 1

Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do school board members identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility?

Summary Table 7 reports that in each of the four categories, the school board member respondents indicated that the predominate proportion of the responsibility was the superintendent's. The largest percent of response from school board members was in the Administration and Organization of the School System category with 82.1 percent. Each of the four categories contained over 70 percent of the school board member responses in the Superintendent Responsibility column. The frequency of responses do not total 535 across each row due to individual responses of "non-applicable".

Summary Tables 8 through 11 report in a similar format the school board member responses on each of the issues arranged in categories. More complete information concerning the responses by school board members on each

Summary Table 7

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It Is
Category

How It Is Category	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	2/0.4	83/17.5	388/82.1
2	7/1.6	112/25.5	320/72.9
3	17/3.4	127/25.1	362/71.5
4	9/1.7	121/23.2	393/75.1

"How It Is" issue and category is contained in Appendix E.

Summary Table 8 shows that Issue 14 (Deciding which school building to close) contained the highest percent of the response (32.1%) in the School Board Responsibility column with Issue 14 also containing the greatest percent of response (50.0%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 20 (Deciding individual school bus routes) contained the largest percent of response (88.6%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 9 reports that Issue 3 (Hiring legal counsel) contained the largest percent of responses (26.2%) in the School Board Responsibility column with Issue 23 (Firing the budget director) reported as the issue with the greatest percent of responses (42.4%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 22 (Transferring a student to another school) was identified as the largest percent of responses (83.8%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 10 reports that Issue 17 (Awarding contracts to vendors) contained the largest percent of response (35.9%) in the School Board Responsibility column with Issue 27 (Deciding where to deposit school system funds) as the issue with the greatest percent of response (32.0%) in the Shared Responsibility column.

Summary Table 8

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It Is Issues of Category 1 - Administration and Organization of the School System

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	127/23.7	128/23.9	280/52.4
6	69/13.1	209/39.7	248/47.2
7	11/2.1	58/10.8	463/87.1
12	153/28.7	193/36.3	186/35.0
13	27/5.0	240/44.9	268/50.1
14	165/32.1	257/50.0	92/17.9
20	17/3.2	43/8.2	369/88.6
24	111/21.7	146/28.5	255/49.8
26	109/20.8	194/37.0	221/42.2

Summary Table 9

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It
Is Issues of Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
3	211/39.5	207/38.8	116/21.7
5	146/29.4	157/31.7	173/38.9
9	136/26.2	199/38.2	185/35.6
16	27/5.2	147/28.3	345/66.5
19	89/16.9	198/37.6	240/45.5
21	51/9.6	170/32.0	310/58.4
22	26/5.2	56/11.0	426/83.8
23	132/25.6	218/42.4	164/32.0
25	56/10.5	144/27.0	333/62.5

Summary Table 10

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It
Is Issues of Category 3 - Financial Management

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
2	103/19.6	158/30.2	263/50.2
4	26/4.9	122/23.1	381/72.0
11	99/18.6	103/19.4	329/62.0
17	191/35.9	161/30.2	181/33.9
27	115/22.0	168/32.0	241/46.0

Issue 4 (Establishing line-item budgets) contained the largest percent of response (72.0%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 11 reports that Issue 18 (Deciding which extracurricular activities to offer) contained the largest percent of response (14.0%) in the Board Responsibility column. Issue 18 was also reported with the largest percent of response (45.7%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 10 (Selecting textbooks) was reported with the greatest percent of response (76.1%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Research Question 2

Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do school board members identify as ones for which they should assume responsibility?

Summary Table 12 reports that in each of the four categories, the school board member respondents indicated that the predominate proportion of the responsibility should be the superintendent's. The largest percent of response from school board members was in the Administration and Organization of the School System category with 74.3 percent. Each of the categories contained over 60 percent of the school board member responses in the Superintendent Responsibility column. The frequency of responses do not total 535 across each row due to individual

Summary Table 11

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It
Is Issues of Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
8	63/11.7	247/46.3	224/42
10	26/4.9	101/19.0	403/76.1
15	67/12.6	209/39.3	256/48.1
18	74/14.0	243/45.7	214/40.3

Summary Table 12

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It
Should Be Categories

How It Should Be Category	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	0/0	123/25.7	356/74.3
2	8/1.8	131/29.4	307/68.8
3	26/5.1	166/32.7	316/62.2
4	11/2.1	170/32.5	342/65.4

responses of "non-applicable".

Summary Tables 13 through 16 report in a similar format the school board member responses on each of the issues arranged in categories. More complete information concerning the responses by school board members on each "How It Should Be" issue and category is contained in Appendix F.

Summary Table 13 reports that Issue 14 (Deciding which school building to close) contained the highest percent of response (35.6%) in the School Board Responsibility column. Issue 13 (Determining items on the school board agenda) was reported with the largest percent of response (63.2%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 20 (Deciding individual bus routes) was reported as containing the greatest percent of response (87.4%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 14 reported that Issue 3 (Hiring legal counsel) contained the highest percent of response (41.8%) in the School Board Responsibility column. Issue 23 (Firing the budget director) contained the largest percent of response (48.3%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 16 (Transferring a principal) contained the greatest percent of response (62.0%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 15 indicates that Issue 17 (Awarding

Summary Table 13

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It
Should Be Issues of Category 1 - Administration and
Organization of the School System

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	124/23.2	154/28.8	257/48
6	83/15.6	322/60.8	125/23.6
7	11/2.1	69/13.0	451/84.9
12	155/29.1	263/49.3	115/21.6
13	43/8.1	338/63.2	154/28.7
14	184/35.6	287/55.5	46/8.9
20	16/3.0	51/9.6	462/87.4
24	128/24.9	201/39.2	184/35.9
26	121/23.1	225/42.8	179/34.1

Summary Table 14

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It Should Be Issues of Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
3	223/41.8	248/46.4	63/11.8
5	160/32.0	181/36.3	159/31.7
9	153/29.3	229/43.9	140/26.8
16	26/5.0	172/33.0	323/62.0
19	96/18.1	232/44.2	199/37.7
21	52/9.7	220/41.4	260/48.9
22	28/5.5	69/13.5	414/81.0
23	139/26.9	249/48.3	128/24.8
25	54/10.1	166/31.1	313/58.8

Summary Table 15

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It
Should Be Issues of Category 3 - Financial Management

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
2	124/23.6	203/38.6	199/37.8
4	27/5.1	188/35.5	314/59.4
11	108/20.3	124/23.4	299/56.3
17	202/38.0	177/33.2	154/28.8
27	130/24.8	205/39.1	190/36.1

contracts to vendors) contained the largest percent of response (38.0) in the School Board Responsibility column. Issue 27 (Deciding where to deposit school system funds) contained the highest percent of response (39.1%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 4 (Establishing line-item budgets) contained the greatest percent of response (59.4%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 16 reports that Issue 18 (Deciding which extracurricular activities to offer) contained the highest percent of response (13.8%) in the School Board Responsibility column. Issue 18 was also reported with the largest percent of response (58.9%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 10 (Selecting textbooks) was reported with the greatest percent of response (64.2%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Research Question 3

Are there significant differences between the issues or categories of leadership that school board members identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility and ones for which they should assume responsibility?

Crosstabulation procedures with the calculation of Chi-Square values and level of significance were used on each of the individual "How It Is" issues with the corresponding "How It Should Be" issues for school board

Summary Table 16

Distribution of School Board Member Responses by How It
Should Be Issues of Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
8	87/16.3	307/57.5	140/26.2
10	34/6.4	156/29.4	340/64.2
15	71/13.4	263/49.4	198/37.2
18	73/13.8	313/58.9	145/27.3

member responses. Due to the resulting crosstabulations containing empty cells, the Chi-Square values and significant levels were indeterminate. In an effort to demonstrate the magnitude of the differences on how responsibility is separated and how it should be separated, a Shift in Responsibility Ratio (SRR) was devised in the following manner. The data were recoded from a five response range to three: Shared Responsibility, Board Responsibility, and Superintendent REsponsibility. Each Crosstabulation, as reported in detail in Appendix C, resulted in a three-by-three table containing nine cells numbered for explanation purposes as follows:

	Board	Shared	Superintendent
Board	1	2	3
Shared	4	5	6
Superintendent	7	8	9

The cells along the 1-5-9 diagonal indicated no definite directional shifts in responsibility. For example, cell 1 gave the number of school board respondents who think the issue is board responsibility and who also think it should be board responsibility. The cells above the diagonal (2, 3, and 6) indicated a shift in the responsibility from board to shared, from board to superintendent, and from shared to superintendent. The percent of total sample figures from these three cells were added together

and reported in column 1 of Summary Tables 17 through 20 as Responsibility Shifts Towards Superintendent. The cells below the diagonal (4, 7, and 8) indicated a shift in responsibility from shared to board, from superintendent to board, and from superintendent to shared. The percent of total sample figures from these three cells were added together and reported in column 2 of Summary Tables 17 through 20 as Responsibility Shifts Towards School Board. The Shift in Responsibility Ratio (SRR) was calculated by dividing column 2 figures by the corresponding column 1 figure. An SRR of 1.00 showed no definite directional shift in responsibility. An SRR smaller than 1.00 showed the shift in responsibility was greater towards the superintendent. An SRR greater than 1.00 showed the shift in responsibility was towards the school board. The SRR values were reported in column 3 of Summary Tables 17 through 20.

Summary Table 17 reported the SRR values for each of the issues in Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System. Every one of the SRR values was greater than 1.00 indicating that school board members thought that they should have more of the responsibility for each issue than they perceive they already have. The largest SRR (6.92) in the Administration and Organization of the School System category was on Issue 13

Summary Table 17
 Shift in Responsibility Ratios for School Board Member Responses by Issues of
 Category 1 - Administration and Organization of the School System

Issue	Shift Towards		Responsibility Ratio
	Superintendent	School Board	
1	5.5	9.7	1.76
6	7.4	29.3	3.96
7	4.6	6.7	1.46
12	5.1	17.1	3.35
13	3.6	24.9	6.92
14	5.7	16.0	2.81
20	3.3	4.2	1.27
24	2.8	17.3	6.18
26	3.8	12.2	3.21

(Determining items on the board agenda).

Summary Table 18 reported the SRR values for each issue in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel. Again, every SRR value indicated a shift in responsibility was desired by school board respondents towards the board. The largest SRR (3.07) in Category 2 was on Issue 3 (Hiring legal counsel).

Summary Table 19 exhibited the SRR values for each issue in Category 3-Financial Management. Every SRR value was 2.39 or greater with Issue 2 (Deciding how to invest \$100,000) reported as the largest SRR value (8.15).

Summary Table 20 reported the SRR values for each issue in Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction. Every SRR value was 2.86 or higher with Issue 10 (Selecting textbooks) given as the largest SRR value (4.53).

Research Question 4

Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do superintendents identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility?

Summary Table 21 reports that in each of the four categories, the superintendent respondents indicated that the major proportion of responsibility was their own. The largest percent of response was in the Administration and Organization of the School System category with 88.3 percent. Each of the four categories contained over 70 percent of the superintendent responses

Summary Table 18

Shift Responsibility Ratios for School Board Member Responses by Issues of Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel

Issue	Shifts Towards			Shift In
	Superintendent	School Board	Responsibility Ratio	
3	4.6	14.1	3.07	
5	6.0	14.3	2.58	
9	5.3	16.1	3.04	
16	6.8	10.0	1.47	
19	6.8	14.2	2.09	
21	5.1	13.4	2.63	
22	3.4	6.5	1.91	
23	5.2	12.6	2.42	
25	7.9	11.2	1.42	

Summary Table 19

Shift in Responsibility Ratios for School Board Member Responses by Issues
of Category 3 - Financial Management

Issue	Shift Towards		Shift In	
	Superintendent	School Board	School Board	Responsibility Ratio
2	2.0	16.3		8.15
4	4.0	16.3		4.08
11	3.6	9.8		2.72
17	4.4	10.5		2.39
27	2.6	13.0		5.00

Summary Table 20

Shift In Responsibility Ratios for School Board Member Responses by Issues of
Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction

Issue	Shift Towards		School Board	Responsibility Ratio
	Superintendent	Shift Towards		
8	5.8	21.1	3.64	
10	3.4	15.4	4.53	
15	4.3	14.5	3.37	
18	6.4	18.3	2.86	

Summary Table 21

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Is
Categories

How It Is Category	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	3/.4	82/11.3	642/88.3
2	14/2.2	140/21.7	490/76.1
3	14/1.8	153/20.0	599/78.2
4	13/1.6	205/25.6	584/72.8

in the Superintendent Responsibility column. The frequency of responses do not total to 817 across each row due to individual responses of "non-applicable".

Summary Tables 22 through 25 report in a like fashion the superintendent responses on each of the issues arranged by categories. More complete information concerning the responses by superintendents on each How It Is issue and category is contained in Appendix E.

Summary Table 22 reports that Issue 26 (Setting attendance boundaries) contained the highest percent of response (30.5%) in the Board Responsibility column. Issue 14 (Deciding which school building to close) was reported as the issue with the greatest percent of response (56.9%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 7 (Talking to the press after a high school drug search) was the issue that the superintendents identified with the largest percent of response (93.5%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 23 reports that Issue 5 (Negotiating at employee contract talks) has the largest percent of response (31.3%) in the Board Responsibility column. Issue 3 (Hiring legal counsel) contained the highest percent of response (46.7%) in the Shared Responsibility column with Issue 22 (Transferring a student to another school) identified with the largest percent of response

Summary Table 22

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Is
 Issues of Category 1 - Administration and Organization of
 the School System

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	107/13.1	153/18.7	557/68.2
6	55/6.8	289/35.6	467/57.6
7	11/1.4	41/5.1	749/93.5
12	207/25.4	375/46.0	233/28.6
13	21/2.6	301/36.8	495/60.6
14	238/30.3	447/56.9	101/12.8
20	27/3.4	80/9.8	699/86.8
24	142/17.7	221/27.6	437/54.7
26	234/30.5	347/45.2	187/24.3

Summary Table 23

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Is
Issues of Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
3	292/36	379/46.7	140/17.3
5	235/31.3	265/35.3	251/33.4
9	138/17.7	303/38.9	337/43.4
16	73/9.2	229/28.9	491/61.9
19	99/12.4	316/39.4	387/48.2
21	79/9.9	277/34.4	449/55.7
22	41/5.5	78/10.5	626/84
23	188/24.3	303/39.0	285/36.7
25	83/10.3	192/23.7	534/66.0

(84%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 24 which contained the issues of Category 3-Financial Management--showed that Issue 17 (Awarding contracts to vendors) had the largest percent of superintendent response (36.4%) in the Board Responsibility column. Issue 27 (Deciding where to deposit school system funds) contained the highest percent of superintendent response (27.9%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 11 (Authorizing expenditures from allocated funds) contained the greatest percent of response (77.8%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Summary Table 25 contained the issues of Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction for superintendent responses. Issue 18 (Deciding which extracurricular activities to offer) contained the highest percent of responses (19.5%) in the Board Responsibility column. Issue 15 (Deciding the grade organization of the school system) was the issue which had the largest percent of response (48.8%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 10 (Selecting textbooks) reported the greatest percent of response (78.0%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Research Question 5

Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do superintendents identify as ones for which they should assume responsibility?

Summary Table 24

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Is
Issues of Category 3 - Financial Management

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
2	105/13.5	158/20.2	519/66.3
4	45/5.5	140/17.2	629/77.3
11	64/7.8	117/14.4	633/77.8
17	296/36.4	208/25.5	311/38.1
27	255/32.3	221/27.9	315/39.8

Summary Table 25

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Is
Issues of Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction

How It Is Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
8	80/9.8	380/46.6	356/43.6
10	39/4.8	140/17.2	633/78
15	124/15.3	396/48.8	291/35.9
18	158/19.5	389/47.8	266/32.7

Summary Table 26 shows that in each of the four categories, the superintendent respondents indicated that the major proportion of the responsibility should be in their hands. The largest percent of response was in Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System with 85.5 percent. Each of the four categories contained over 71 percent of the superintendent responses in the Superintendent Responsibility column. The frequency of responses do not total 917 across each row due to individual responses of "non-applicable". More complete information concerning the superintendent responses on each How It Should Be issue and category is contained in Appendix F.

Summary Tables 27 through 30 report the superintendent responses on each individual issue arranged by category. Summary Table 27 has Issue 14 (Deciding which school building to close) as the one where the superintendent respondents assign the largest percent of responsibility (33.3%) to the school board. Issue 6 (Providing orientation for new board members) is reported as the issue with the highest percent of response (63.5%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 7 (Talking to the press after a high school drug search) is listed as the issue where superintendent respondents claimed the highest percent of responsibility (94.2%) should be for themselves.

Summary Table 26

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Should Be Categories

How It Should Be Category	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	1/0.1	106/14.4	630/85.5
2	5/0.8	96/14.7	553/84.5
3	8/1.0	169/22.0	590/77.0
4	14/1.7	215/26.8	574/71.5

Summary Table 27

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Should Be Issues of Category 1 - Administration and Organization of the School System

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
1	106/13	193/23.6	518/63.4
6	99/12.2	519/63.5	198/24.3
7	13/1.7	33/4.1	758/94.2
12	199/24.4	451/55.3	165/20.3
13	27/3.3	487/59.6	303/37.1
14	263/33.3	466/58.9	62/7.8
20	20/2.5	86/10.6	701/86.9
24	103/12.8	255/31.8	444/55.4
26	227/29.4	376/48.6	170/22

For Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel-Summary Table 28 reports that Issue 5 (Negotiating at employee contract talks) contained the greatest percent of response (32.2%) as Board Responsibility. Issue (Hiring legal counsel) exhibited the largest percent of response (56.5%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 22 (Transferring a student to another school) was the issue in Category 2 where superintendents placed the highest percent of response (84.4%) as their responsibility.

Over one-third of the superintendent respondents (35.9%) indicated that Issue 17 (Awarding contracts to vendors) should be Board Responsibility. Issue 27 (Deciding where to deposit school system funds) was reported by superintendent respondents as having the largest percent of response (33.7%) in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 11 (Authorizing expenditures from allocated funds) contained the greatest percent of response (79.0%) where superintendents claimed responsibility should be for themselves.

For Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction-Summary Table 30 reports that Issue 15 (Deciding grade organization of the school system) was where superintendents assigned the highest percent of their response (15.2%) in the Board Responsibility column. Issue 15 along with Issue 18 (Deciding which extracurricular activities to offer) were tied with 54.3 percent of the response in the Shared Responsibility column. Issue 10 (Selecting textbooks)

Summary Table 28

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Should Be Issues of Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
3	251/31.0	458/56.5	101/12.5
5	244/32.2	313/41.5	198/26.3
9	81/10.4	324/41.3	379/48.3
16	33/4.2	221/27.8	541/68.0
19	53/6.6	319/39.7	432/53.7
21	42/5.1	271/33.7	492/61.2
22	28/3.8	86/11.4	638/84.8
23	155/19.9	341/43.7	285/36.4
25	24/3.0	175/21.6	610/75.4

Summary Table 29

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It Should
Be Issues of Category 3 - Financial Management

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
2	93/11.9	213/27.2	478/60.9
4	30/3.7	211/25.9	573/70.4
11	56/6.9	115/14.1	643/79.0
17	292/35.9	231/28.4	291/35.7
27	237/30.0	267/33.7	288/36.3

Summary Table 30

Distribution of Superintendent Responses by How It
Should Be Issues of Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction

How It Should Be Issue	Responsibility		
	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%
8	72/8.8	434/53.2	310/38.0
10	36/4.5	185/22.6	592/72.9
15	124/15.2	440/54.3	247/30.5
18	136/16.7	441/54.3	236/29.0

was the issue in Category 4 which contained the greatest percent of response (72.9%) in the Superintendent Responsibility column.

Research Question 6

Are there significant differences between the issues or categories of leadership that superintendents identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility and ones for which they should assume responsibility?

Crosstabulation procedures with the calculation of Chi-Square values and level of significance were used on each individual "How It Is" issue with the corresponding "How It Should Be" issue. Due to the resulting cross-tabulations containing empty cells, the Chi-Square values and levels of significance were indeterminate. In an effort to demonstrate the magnitude of the differences between the superintendent responses on how responsibility is separated and how it should be separated on each issue, the Shift in Responsibility Ratio (SRR) was used in this research question exactly as previously explained in the findings on Research Question 3 for school board member respondents. Summary Tables 31 through 34 report the SRR values for each issue grouped by category. As before, as SRR value of 1.00 indicated no definite shift in responsibility, an SRR value below 1.00 indicated a shift in responsibility towards the superintendent, and an SRR value greater than 1.00 indicated a shift in responsibility towards the school board.

Summary Table 31 exhibited mixed results in the SRR

Summary Table 31
 Shift In Responsibility Ratios for Superintendent Responses by Issues of
 Category 1 - Administration and Organization of the School System

Issue	Shift Towards		Responsibility Ratio
	Superintendent	School Board	
1	4.0	8.8	2.20
6	4.7	37.5	7.98
7	3.9	3.2	0.82
12	8.3	14.8	1.78
13	4.2	27.4	6.52
14	6.6	12.6	1.91
20	4.9	4.6	0.94
24	11.3	7.9	0.70
26	5.6	7.3	1.30

values associated with Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System. Two-thirds of the SRR values showed a shift in responsibility towards the school board with Issue 6 (Providing orientation for new board members) shown as the largest SRR value of 7.98. Three of the nine SRR values in this category indicated slight shifts in responsibility towards the superintendent with Issue 24 (Deciding which staff report directly to the board) reported as the SRR value (0.70) with the greatest degree of shift in responsibility.

Summary Table 32 reported the SRR values on each issue of Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel with the majority of the values (7 out of 9) as exhibiting a shift in responsibility towards the superintendent. Issue 25 (Hiring a basketball coach) had the lowest SRR value which indicated that superintendent respondents thought they should have more of the responsibility in this area than they perceive they already have. Issue 3 (Hiring legal counsel) had no definite directional shift in responsibility due to an SRR value of 1.00. Only Issue 5 (Negotiating at employee contract talks) was shown to have an SRR value (1.80) which indicated a shift in responsibility towards the school board in this category.

Four of the five issues in Category 3-Financial Management-were reported in Summary Table 33 as having shifts in responsibility towards the school board with

Summary Table 32

Shift in Responsibility Ratios for Superintendent Responses by Issues of Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel

Issue	Shift Towards		Responsibility Ratio
	Superintendent	School Board	
3	8.8	8.8	1.00
5	8.7	15.7	1.80
9	15.4	6.6	0.43
16	13.4	6.4	0.48
19	15.8	6.9	0.44
21	13.7	7.0	0.51
22	4.3	2.4	0.56
23	11.6	8.9	0.77
25	16.7	4.8	0.29

Summary Table 33

Shift in Responsibility Ratios for Superintendent Responses by Issues of
Category 3 - Financial Management

Issue	Shift Towards		Shift In	
	Superintendent	School Board	School Board	Responsibility Ratio
2	3.8	7.8		2.05
4	5.1	10.8		2.12
11	5.1	4.0		0.78
17	5.1	7.2		1.41
27	5.9	7.1		1.20

Issue 4 (Establishing line-item budgets) having the largest SRR (2.12). Only Issue 11 (Authorizing expenditures from allocated funds) reported an SRR value below 1.00 which indicated that superintendent respondents desired more responsibility on that issue than they perceived they had.

Every SRR value reported in Summary Table 34 for the issues in Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction-showed shifts in responsibility towards the school board. Issue 10 (Selecting textbooks) contained the largest SRR value (1.88) in this category showing that superintendent respondents wanted the school board to assume more of the responsibility on this issue than superintendents perceived they had.

Research Question 7

What are the issues or categories of leadership where school board members and superintendents differ on their identification as ones on which each group does assume responsibility?

The previous research questions dealt with categories and issues analyzed according to each individual sample group. This research question addressed how the responses of the two sample groups compare on each "How It Is" category and issue. Crosstabulation procedures with the calculation of Chi-Square values and levels of significance were used to analyze the responses. Due to the number of empty cells or the number of cells with expected frequencies of less

Summary Table 34

Shift in Responsibility Ratios for Superintendent Responses by Issues of
 Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction

Issue	Shift Toward		Shift In	
	Superintendent	School Board	Superintendent	School Board
8	10.9	16.0	1.47	
10	5.2	9.8	1.88	
15	7.1	11.2	1.58	
18	9.0	10.1	1.12	

than 5, the levels of significance were indeterminate. The data were recoded from five response possibilities on each issue to three: Board Responsibility, Shared Responsibility and Superintendent Responsibility. The resulting cross-tabulations are reported in greater detail in Appendix E.

Summary Table 35 showed information concerning the significance of the crosstabulation between school board member and superintendent responses on each "How It Is" category. Also indicated is where each respondent group assigned the major proportion of the responsibility. Although the superintendent was perceived by each respondent group to have the major portion of responsibility in each category, responses in Categories 1 (Administration and Organization of the School System) and 3 (Financial Management) were reported as having statistically significant differences at the .02 level.

The contribution that each issue had towards the significance of Category 1 is reported in Summary Table 36. Only two of the nine issues are shown as not having statistical significance at the .02 level. In both of these issues (20 and 24) the superintendent was perceived to have the major portion of responsibility. Four of the nine issues (1, 6, 7, and 13) showed statistical significance and had the greatest percent of responsibility assigned to the superintendent. Issues 12 and 14 reported significance and unlike the previously mentioned issues,

Summary Table 35

Levels of Significance and Areas of Largest Responsibility by How It Is
Categories for Each Group

How It Is Category	(χ^2) S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Reported Largest Responsibility	Largest Responsibility
			To/%		To/%
1	(9.50548) 0.0086	Supt (82.0)		Supt (88.3)	
2	(2.40540) NS	Supt (71.5)		Supt (78.2)	
3	(8.35761) 0.0153	Supt (72.9)		Supt (76.1)	
4	(1.00803) NS	Supt (75.1)		Supt (72.8)	

S = Level of Significance

NS = Not Significant

Supt = Superintendent

Summary Table 36

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility by How It Is Issues of
 Category 1 - Administration and Organization of the School System For Each
 Group

How It Is Issue	(X ²)S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Responsibility	Largest Responsibility	Reported Responsibility	Largest Responsibility
		To/%	To/%	To/%	To/%
1	(38.45869)0.0000	Supt (52.3)	Supt (68.2)		
6	(21.74676)0.0000	Supt (47.1)	Supt (57.6)		
7	(16.80778)0.0002	Supt (87.0)	Supt (93.5)		
12	(12.79654)0.0017	Shared (36.3)	Shared (46.0)		
13	(17.08657)0.0002	Supt (50.1)	Supt (60.6)		
14	(8.37738)0.0152	Shared (50.0)	Shared (56.9)		
20	(1.27384) NS	Supt (88.7)	Supt (86.7)		
24	(3.96392) NS	Supt (49.8)	Supt (54.6)		
26	(47.26233)0.0000	Supt (42.2)	Shared (45.2)		

S = Level of Significance Supt = Superintendent

NS = Not Significant

had the major proportion of responsibility as shared. The remaining issue (26) showed significance with the largest percent of responsibility reported by the school board respondents (42.2%) with the superintendents while the superintendent respondents placed the major part of responsibility (45.2%) in the shared region.

Only two of the issues (3 and 9) were reported in Summary Table 37 as having significance at the .02 level. Issue 3 (Hiring legal counsel) was reported by the board respondents as having the major part of the responsibility as theirs (39.5%), while the superintendent respondents reported their largest response in the shared region (46.7%). Issue 9 (Hiring a deputy superintendent) contained differing and significant responses. The school board members reported the greatest percent of their responses (38.3%) in the shared region of responsibility while the superintendents indicated that they had the major part of the responsibility with 43.3 percent in their region of responsibility.

Three of the five issues contained in Category 3 showed significance at the .02 level and contributed to the overall significance of the category. Those issues were 2 (Deciding how to invest \$100,000), 11 (Authorizing expenditures from allocated funds), and 27 (Deciding where to deposit school system funds). All of the

Summary Table 37

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility by How It Is Issues of
 Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel - For Each Group

How It Is Issue	(χ^2) S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Largest Responsibility	To/%
		3	(9.11754)0.0105	Board (39.5)	Shared (46.7)
5	(4.02974) NS	Supt (38.9)	Shared (35.3)	Shared (35.3)	
9	(15.13703)0.0005	Shared (38.3)	Supt (61.9)	Supt (43.3)	
16	(7.65177) NS	Supt (66.5)	Supt (48.3)	Supt (61.9)	
19	(5.41365) NS	Supt (45.5)	Supt (55.8)	Supt (48.3)	
21	(0.94475) NS	Supt (58.4)	Supt (84.0)	Supt (55.8)	
22	(0.17148) NS	Supt (83.9)	Shared (39.0)	Supt (84.0)	
23	(3.19458) NS	Shared (42.4)	Supt (66.0)	Shared (39.0)	
25	(2.02289) NS	Supt (62.5)	Supt (66.0)	Supt (66.0)	

S = Level of Significance Supt = Superintendent

NS = Not Significant

respondents in both groups attributed the major portion of responsibility was the superintendent's, but there were differences in the amounts. Issue 27 was one where the school board respondents gave a larger percent of the responsibility (46.0%) to the superintendent than the superintendent respondents claimed for themselves (39.8%).

Although Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction did not have significance at the .02 level, two of the issues in that category did. Issue 15 (Deciding grade organization of school system) reported that the school board respondents indicated that the major part of the responsibility (48.1%) was the superintendent's, while the superintendent respondents said that the responsibility was shared (48.8%). On Issue 18 (Deciding which extracurricular activities to offer) both respondent groups said that majority of the responsibility was shared, and their percent of responses only differed by 2 percent in that region. It was in the other two regions of responsibility on Issue 18 where the responses were different and attributed to the significance.

Research Question 8

What are the issues or categories of leadership where school board members and superintendents differ on their identification as ones on which each group should assume responsibility?

Summary Table 38

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility by How It Is Issues of
 Category 3 - Financial Management - For each Group

How It Is Issue	(χ^2) S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Largest Responsibility	To/%
		2	(34.19130)0.0000	Supt (50.2)	Supt (66.4)
4	(7.05357) NS	Supt (72.0)	Supt (77.3)	Supt (77.3)	
11	(47.00817)0.0000	Supt (62.0)	Supt (77.8)	Supt (77.8)	
17	(4.16276) NS	Board (35.8)	Supt (38.2)	Supt (38.2)	
27	(16.51150)0.0003	Supt (46.0)	Supt (39.8)	Supt (39.8)	

S = Level of Significant

NS = Not Significant

Supt = Superintendent

Summary Table 39

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility by How It Is Issues of
 Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction - For Each Group

How It Is Issue	(X ²)S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Largest Responsibility	To/%
		8	(1.43022) NS	Shared (46.3)	Shared (46.6)
10	(0.74819) NS	Supt (76.0)	Supt (78.0)		
15	(19.95045) 0.0000	Supt (48.1)	Shared (48.8)		
18	(11.09370) 0.0039	Shared (45.8)	Shared (47.8)		

S = Level of Significance

NS = Not Significant

Supt = Superintendent

This research question addressed how the responses of the two groups compared on each "How It Should Be" category and issue. As in Research Question 7, cross-tabulation procedures with the calculation of Chi-Square values and levels of significance were used to analyze the responses. Due to the number of empty cells or the number of cells with expected frequencies of less than 5, the levels of significance were indeterminate. The data were recoded from five response possibilities to three: Board Responsibility, Shared Responsibility, and Superintendent Responsibility. More detailed information concerning each crosstabulation is contained in Appendix F.

Summary Table 40 showed information concerning the significance between the school board member responses and the superintendent responses on each "How It Should Be" category. Additionally, that table showed where each group indicated the major portion of the responsibility should be. Even though the superintendent region of responsibility was where each respondent group perceived that the major part of the responsibility should be, Categories 1 (Administration and Organization of the School System), 2 (Pupil and Professional Personnel), and 3 (Financial Management) reported significance at the .02 level.

The contribution that each issue made towards the

Summary Table 40

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility by How It Should Be Categorized for Each Group

How It Should Be Categorized	(X^2) S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Reported Largest Responsibility	Largest Responsibility
1	(24.77937)0.0000	Supt (74.3)	To/%	Supt (85.5)	To/%
2	(38.50191)0.0000	Supt (68.8)	To/%	Supt (84.6)	To/%
3	(41.52249)0.0000	Supt (62.2)	To/%	Supt (76.9)	To/%
4	(5.49957) NS	Supt (65.4)	To/%	Supt (71.5)	To/%

S = Level of Singificance

NS = Not Significant

Supt = Superintendent

significance of Category 1 is reported in Summary Table 41. Four of the nine issues in this category did not show statistical significance at the .02 level. Issues 6 (Providing orientation for new board members), 12 (Appointing citizen advisory committees) and 14 (Deciding which school building to close) all indicated that each respondent group thought that the responsibility on those issues should be shared, and there were no significant differences. Issue 20 (Deciding individual bus routes) also reported no significant differences with each group putting the largest percent in the superintendent's region of responsibility. The majority of the issues-five out of nine of the issues in this category-did report statistical significance at the .02 level. Issue 24 (Deciding which staff report directly to the board) exhibited the most drastic difference in response in this category. 39.2% of the school board respondents indicated that the responsibility on this issue should be shared, while 55.4% of the superintendent respondents indicated that it should be their own.

Two-thirds of the issues in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel-had statistical significance as shown in Summary Table 42. Issue 3 (Hiring legal counsel) and Issue 23 (Firing the budget director) both reported the highest percent in the should be shared

Summary Table 41

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility By How It Should Be
 Issues on Category 1 - Administration and Organization of the School System -
 For Each Group

How It Should Be Issue	(X^2) S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Largest Responsibility	To/%
1	(36.45663)0.0000	Supt (48.0)	Supt (48.0)	Supt (63.4)	Supt (63.4)
6	(3.43677) NS	Shared (60.8)	Shared (60.8)	Shared (63.6)	Shared (63.6)
7	(36.52931)0.0000	Supt (84.9)	Supt (84.9)	Supt (94.3)	Supt (94.3)
12	(5.12931) NS	Shared (49.3)	Shared (49.3)	Shared (55.3)	Shared (55.3)
13	(21.25242)0.0000	Shared (63.2)	Shared (63.2)	Shared (59.6)	Shared (59.6)
14	(1.55410) NS	Shared (55.5)	Shared (55.5)	Shared (58.9)	Shared (58.9)
20	(0.68356) NS	Supt (87.3)	Supt (87.3)	Supt (86.9)	Supt (86.9)
24	(55.93105)0.0000	Shared (39.2)	Shared (39.2)	Supt (55.4)	Supt (55.4)
26	(23.94847)0.0000	Shared (42.9)	Shared (42.9)	Shared (48.6)	Shared (48.6)

S = Level of Significance

Supt = Superintendent

NS = Not Significant

Summary Table 42

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility By How It Should Be Issues
of Category 2 - Pupil and Professional Personnel - For Each Group

How It Should Be Issue	(X^2) s	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
		Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%
3	(16.96008)0.0002	Shared (46.4)	Shared (56.5)	Shared (46.4)	Shared (56.5)
5	(5.18555) NS	Shared (36.3)	Shared (41.5)	Shared (36.3)	Shared (41.5)
9	(99.99763)0.0000	Shared (43.9)	Supt (48.3)	Shared (43.9)	Supt (48.3)
16	(5.11779) NS	Supt (62.0)	Supt (68.1)	Supt (62.0)	Supt (68.1)
19	(57.00402)0.0000	Shared (44.0)	Supt (53.7)	Shared (44.0)	Supt (53.7)
21	(23.15772)0.0000	Supt (48.9)	Supt (61.1)	Supt (48.9)	Supt (61.1)
22	(3.70883) NS	Supt (81.0)	Supt (84.8)	Supt (81.0)	Supt (84.8)
23	(21.65932)0.0000	Shared (48.3)	Shared (43.7)	Shared (48.3)	Shared (43.7)
25	(52.81463)0.0000	Supt (58.7)	Supt (75.4)	Supt (58.7)	Supt (75.4)

S = Level of Significance Supt = Superintendent

NS = Superintendent

region of responsibility, but the percent of responses from each group in that region of responsibility was different by as much as 10.1 percent in Issue 3. Issue 9 (Hiring a deputy superintendent) and Issue 19 (Hiring a principal) had responses that indicated the school board member respondents placed the largest percent in the should be shared region of responsibility, while the superintendent respondents put the greatest percent in the should be superintendent region of responsibility. Issue 21 (Promoting a teacher to principal) and Issue 25 (Hiring a basketball coach) were indicated by both respondent groups as having the greatest percent in the should be superintendent region of responsibility, but with percents of response that differ by as much as 16.7 percent as in Issue 25.

Sixty percent of the issues in Category 3-Financial Management-exhibited significance at the .02 level. Summary Table 43 reported that the significance on Issue 2 (Deciding how to invest \$100,000) was due to the school board member respondents placing the largest percent of their responses (38.6%) in the should be shared region of responsibility, while the superintendent respondents put the biggest percent of their responses (61.0%) in the should be superintendent region. The other two significant issues in this category, Issue 4 (Establishing

Summary Table 43

Levels of Significance and Areas of Responsibility by How It Should Be Issues of Category 3 - Financial Management - For Each Group

How It Should Be	Issue	(χ^2) S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
			Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Largest Responsibility	To/%
	2	(71.61381)0.0000	Shared (38.6)		Supt (61.0)	
	4	(17.41449)0.0002	Supt (59.4)		Supt (70.4)	
	11	(86.74330)0.0000	Supt (56.3)		Supt (79.0)	
	17	(7.42456) NS	Board (37.9)		Board (36.7)	
	27	(5.52972) NS	Shared (39.0)		Supt (36.4)	

S = Level of Significance

NS = Not Significant

Supt = Superintendent

line-item budgets) and Issue 11 (Authorizing expenditures from allocated funds) were reported by both groups as having the greatest percent of responses in the should be superintendent region of responsibility, but by differing amounts.

Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction-was the only one of the four categories which did not report statistical significance at the .02 level as shown in Summary Table 40. Summary Table 44 did show significance in two of the four issues in Category 4. Issue 8 (Deciding which courses to cut from the curriculum) reported that each group placed the largest percent of their responses in the should be shared region of responsibility, but differed in that region by only 4.3 percent. The differences in percent of responses in the should be board and should be superintendent regions of responsibility were what attributed to the significance of this issue. See Table R8-8 in Appendix F for more complete information concerning Issue 8. Issue 10 (Selecting textbooks) also was reported as having statistical significance at the .02 level in Category 4. Each group responded with the greatest percent in the should be superintendent responsibility region, but those percents differed by 8.6 percent between the two groups.

Research Question 9

What are the relationships between attitudes about the

Summary Table 44

Levels of Responsibility and Areas of Responsibility By How It Should Be Issues
 of Category 4 - Curriculum and Instruction - For Each Group

How It Should Be	Issue	(X^2) S	School Board		Superintendent Reported	
			Reported Largest Responsibility	To/%	Largest Responsibility	To/%
			8	(29.79739)0.0000	Shared (57.5)	Shared (53.2)
10	(11.53869)0.0031	Supt (64.2)	Supt (72.8)			
15	(6.69371) NS	Shared (49.4)	Shared (54.3)			
18	(3.43643) NS	Shared (58.9)	Shared (54.2)			

S = Level of Significance

NS = Not Significant

Supt = Superintendent

separation of responsibilities held by school board members and superintendents using demographic data for comparisons and analysis?

Crosstabulation procedures with the calculation Chi-Square values and levels of significance were applied on each of the "How It Is" and "How It Should Be" categories by sex, region, school district enrollment size, community description, and years of experience for each of the two respondent groups. The resulting crosstabulations contained empty cells or the number of cells with expected frequencies of less than five was greater than 20% so that the significance levels were indeterminate. The data were recoded from five possible responses to three: Board Responsibility, Shared Responsibility, and Superintendent Responsibility. None of the crosstabulations from this analysis exhibited significance at or above the .02 level. In an effort to identify the differences between the two respondent groups, even if those differences are not significant, demographic comparison summary tables were prepared by reporting the response percents in the Superintendent Responsibility area in each "How It Is" category with those in each "How It Should Be" category. When the "How It Is" percent was larger than the "How It Should Be" percent, a shift in responsibility was indicated towards the school board. When the "How It Should Be" percent was larger than the "How It Is" percent, a shift

in responsibility was indicated towards the superintendent. More complete information concerning each response is contained in Appendix G.

Sex of Respondent Groups

In each of the four categories male school board member respondents indicated the responsibility should be shifting towards the school board when their "How It Is" responses were compared with their "How It Should Be" responses. Female school board respondents had greater percents of response in the superintendent responsibility area than did male school board members in all categories except Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction. The female school board respondents also indicated shifts in responsibility towards the school board in all four categories when their "How It Is" responses were compared to their "How It Should Be" responses. See Tables R9-1 and R9-9 in Appendix G for the percent of response in each category.

Male superintendent responses reported mixed findings with respect to shift of responsibility. In Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel-male superintendents indicated a shift in responsibility towards themselves when their "How It Is" responses were compared with their "How It Should Be" responses. In the other three categories, male superintendent respondents indicated slight shifts in responsibility towards the school board. Female superintendent respondents indicated a shift in

responsibility towards the school board in Category 3-Financial Management and Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction. The female superintendents reported the same percent of response (87%) in the Superintendent Responsibility area for Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System-indicating that there was no difference in their attitude towards "How It Is" and "How It Should Be". See Table R9-1 and R9-9 in Appendix G for more complete information concerning each percent of response by sex.

Regions of Respondent Groups

School board member responses indicated a shift in responsibility towards themselves in all categories of each region with one lone exception. In the Western Region school board members indicated a shift in responsibility towards the superintendent in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel. More complete information concerning each percent of response is contained in R9-2 and R9-10 of Appendix G.

An analysis of the superintendent responses by region showed mixed results. In Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System-only the superintendent respondents in the Northeast Region indicated a shift in responsibility towards themselves. The superintendent respondents in the other four regions indicated a shift

Summary Table 45

Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categories by Sex (In Percentages)

Category/Sex	School Board		Superintendent	
	Male I/S	Female I/S	Male I/S	Female I/S
1	78.9/73.8*	88.5/75.7*	88.4/85.4*	87.0/87.0
2	67.2/65.2*	84.6/76.2*	76.0/84.5+	77.3/85.7+
3	67.8/57.9*	79.2/70.8*	78.0/77.2*	77.2/69.2*
4	75.3/66.4*	74.9/63.4*	72.6/71.3*	71.3/76.9+

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Towards Board

+ Denotes Shift Towards Superintendent

Summary Table 46

School Board Member Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categories by Region (In Percentages)

Category/Region	Northeast		Central		Southern		Western		Pacific	
	I	S	I	S	I	S	I	S	I	S
1	75.3	70.0*	82.8	74.7*	83.8	75.3*	78.7	77.1*	88.7	75.7*
2	64.0	56.3*	75.4	71.0*	72.3	69.1*	75.6	73.3*	76.6	76.2*
3	62.5	47.2*	74.8	65.5*	68.6	60.5*	72.0	68.0*	76.3	68.8*
4	75.5	66.3*	76.1	69.9*	78.9	66.3*	71.2	59.6*	70.5	55.1*

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Towards Board

+ Denotes Shift Towards Superintendent

in responsibility towards the school board. In Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel-the reverse situation occurred. The shift in responsibility was towards the superintendent in each region except the South, where there was a slight indication of shift in responsibility towards the school board. The superintendent respondents indicated a shift in responsibility towards the school board in the Central, Western, and Pacific Regions with respect to Category 3-Financial Management. The other two regions -Northeast and South-indicated a shift in responsibility towards the superintendent. The South Region was the only one of the five regions to report a shift in responsibility towards the superintendent in Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction. The superintendent respondents in the other four regions reported shifts in responsibility towards the school board with respect to curriculum and instruction. The superintendent respondents in the Pacific Region exhibited the largest percent of shift in responsibility (19%) towards the school board in Category 4. More complete information is contained in R9-3 and R9-11 of Appendix G concerning each of the superintendent responses by region.

Enrollment Sizes of Respondent Groups

An analysis of the school board member responses in each category by school district enrollment showed a shift in responsibility towards the school board in all but the

Summary Table 47

Superintendent Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categories by Region (In Percentages)

Category/Region	Northeast		Central		Southern		Western		Pacific	
	I	S	I	S	I	S	I	S	I	S
1	84.7	87.1+	88.8	87.6*	88.2	87.6*	91.9	79.2*	86.9	82.4*
2	71.9	82.1+	78.9	87.6*	84.4	85.3+	65.3	76.1+	82.5	90.0+
3	75.7	77.9+	82.8	82.2*	75.0	72.2*	74.5	70.8*	75.3	73.1*
4	75.4	74.6*	71.7	73.3+	81.8	74.4*	70.6	67.1*	65.3	64.3*

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Towards Board

+ Denotes Shift Towards Superintendent

"More Than 25,000" enrollment size for Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System. The school board respondents from districts with reported enrollment sizes of 1,000 to 4,999 and of 10,000 to 24,999 indicated shifts in responsibility towards themselves in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel. All school board member responses in Category 3-Financial Management and Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction-indicated a shift in response towards the school board. See R9-4 and R9-12 for more complete information concerning each school board member response by school district enrollment size.

The superintendent respondents showed mixed results in their shifts in responsibility. For Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System-the superintendent respondents indicated a shift in responsibility towards the board in school districts with less than 1,000 students and in school districts with 1,000 to 4,999 students. There was little or no shift in responsibility from the superintendent respondents in districts with 5,000 to 9,999 students and in more than 25,000 students. The only district size which reported a shift in responsibility towards the superintendent for Category 1 was in the 10,000 to 24,999 enrollment size. The superintendent responses in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel indicated a shift in responsibility

Summary Table 48

School Board Member Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categorized by School District Enrollment Size (In Percentages)

Category/Size	Less Than 1,000		1,000 to 4,999		5,000 to 9,999		10,000 to 24,999		More Than 25,000	
	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
1	83.0/70.8*	80.9/75.5*	88.2/77.9*	84.3/72.5*	62.5/66.7+					
2	57.0/59.3+	71.1/62.1	84.4/84.8+	83.7/79.6*	82.6/87.0+					
3	71.8/63.1*	68.9/58.2*	77.9/72.1*	75.5/64.8*	65.0/57.1*					
4	72.2/65.4*	74.3/66.4*	79.8/65.9*	82.1/62.5*	64.0/60.0*					

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Towards Board

+ Denotes Shift Towards Superintendent

towards the superintendent in every district size except 25,000 or more students where there was little or no indication of shift in responsibility. In Category 3-Financial Management-the superintendent respondents indicated a shift toward the board in three of the five enrollment sizes. The "Less than 1,000", "10,000 to 24,999", and "More than 25,000" enrollment groups exhibited those shifts in responsibility towards the board. Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction-reported mixed results on shift in responsibility. Two of the enrollment groups (Less than 1,000 and 10,000 to 24,999) reported shifts in responsibility towards the board, two of the groups (1,000 to 4,999 and 5,000 to 9,999) reported shifts in responsibility towards the superintendent, and one group (More than 25,000) indicated little or no shift in responsibility for Category 4. See R9-5 and R9-13 in Appendix G for more complete information.

Community Descriptions of Respondent Groups

All of the school board member responses in Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System-showed a shift in responsibility towards the board except for the community description "Other". Four of the five community descriptions in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel-indicated a shift in responsibility by the school board member respondents towards themselves. Only those

school board member respondents in the rural community description indicated a shift towards the superintendent for Category 2. Results in Category 3-Financial Management-showed a shift in responsibility reported by school board member respondents towards themselves in all but the community description of "Other". Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction-contained the same report by school board members as Category 1. The shift in responsibility was indicated towards the school board in each community description except "Other", which exhibited no definite directional shift in responsibility by school board member respondents. More complete information concerning the school board member responses by community description is contained in R9-6 and R9-14 of Appendix G.

The results of the analysis of the superintendent responses by community description were more varied than those of the school board member respondents. In three of the five community descriptions-Suburban, Rural, and Small Town-superintendent respondents indicated a shift in responsibility towards the board for Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System. All of the superintendent responses in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel-indicated a shift in responsibility towards themselves. For Category 2-Financial Management-the superintendent respondents from Suburban, Rural, and Small Town communities indicated a shift in responsibility

Summary Table 49

Superintendent Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categories by School District Enrollment Size (In Percentages)

Category/Size	Less Than 1,000		1,000 to 4,999		5,000 to 9,999		10,000 to 24,999		More Than 25,000	
	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
1	90.1/84.1*	87.2/86.0*	87.0/87.0	79.2/87.5+	100.0/100.0					
2	71.7/82.1+	77.3/85.0+	87.2/90.0+	90.0/95.0+	100.0/100.0					
3	79.5/74.2*	77.7/80.0+	70.5/79.5+	75.0/62.5*	100.0/87.5*					
4	74.3/70.3*	70.9/71.8+	79.2/83.3+	68.0/60.0*	75.0/75.0					

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Toward Board

+ Denotes Shift Towards Superintendent

Summary Table 50

School Board Member Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categories by Community Description (In Percentages)

Description/ Category	Urban		Suburban		Rural		Small Town		Other	
	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
1	79.7/70.3*	80.3/71.4*	81.4/78.0*	84.8/74.4*	92.9/92.9					
2	80.0/78.3*	80.3/73.2*	57.8/65.0+	71.9/61.3*	81.8/72.7*					
3	62.9/48.4*	74.7/61.7*	68.8/65.6*	72.5/62.7*	86.7/93.3+					
4	73.9/56.5*	75.9/65.7*	74.2/70.3*	75.2/63.4*	80.0/80.0					

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Toward Board

+ Denotes Shift Toward Superintendent

towards the board. Those superintendent respondents from Urban communities expressed a shift in responsibility towards themselves for Category 3, while those who described their community as "Other" showed no definite directional shift in responsibility. Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction-had the shift in responsibility towards the superintendent in communities described as Urban, Suburban, and Small Town by the superintendent respondents. Those superintendents in rural communities indicated a shift towards the school board for Category 4 and those superintendents in the "Other" community description had expressed no shift in responsibility. See R9-7 and R9-15 in Appendix G for more complete information concerning the superintendent responses by community description.

Average Years of Experience of Respondent Groups

Six years of experience was reported earlier in this study to be the average length of service for school board members. Using that figure for comparisons, school board member respondents indicated a shift in responsibility towards themselves in all but Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel. The largest difference occurred in Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction where their "How It Should Be" response in the area of superintendent responsibility was 10.3 percent greater than their "How It Is" response.

Summary Table 51

Superintendent Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categories by Community Description (In Percentages)

Description Category	Urban		Suburban		Rural		Small Town		Other	
	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S
1	84.6/92.3+	85.1/83.7*	88.9/84.5*	89.6/85.9*	94.4/100.0+					
2	82.9/91.7+	82.9/90.8+	72.8/81.6+	76.7/84.8+	77.8/83.3+					
3	79.4/82.4+	73.0/72.4*	78.5/77.0*	80.9/78.5*	82.4/82.4					
4	60.6/65.8+	74.5/77.4+	74.3/69.8*	70.6/72.4+	72.2/72.2					

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Towards Board

+ Denotes Shift Towards Superintendent

Seven years of experience was the average for superintendent respondents. In every category, they indicated a shift in responsibility towards the board. Like the school board respondents, the superintendent responses exhibited that largest percent of shift (7.9%) in Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction. See Tables R9-8 and R9-16 in Appendix G for more complete information.

Summary

This chapter has presented descriptions of the demographic characteristics of school board and superintendent respondents. Included in those descriptions were reports of several national demographics for comparisons with this study. Also included in this chapter were reports of the findings with respect to each research question. The method of analysis and summary of the findings described by category, first, and important issues, second, was the arrangement used in reporting the findings.

Summary Table 52

School Board Member and Superintendent Responses in Superintendent Responsibility for How It Is and How It Should Be Categories by Average Years of Experience (In Percentages)

Category/Group	School Board		Superintendent	
	I	S	I	S
1	79.5	76.2*	82.9	80.0*
2	51.6	54.3+	87.1	83.9*
3	68.3	59.5*	78.4	75.7*
4	63.6	53.3*	76.3	68.4*

I = How It Is

S = How It Should Be

* Denotes Shift Towards Board

+ Denotes Shift Towards Superintendent

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of the study that was conducted. This summary will include a review of the need and purpose of the study, a restatement of the research questions, a summary of related literature, the research methodology employed, and the conclusions derived from the analysis of the data. Also, recommendations for further research will be made.

Summary

Need and Purpose of the Study

Separation of the responsibilities in the operation of a school system started to emerge in the early 1900's as an issue in educational administration. Typical of the writings of that period was the following statement made by George D. Strayer:

The right relationship between boards of education and superintendents of schools will come to exist when boards of education cease to think of their function as having to do with the execution of the policies they adopt (Strayer, 1923, p. 162). Efforts were made during the 1930's, 40's, and 50's to address, define, and codify the distinction between the

school board making the policies and the superintendent implementing those policies. In a study of sixty school districts in the midwest conducted by Maurice Stapley, the following conclusion was stated:

Decision-making and even the execution of policies often were divided arbitrarily between the board and superintendent. Sometimes a board would reserve to its membership the execution of even minor administrative details, and yet the same board might leave major policy matters in other areas entirely to the discretion of the superintendent (Stapley, 1957, p.17).

During the next thirty year span of this century, the 1960's through 80's, the national organizations of school board members and superintendents issued Joint Position Statements concerned with how the division of policy making and administration could be achieved:

It is increasingly important for the board and superintendent to delineate their respective roles...To accomplish these tasks, the board must serve as a legislative body in the development and evaluation of policies. The superintendent must be primarily responsible for the administration of the school district in accordance with those policies (AASA, 1980, p. 1).

This Joint Position Statement continued with lists of the specific responsibilities of boards and of superintendents in order to assist in the delineation of their separate responsibilities in the operation of a school system.

More recently, Sally B. Zakariya, an Associate Editor of The American School Board Journal has written:

A general rule is that board policy spells out the what, why, and how much; the superintendent handles the who, where, when, and how. The real answer to the policy-versus-administration question, however is something your board and superintendent must hammer out (Zakariya, 1983, p. 29).

In over fifty years of study, effort, and writing, the separation of responsibilities in the operation of a school system has come full circle. The theory of the board setting the policy and the superintendent implementing that policy has been firmly established in the literature, but the difficulty of putting that theory into practice still remains despite the many efforts to define, codify, and delineate the specific responsibilities of each group.

The purpose of this study was to determine which areas or categories of leadership responsibilities were being performed by school board members or by superintendents; what were the perceptions of those two groups concerning

who should be responsible; and to determine relationships between attitudinal variables and certain demographic variables.

Research Questions Restated

1. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do school board members identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility?

2. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do school board members identify as ones for which they should assume responsibility?

3. Are there significant differences between the issues or categories of leadership that school board members identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility and ones for which they should assume responsibility?

4. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do superintendents identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility?

5. Which issues or categories of leadership in the school system do superintendents identify as ones for which they should assume responsibility?

6. Are there significant differences between the issues or categories of leadership that superintendents identify as ones for which they do assume responsibility and ones for which they should assume responsibility?

7. What are the issues or categories of leadership where school board members and superintendents differ on their identification as ones on which each group does assume responsibility?

8. What are the issues or categories of leadership where school board members and superintendents differ on their identification as ones on which each group should assume responsibility?

9. What are the relationships between the attitudes about the separation of responsibilities held by school board members and superintendents using demographic data for comparisons and analysis?

Summary of Related Literature

The researcher presented a historical perspective of the development of the theory in educational administration concerning the separation of responsibilities in the leadership of a school system as the school board setting policies and the superintendent implementing those policies. The statement that the school board should always confine its work to seeing that the schools were properly administered and never should the board itself administer the schools was established early and repeated often (Olsen, 1926, p. 5). William L. Boyd addressed the same concern over fifty years later:

The long-standing complaint, and one that is

still frequently heard, has been that school boards too often have interfered in the administration of the schools. But why should board-staff relationships be so problematic? Is it just that the policy-making and administrative functions are so hard-some would say impossible-to separate in practice? Or does the problem run deeper than that? Can it be that representation and administration are inherently at odds, that there is an inescapable tension between the needs of the two functions, i.e., for democratic deliberation on the one hand, and efficient, expeditious action on the other hand (Cistone, 1975, p. 103)?

The researcher presented a historical perspective of the responsibilities of school boards and their members. Representative of the early writings on this matter was characterized by, "The general functions of a board of education may be best summarized as follows: (1) Select the superintendent of schools. (2) Determine the policies of the school system. (3) See that these policies are carried out by the superintendent and his associates" (Olsen, 1926, p. 8). Extensive lists were developed and published which detailed the functions and responsibilities

of school boards during the ensuing years. The most current of those lists of responsibilities was developed by a Joint AASA-NSBA Committee in 1980. They listed the specific responsibilities of a school board as:

- o To delegate to the superintendent responsibility for all administrative functions, except those specifically reserved through board policy for the board chairperson. Those reserved areas might include: conducting board meetings and public hearings, approving the agenda and minutes and other activities incidental to, and associated with serving as presiding officer of the board.
- o To support the superintendent fully in all decisions that conform to professional standards and board policy.
- o To hold the superintendent responsible for the administration of the school through regular constructive written and oral evaluations of the superintendent's work. Effective evaluation is ongoing effort and should be linked to goals established by the board with the assistance of the superintendent.
- o To provide the superintendent with a comprehensive employment contract.

- o To give the superintendent the benefit of the board's counsel in matters related to individual board members' expertise, familiarity with the local school system, and community interests.
- o To hold all board meetings with the superintendent or a designee present.
- o To consult with the superintendent on all matters, as they arise, that concern the school system and on which the board may take action.
- o To develop a plan for board-superintendent communications.
- o To channel communications with school employees that require action through the superintendent, and to refer all applications, complaints, and other communications, oral or written, first to the superintendent in order to assure that the district processes such communications in an effective, coordinated fashion and is responsive to students and patrons.
- o To take action on matters only after hearing the recommendation of the superintendent.
- o To establish a policy on the effective management of complaints.

- o To provide the superintendent with sufficient administrative help, especially in the area of monitoring teaching and learning. (AASA, 1980 pp. 3-4).

The researcher next presented a historical perspective of the responsibilities of the superintendent which was developed along similar lines to that of the school board responsibilities. Extensive lists and classifications of the responsibilities of superintendents were developed by various writers and organizations of educational administration. Illustrative of those lists and classifications was the most current one proposed by an AASA-NSBA Joint Committee concerning the responsibilities within the province of the superintendent:

- o To serve as the board's chief executive officer and adviser.
- o To provide leadership for the district's educational programs.
- o To provide leadership for the district's long range strategic and short range operational plans.
- o To describe for the board the successes, needs, and challenges facing the school system.
- o To recommend policy options to the board with specific recommendations when circumstances

require new policies or the revision of existing ones.

- o To keep the board informed through sharing timely and accurate information.
- o To recommend and assign members of the administrative team. (The superintendent generally oversees the development of appropriate job descriptions and ensures that they are followed. As a rule, the superintendent submits employment recommendations to the board for final approval.)
- o To ensure an adequate evaluation/performance review system for district personnel and programs in accordance with district policies.
- o To develop, recommend for approval, and administer the school district's budget and overall financial plan.
- o To provide periodic progress reports on selected district policy.
- o To consult with the board as part of the process of developing districtwide goals and objectives.
- o To develop and inform the board, administration, and staff of administrative procedures needed to implement board policy.

- o To ensure the management of the district's day-to-day operations.
- o To provide an ever-present orientation that the overriding mission of the school system is education. (AASA, 1984, pp. 4-5).

The concept of cooperation and teamwork in the relationship between the school board and superintendent in the separation of responsibilities in the operation of a school system was addressed in the review of literature. One writer advised that any differentiation of powers and functions should come naturally out deliberations of the school board and the superintendent working together as a team without dividing the functions and powers according to some preconceived formula (Hunkins, 1949, p. 16). On another side of the issue, Carroll F. Johnson addressed why the working relationship between the school board and superintendent was a troubled one:

Boards and superintendents have troubled relationships because they are from different tribes. Board members are amateurs in education, superintendents are professionals; board members are volunteers, superintendents are paid; board members are part-time, superintendents are full-time; board members

are usually elected, superintendents are usually appointed; board members hold their power collectively, superintendents hold theirs individually. Most important, while the board is, in a sense, the boss and the superintendent is hired to be a leader. Both the board and the superintendent are in charge (Johnson, 1980, p. 1).

The literature regarding general categories of leadership in the school system contained the categories of Administration and Organization of the School System, Pupil and Professional Employee Relations, Financial Management, and Curriculum and Instruction in common. Advice on handling the separation of the responsibilities was emphasized by Dean Smith, Superintendent of Schools in Kennewick, Washington, to superintendents as:

Together with your board devise written guidelines that (a) specify how key issues will be handled and (b) demarcate the limits of your responsibility and authority (Smith, 1982, p. 32).

Research Methodology

This study utilized descriptive research methodology and survey technique to gather data from school board members and superintendents about their attitudes toward

the separation of responsibilities in the operation of a school system in the categories of Administration and Organization, Pupil and Professional Employees, Financial Management, and Curriculum and Instruction.

Two samples—one of school board members and the other of superintendents—were drawn from the population of subscribers to The American School Board Journal. Each sample contained 2,488 members and was drawn so that a superintendent and one of his or her board members from the same school district could not be chosen. Also, the school board member sample was drawn so that two or more members of the same school board could not be chosen. Both of these stipulations were utilized in order that sample bias could be reduced.

The survey form used to collect the data was divided into two parts. Part I collected demographic information about the respondent's school district, sex, and years of experience. Part II collected data concerning the respondent's attitude towards how responsibility is separated and how responsibility should be separated on twenty-seven issues.

The method of analysis and statistical treatments applied to the data were identified. Research questions 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9 were analyzed by means of frequency distributions. Research questions 3, 6, 7, and 8 were

analyzed using crosstabulation and chi-square procedures. The researcher analyzed the data for significance between the how responsibility is separated and how responsibility should be separated attitudinal variables and between those attitudinal variables and the demographic or personal variables. All significant results were reported with the level of significance established at .02. To further demonstrate the differences in respondent attitudes, a Shift in Response Ratio (SRR) was calculated for research questions 3 and 6 which indicated whether the respondent group thought that more of the responsibility in each category should be their own or the other group's.

Results

The two respondent groups were described by region of the United States, enrollment size, community description, sex and years of experience.

School board member respondents reported the largest percent of their responses for how the responsibility is separated in their school districts in the superintendent's area of responsibility in all four categories. The largest percent of their responses for superintendent responsibility (82.1%) was in Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System followed by Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction with 75.1 percent, Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel with 72.9 percent, and

Category 3-Financial Management with 71.5 percent.

School board member respondents reported the largest percent of their responses for how the responsibility should be separated in the superintendent's area of responsibility in all four categories. The percents of their responses in the superintendent's area of responsibility from largest to smallest were: Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System (74.3%), Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel (68.8%), Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction (65.4%), and Category 3-Financial Management (62.2%).

The Shift in Responsibility Ratio (SRR) when school board member responses for how the responsibility is separated were compared with their responses for how the responsibility should be separated, indicated that the school board member respondents wanted more of the responsibility than they thought they had in each of the four categories.

Superintendent respondents reported the largest percent of their responses in their own area of responsibility for all four categories when asked to indicate how they thought the responsibility was separated in their school district. In order from largest to smallest percent of response were: Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System with 88.3 percent, Category 3-Financial Management with 78.2 percent,

Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel with 76.1 percent, and Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction with 72.8 percent.

Superintendent respondents reported the largest percent of their responses in their own area of responsibility for all four categories when asked how they thought the responsibility should be separated in their school district. From largest to smallest their responses for superintendent responsibility were: Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System with 85.5 percent, Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel with 84.5 percent, Category 3-Financial Management with 77.0 percent, and Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction with 71.5 percent.

The Shift in Responsibility Ratios for superintendent respondents indicated that superintendents thought that the school board should have more of the responsibility in three out of the four categories. Only in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel did superintendents indicate a shift in responsibility towards themselves.

Although the percent of response from each of the two groups was largely reported in the superintendent responsibility area, there were significant differences between the two groups when their responses on how the responsibility is separated were compared. Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System and

Category 3-Financial Management were the categories that were reported as significant.

Category 3-Financial Management and Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction were reported as showing significant differences when the responses of the two groups on how the responsibility should be separated were compared.

Conclusions

This section is separated into three parts. The first part contains conclusions concerning the separation of responsibility by demographic characteristics. The second section contains conclusions concerning the separation of responsibility by issues. The final section contains overall conclusions concerning the study.

Demographic characteristics of sex, region, enrollment size, and community description from each of the two samples were found to contain categories where the separation of responsibility in the operation of a school system indicated differences. Concerning the demographic characteristic of sex of the respondent groups, female board members indicated to a higher degree than their male counterparts that they desired a larger portion of the responsibility than they felt they already had in three out of four categories studied. Those categories were: Administration and Organization of

the School System, Pupil and Professional Personnel and Financial Management. There were no significant differences between the responses of male and female superintendents. School board members from every region of the country reported they wanted a larger share of the responsibility in all four categories. The superintendent respondents indicated they wanted more responsibility, with the lone exception being those superintendents who responded from the Western region in Category 1-Administration and Organization of the School System. With only a minor exception, school board member respondents from all of the enrollment classifications indicated they wanted more of the responsibility in every category with their strongest expressions in Category 4-Curriculum and Instruction. The superintendent respondents from every enrollment classification indicated they wanted more responsibility in Category 2-Pupil and Professional Personnel. Those superintendent respondents in school districts of "Less than 1,000" and "5,000 to 9,999" expressed a willingness for the school board to assume more of the responsibility on curriculum and instruction matters. Concerning the demographic characteristic of community description, school board members indicated they wanted more of the responsibility in every category in every type of community with one lone

exception. Those board respondents from Rural communities indicated they were willing to allow the superintendent more responsibility in Category2-Pupil and Professional Personnel. Superintendent respondents from Urban communities indicated they wanted more responsibility in all categories and all superintendent respondents wanted more responsibility in Category2-Pupil and Professional Personnel.

When analyzing individual issues on a national basis, several stood out as exhibiting trends between the two sample groups. On five of the twenty-seven issues, school board member respondents indicated they wanted substantially more of the responsibility and the superintendent respondents indicated they were willing to accommodate that desire to a certain degree. Those issues were: Issue 2 (Deciding how to invest \$100,000), Issue 4 (Establishing line-item budgets), Issue 6 (Providing orientation for new board members), Issue 8 (Deciding which courses to cut to meet budget demands), and Issue 13 (Determining items on board agenda). On the other hand, four of the issues had indications of disagreement concerning who should have more of the responsibility. Issue 9 (Selecting a deputy superintendent), Issue 11 (Authorizing specific expenditures from allocated funds), Issue 19 (Selecting a high school principal) and Issue 21 (Promoting a teacher to assistant

Principal) were those issues where each group wanted more of the responsibility for themselves.

From this study it can be concluded that school board member respondents want more of the responsibility in the operation of a school system than they now feel they have. This desire was expressed on all issues studied. Superintendent respondents indicated they were willing to have the board assume more of the responsibility on a majority of the issues studied. Where the board desire for more responsibility and the superintendent desire to accommodate that wish diverged the greatest was on issues of personnel selection. The matter of personnel selection has the potential to cause a struggle between the school board and the superintendent.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based upon the results and conclusions of this study of the attitudes of school board members and superintendents towards the separation of responsibility and the relationship that exists between those attitudes and certain demographic and personal variables, the following recommendations are made for further study:

The study was limited to a nationwide sample of school board members and superintendents who are subscribers to The American School Board Journal. As such, it cannot

be assured that the population studied reflects the same characteristics as the population of school board members and superintendents who have subscribed to the Journal. A more comprehensive nationwide sample would result in more accurate information about school board member and superintendent attitudes towards separation of responsibility.

Since the design of this study precluded responses from the superintendent and one or more of the school board members from the same school district, a follow-up study should investigate the attitudes of a superintendent and each of his or her board members towards separation of responsibility on a case study basis.

Also, other issues may be identified to be included in future research which may have greater potential to illustrate the difference between school board members and superintendent attitudes towards separation of responsibility.

Bibliography

- American Association of School Administrators. (1946). School Boards in Action. Washington, D.C.: AASA.
- _____. (1956). School Board-Superintendent Relationships. Washington, D.C.: AASA.
- _____. (1963). Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff. Washington, D.C.: AASA.
- _____. (1980). Roles and Relationships: School Boards and Superintendents. Arlington, Virginia: AASA.
- _____. (1984). Principles of Effective School District Governance and Administration. Arlington, Virginia: AASA.
- Ashby, Lloyd W. (1968). The Effective School Board Member. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.
- Barham, Frank E. and George W. Holmes, III, eds. (1977). Virginia School Boards: A Manual for Virginia School Board Members. Charlottesville, Virginia: The Virginia School Boards Association.
- California School Boards Association, Inc. (1955). Boardmanship: A Guide for the School Board Member. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Cawelti, Gordon. (1982, March). "Guess What? Big City Superintendents Say Their Boards are Splendid." American School Board Journal.
- Cistone, Peter J., editor. (1975). Understanding School Boards. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Cubberly, Ellwood P. (1916). Public School Administration. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. (1983). "Improving the American School Board." The Educational Forum. Summer.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. and Joseph T. Hentges. (1982). The American School Superintendency 1982: A Summary Report. Arlington, Virginia: AASA.

- Dillman, Don A. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Douglas, Bennett C. (1923). "The Status of the Superintendent." First Yearbook. Washington, D.C. National Education Association Department of Superintendence.
- Earle, Jesse. (1924, July). "What About School Boards and Superintendents?". The American School Board Journal.
- Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators. (1965). "The Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools." Washington, D.C.
- Good, Carter V. (1966). Essentials of Educational Research. (1966). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Grant, W. Vance and Thomas D. Snyder. (1983). Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84. United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Griffiths, D. (1966) The School Superintendent. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Hollis, Coy F. (1972). "Perceptions of School Board Members and School System Personnel Concerning Role Responsibility in Initiating Solutions to Educational Problems." A paper presented to Mid South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Hoover, Carl and Jim Slezak. (1978, May) "This Board and Superintendent Defined Their Respective Responsibilities." The American School Board Journal.
- Hunkins, Ralph V. (1949). Superintendent and School Board: A Manual of Operative School Administration. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Johnson, Carroll F. (1980). "A Modes Proposal to Improve Board-Superintendent Relationships." Updating School Board Policies.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Kowalski, Joan P. (1976). Evaluating Superintendents and School Boards. Educational Research Service, Inc.

- McIntire, Ronald G. (1982, August). "Develop Policies Through Teamwork." The American School Board Journal.
- Meyer, James A. (1982). "A National Survey of the Attitude of School Board Members Toward Community Participation -Community Control." Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Mouly, George J. (1970). The Science of Educational Research. Litton Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Mullins, Carolyn. (1975, February). "Board Members Pinpoint the Kinds of Superintendents Who Embarrass Their Peers and Embattle Their Boards." The American School Board Journal.
- Olsen, Hans C. (1926). The Work of Boards of Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Bureau of Publications.
- Sax, Gilbert. (1979). Foundations of Educational Research. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Shannon, Thomas A. (1980, January). "Board-Superintendent Relations." The American School Board Journal.
- Smith, Dean. (1982, April). "Make the Right Kind of Splash." The Executive Educator.
- Stapley, Maurice E. (1957). School Board Studies. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Strayer, George D. (1923). "The Relation of Administrative Officers to Boards of Education." First Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association Department of Superintendence.
- Reeder, Ward G. (1944). School Boards and Superintendents: A Manual on Their Powers and Duties. New York: The Macmillian Company.
- Reeves, Charles E. (1954). School Boards: Their Status Functions and Activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Underwood, Kenneth E., Jim C. Fortune, and Frank J. Cleary. (1985, January). "Heads Up: Professionally and Financially, You're Better Off Than Ever Before." The American School Board Journal. p. 29.

Wiersma, William. (1980). Research Methods in Education.
Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Zakariya, Sally B. (1983, October). "Learn These Lessons,
and Keep Your Superintendent Happy." The American
School Board Journal.

APPENDIX A
NATIONAL SURVEY
OF
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
AND
SUPERINTENDENTS

PART I - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to the following questions about yourself and your school system.

1. In which state is your school system located? _____
2. What is the approximate size of your school system's enrollment?
(Please check one.)
 fewer than 1,000 1,000 to 4,999 5,000 to 9,999
 10,000 to 24,999 25,000 or more
3. Which of the following best describes the community your school system serves? (Please check one.)
 urban suburban rural small town other
(Please specify _____)
4. Are you male or female?
5. For school board members only:
Are you a member of the board of education of a local school system? Yes No
6. For superintendents only:
Are you the chief executive officer of the school system?
 Yes No

How many years have you been a superintendent in this school system? ___years

What is the total number of years you have been a superintendent? ___years

PART II: LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY

DIRECTIONS: We have listed 27 issues on which school boards and superintendents are expected to make decisions. For each issue, please indicate who, in your school system, actually decides on that issue (the HOW IT IS column) and who you believe should decide on that issue (the HOW IT SHOULD BE column). Please indicate your answer by circling a number from 1 to 5.

- 1 -- The school board is/should be totally responsible.
- 2 -- The school board is/should be primarily responsible.
- 3 -- The school board and superintendent are/should be equally responsible.
- 4 -- The superintendent is/should be primarily responsible.
- 5 -- The superintendent is/should be totally responsible.

Example:

<u>HOW IT IS</u>					<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>HOW IT SHOULD BE</u>				
1	2	3	(4)	5	Setting school attendance boundaries	1	2	(3)	4	5

The circled answers in this sample question indicate that the superintendent is primarily responsible for setting attendance boundaries (HOW IT IS - 4), but the respondent believes the responsibility should be shared equally between the superintendent and the school board (HOW IT SHOULD BE - 3).

- 1 -- The school board is/should be totally responsible.
 2 -- The school board is/should be primarily responsible.
 3 -- The school board and the superintendent are/should be equally responsible.
 4 -- The superintendent is/should be primarily responsible.
 5 -- The superintendent is/should be totally responsible.

<u>HOW IT IS</u>	<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>HOW IT SHOULD BE</u>
1 2 3 4 5	1. Accepting or rejecting a request from a specific nonschool group to use school facilities	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	2. Deciding how to invest \$100,000	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	3. Hiring legal counsel	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	4. Establishing line-item budgets	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	5. Negotiating for the school system at up-coming employee contract talks	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	6. Providing orientation for new school board members	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	7. Talking to the press after a drug search on a high school campus	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	8. Deciding which courses to cut from the curriculum to meet budget demands	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	9. Hiring a deputy superintendent	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	10. Selecting textbooks for use in the school system	1 2 3 4 5

<u>HOW IT IS</u>					<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>HOW IT SHOULD BE</u>				
1	2	3	4	5	11. Authorizing specific expenditures from allocated funds	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. Appointing people to serve on citizen advisory committees	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. Determining what items will be included on the school board agenda	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14. Deciding which school building to close due to declining enrollment	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	15. Deciding the grade organization of the system's schools	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	16. Transferring a principal from one school to another in the system	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	17. Awarding contracts to vendors	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	18. Deciding which extracurricular activities the schools will offer	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	19. Hiring a high school principal	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	20. Deciding individual school bus routes	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	21. Promoting a teacher to the assistant principalship	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	22. Transferring a student from one school to another in the system	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	23. Firing the school system's budget director	1	2	3	4	5

<u>HOW IT IS</u>					<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>HOW IT SHOULD BE</u>				
1	2	3	4	5	24. Deciding which staff members report directly to the school board	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	25. Hiring a basketball coach	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	26. Setting school attendance boundaries	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	27. Deciding where to deposit school system funds	1	2	3	4	5

Please send us the completed survey in the return envelope provided.

Thank you for your help.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD
JOURNAL®

1680 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314 / (703) 838-6722

APPENDIX B

February 11, 1985

Dear Colleague:

Great expectations: Board members have them for their superintendents, and superintendents have them for their boards.

Trouble is, these expectations often aren't a perfect match. Sometimes, in fact, they are diametrically opposed. Worse yet, board members and superintendents often aren't able to identify precisely the areas of agreement and conflict.

When that happens, a school system can face one of the most divisive problem in education. But even if a full-blown crisis never erupts, misunderstandings between boards and superintendents about their respective roles can lead to wasted time, squandered resources, and heightened stress. At a time when the school field faces external problems in abundance, solid relations between the superintendent and the board are more critical than ever.

And that's where you come in. You have been selected to play the key part in a national study of board members and superintendents. We need you to analyze the enclosed questionnaire describing a variety of typical situations. As candidly as you can, indicate your personal opinion of who should--and who actually does--take responsibility for handling each situation. Forget textbook formulations and accepted doctrines; let us have your judgments based solely on personal observation, experience, and preference.

We'll tabulate the results and report the significant findings in a major article in The American School Board Journal. Our objective is to increase the understanding and appreciation superintendents and board members have for the opinions and perceptions of their counterparts.

Your cooperation in this project is pivotal. Please take a few minutes now to complete the special survey form enclosed. A self-addressed, postage-paid envelope is included for your convenience. Make your opinions count.

Thank you for your important help.

Cordially,

The Editors

APPENDIX C

Table R3-1
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Issue 1

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	109	9	9	9	9	9	127	127
Shared	20.4	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	23.7	23.7
Superintendent	9	108	108	11	11	11	128	128
	1.7	20.2	20.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	23.9	23.9
	6	37	37	237	237	237	280	280
	1.1	6.9	6.9	44.3	44.3	44.3	52.3	52.3
Total	124	154	154	257	257	257	535	535
	23.2	28.8	28.8	48.0	48.0	48.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 628.579$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-2

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 2

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	97 18.5	5 1.0	1 .2	103 19.7
Shared	17 3.2	137 26.1	4 .8	158 30.2
Superintendent	8 1.5	61 11.6	194 37.0	263 50.2
Total	122 23.3	203 38.7	199 38.0	524 100.0

$\chi^2 = 598.141$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-3

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 3

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	190	19	19	2	211			
	35.6	3.6		.4	39.5			
Shared	17	187	3		207			
	3.2	35.0		.6	38.8			
Superintendent	16	42	58		116			
	3.0	7.9	10.9		21.7			
Total	223	248	63		534			
	41.8	46.4	11.8		100.0			

$\chi^2 = 530.839$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-4

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 4.

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	17 3.2	5 .9	4 .8	26 4.9
Shared	3 .6	107 20.2	12 2.3	122 23.1
Superintendent	7 1.3	76 14.4	298 56.3	381 72.0
Total	27 5.1	188 35.5	314 59.4	529 100.0

$\chi^2 = 397.870$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-5
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Issue 5

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	122 24.6	16 3.2	7 1.4	145 29.3
Shared	19 3.8	131 26.5	7 1.4	157 31.7
Superintendent	19 3.8	33 6.7	141 28.5	193 39.0
Total	160 32.3	180 36.4	155 31.3	495 100.0

$\chi^2 = 487.476$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-6

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 6.

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	40 7.6	23 4.4	6 1.1	69 13.1
Shared	15 2.9	184 35.0	10 1.9	209 39.7
Superintendent	28 5.3	111 21.1	109 20.7	248 47.1
Total	83 15.8	318 60.5	125 23.8	526 100.0

$\chi^2 = 216.418$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-7
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Issue 7

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Board	6		1		4		11	
	1.1		.2		.8		2.1	
Shared	1		38		19		58	
	.2		7.2		3.6		10.9	
Superintendent	4		30		427		461	
	.8		5.7		80.6		87.0	
Total	11		69		450		530	
	2.1		13.0		84.9		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 311.981$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-8
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Issue 8.

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	49	12			2		63	
	9.2	2.2			.4		11.8	
Shared	10	220			17		247	
	1.9	41.2			3.2		46.3	
Superintendent	28	75			121		224	
	5.2	14.0			22.7		41.9	
Total	87	307			140		534	
	16.3	57.5			26.2		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 366.399$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-9

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 9

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	116	13			7		136	
	22.3	2.5			1.3		26.2	
Shared	23	168			8		199	
	4.4	32.3			1.5		38.3	
Superintendent	14	47			124		185	
	2.7	9.0			23.8		35.6	
Total	153	228			139		520	
	29.4	43.8			26.7		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 495.922$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-10

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 10

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	22	1	1	3	26			
	4.2	.2		.6	4.9			
Shared	2	85	85	14	101			
	.4	16.0		2.6	19.1			
Superintendent	10	70	70	323	403			
	1.9	13.2		60.9	76.0			
Total	34	156	156	340	530			
	6.4	29.4		64.2	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 456.254$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-11

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 11

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	91 17.1	6 1.1	2 .4	99 18.6
Shared	9 1.7	83 15.6	11 2.1	103 19.4
Superintendent	8 1.5	35 6.6	286 53.9	329 62.0
Total	108 20.3	124 23.4	299 56.3	531 100.0

$\chi^2 = 632.686$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-12

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 12

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	130 24.4	17 3.2	6 1.1	153 28.8
Shared	10 1.9	179 33.6	4 .8	193 36.3
Superintendent	15 2.8	66 12.4	105 19.7	186 35.0
Total	155 29.1	262 49.2	115 21.6	532 100.0

$\chi^2 = 517.218$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0

Table R3-13

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 13

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	18	7		2		27		
	3.4	1.3		.4		5.0		
Shared	7	223		10		240		
	1.3	41.7		1.9		44.9		
Superintendent	18	108		142		268		
	3.4	20.2		26.5		50.1		
Total	43	338		154		535		
	8.0	63.2		28.8		100.0		

$\chi^2 = 294.960$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-14

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 14

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	139 27.1	21 4.1	5 1.0	165 32.2
Shared	28 5.5	225 43.9	3 .6	256 49.9
Superintendent	17 3.3	37 7.2	38 7.4	92 17.9
Total	184 35.9	283 55.2	46 9.0	513 100.0

$\chi^2 = 398.181$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3--15

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 15

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Board	58		8		1		67	
	10.9		1.5		.2		12.6	
Shared	5		190		14		209	
	.9		35.8		2.6		39.4	
Superintendent	8		64		183		255	
	1.5		12.1		34.5		48.0	
Total	71		262		198		531	
	13.4		49.3		37.3		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 586.594$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-16

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 16

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	15 2.9	7 1.4	5 1.0	27 5.2
Shared	1 .2	123 23.7	23 4.4	147 28.4
Superintendent	9 1.7	42 8.1	293 56.6	344 66.4
Total	25 4.8	172 33.2	321 62.0	518 100.0

$\chi^2 = 400.566$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-17

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 17

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	177 33.2	11 2.1	3 .6	191 35.8
Shared	17	135	9	161
Superintendent	8 1.5	25.3 5.8	1.7 26.6	30.2 34.0
Total	202 37.9	177 33.2	154 28.9	533 100.0

$\chi^2 = 651.717$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-18
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Issue 18

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	51	18			5		74	
	9.6	3.4			.9		13.9	
Shared	12	220			11		243	
	2.3	41.4			2.1		45.8	
Superintendent	10	75			129		214	
	1.9	14.1			24.3		40.3	
Total	73	313			145		531	
	13.7	58.9			27.3		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 410.129$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-19

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 19

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Board	69		14		6		89	
	13.1		2.7		1.1		16.9	
Shared	12		170		16		198	
	2.3		32.3		3.0		37.6	
Superintendent	15		48		177		240	
	2.8		9.1		33.6		45.5	
Total	96		232		199		527	
	18.2		44.0		37.8		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 484.355$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-20

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 20

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	11	3		3		3		17
	2.1	.6		.6		.6		3.2
Shared	1	31		11		11		43
	.2	5.9		2.1		2.1		8.1
Superintendent	4	17		448		448		469
	.8	3.2		84.7		84.7		88.7
Total	16	51		462		462		529
	3.0	9.6		87.3		87.3		100.0

$\chi^2 = 445.750$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-21
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Issue 21

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	40	9		2	51			
	7.5	1.7		.4	9.6			
Shared	3	151		16	170			
	.6	28.4		3.0	32.0			
Superintendent	8	60		242	310			
	1.5	11.3		45.6	58.4			
Total	51	220		260	531			
	9.6	41.4		49.0	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 542.992$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-22

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 22

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	20 3.9	2 .4	4 .8	26 5.1
Shared	3 .6	42 8.3	11 2.2	56 11.0
Superintendent	5 1.0	25 4.9	396 78.0	426 83.9
Total	28 5.5	69 13.6	411 80.9	508 100.0

$\chi^2 = 477.370$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-23

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 23

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	118 23.0	10 1.9	4 .8	132 25.7
Shared	10 1.9	195 37.9	13 2.5	218 42.4
Superintendent	11 2.1	44 8.6	109 21.2	164 31.9
Total	139 27.0	249 48.4	126 24.5	514 100.0

$\chi^2 = 565.671$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-24

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 24

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	100 19.5	8 1.6	3 .6	111 21.7
Shared	11 2.1	132 25.8	3 .6	146 28.5
Superintendent	17 3.3	61 11.9	177 34.6	255 49.8
Total	128 25.0	201 39.3	183 35.7	512 100.0

$\chi^2 = 542.979$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-25

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 25

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	39 7.3	7 1.3	10 1.9	56 10.5
Shared	5 .9	114 21.4	25 4.7	144 27.0
Superintendent	10 1.9	45 8.4	278 52.2	333 62.5
Total	54 10.1	166 31.1	313 58.7	533 100.0

$\chi^2 = 457.519$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-26

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Issue 26

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	97 18.5	8 1.5	4 .8	109 20.8
Shared	10 1.9	176 33.6	8 1.5	194 37.0
Superintendent	14 2.7	40 7.6	167 31.9	221 42.2
Total	121 23.1	224 42.7	179 34.2	524 100.0

$\chi^2 = 618.530$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-27
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Issue 27

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	109	6					115	
	20.8	1.1					21.9	
Shared	9	151	8				168	
	1.7	28.8	1.5				32.1	
Superintendent	11	48	182				241	
	2.1	9.2	34.7				46.0	
Total	129	205	190				524	
	24.6	39.1	36.3				100.0	

$\chi^2 = 651.914$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-28

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members from Category 1

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board		1		1		2		2
		.2		.2		.4		.4
Shared		65		18		83		83
		13.8		3.8		17.6		17.6
Superintendent		56		331		387		387
		11.9		70.1		82.0		82.0
Total		122		350		472		472
		25.8		74.2		100.0		100.0

$\chi^2 = 145.947$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-29
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School
 Board Members on Category 2

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	2	3		1		6		
	.5	.7		.2		1.4		
Shared	4	87		21		112		
	.9	19.9		4.8		25.6		
Superintendent	2	40		277		319		
	.5	9.2		63.4		73.0		
Total	8	130		299		437		
	1.8	29.7		68.4		100.0		

$\chi^2 = 214.523$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-30

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Category 3

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	14	3		17
	2.8	.6		3.4
Shared	9	108	10	127
	1.8	21.3	2.0	25.1
Superintendent	2	54	306	362
	.4	10.7	60.5	71.5
Total	25	165	316	506
	4.9	32.6	62.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 463.913$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R3-31

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from School Board Members on Category 4

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	6 1.1	2 .4	1 .2	9 1.7
Shared	4 .8	93 17.8	24 4.6	121 23.2
Superintendent	1 .2	75 14.4	316 60.5	392 75.1
Total	11 2.1	170 32.6	341 65.3	522 100.0

$\chi^2 = 336.526$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-1
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 1

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	85	7		15		107		
	10.4	.9		1.8		13.1		
Shared	7	135		11		153		
	.9	16.5		1.3		18.7		
Superintendent	14	51		492		557		
	1.7	6.2		60.2		68.2		
Total	106	193		518		817		
	13.0	23.6		63.4		100.0		

$\chi^2 = 924.570$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-2

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 2

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	84	16		5		105		
	10.8	2.0		.6		13.4		
Shared	5	143		9		157		
	.6	18.3		1.2		20.1		
Superintendent	3	53		463		519		
	.4	6.8		59.3		66.5		
Total	92	212		477		781		
	11.8	27.1		61.1		100.0		

$\chi^2 = 977.234$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-3

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 3

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	229	28.3	54	6.7	8	1.0	291	36.0
Shared	14	1.7	355	43.9	9	1.1	378	46.7
Superintendent	8	1.0	49	6.1	83	10.3	140	17.3
Total	251	31.0	458	56.6	100	12.4	809	100.0

$\chi^2 = 813.480$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-4
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 4

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	26	12	7	45				
	3.2	1.5	.9	5.5				
Shared	3	115	22	140				
	.4	14.1	2.7	17.2				
Superintendent	1	84	544	629				
	.1	10.3	66.8	77.3				
Total	30	211	573	814				
	3.7	25.9	70.4	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 690.265$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-5

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 5

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	192	32	11	235				
	25.6	4.3	1.5	31.3				
Shared	31	212	22	265				
	4.1	28.2	2.9	35.3				
Superintendent	20	67	164	251				
	2.7	8.9	21.8	33.4				
Total	243	311	197	751				
	32.4	41.4	26.2	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 630.618$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-6

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 6

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	28	17		10		55		
	3.5	2.1		1.2		6.8		
Shared	13	265		11		289		
	1.6	32.7		1.4		35.6		
Superintendent	57	234		176		467		
	7.0	28.9		21.7		57.6		
Total	98	516		197		811		
	12.1	63.6		24.3		100.0		

$\chi^2 = 266.104$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-7
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 7

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	6 .8	1 .1	4 .5	11 1.4
Shared	1 .1	14 1.8	26 3.3	41 5.1
Superintendent	6 .8	18 2.3	724 90.5	748 93.5
Total	13 1.6	33 4.1	754 94.3	800 100.0

$X^2 = 297.016$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-8

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 8

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	43 5.3	15 1.8	22 2.7	80 9.8
Shared	11 1.3	317 38.8	52 6.4	380 46.6
Superintendent	18 2.2	102 12.5	236 28.9	356 43.6
Total	72 8.8	434 53.2	310 38.0	816 100.0

$\chi^2 = 463.776$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-9
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 9

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	71 9.1	34 4.4	32 4.1	137 17.6
Shared	4 .5	245 31.5	54 6.9	303 39.0
Superintendent	6 .8	41 5.3	290 37.3	337 43.4
Total	81 10.4	320 41.2	376 48.4	777 100.0

$\chi^2 = 642.149$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-10

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 10

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	26	8	5	39				
	3.2	1.0	.6	4.8				
Shared	3	108	29	140				
	.4	13.3	3.6	17.2				
Superintendent	7	69	557	633				
	.9	8.5	68.6	78.0				
Total	36	185	591	812				
	4.4	22.8	72.8	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 670.593$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-11

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 11

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	45	5	14	64				
	5.5	.6	1.7	7.9				
Shared	6	88	23	117				
	.7	10.8	2.8	14.4				
Superintendent	5	22	606	633				
	.6	2.7	74.4	77.8				
Total	56	115	643	814				
	6.9	14.1	79.0	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 871.677$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-12
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 12

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	158	43	6	207				
	19.4	5.3	.7	25.4				
Shared	28	328	19	375				
	3.4	40.2	2.3	46.0				
Superintendent	13	80	140	233				
	1.6	9.8	17.2	28.6				
Total	199	451	165	815				
	24.4	55.3	20.2	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 695.777$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-13

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 13

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	14 1.7	6 .7	1 .1	21 2.6
Shared	3 .4	270 33.0	28 3.4	301 36.8
Superintendent	10 1.2	211 25.8	274 33.5	495 60.6
Total	27 3.3	487 59.6	303 37.1	817 100.0

$\chi^2 = 448.613$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6--14

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 14

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	201	36		1		238		
	25.6	4.6		.1		30.3		
Shared	42	389		15		446		
	5.4	49.5		1.9		56.8		
Superintendent	19	38		44		101		
	2.4	4.8		5.6		12.9		
Total	262	463		60		785		
	33.4	59.0		7.6		100.0		

$\chi^2 = 612.326$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-15

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 15

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	96	21	21	7	124			
	11.9	2.6		.9	15.3			
Shared	11	356	29	396				
	1.4	44.0	3.6	48.9				
Superintendent	17	62	211	290				
	2.1	7.7	26.0	35.8				
Total	124	439	247	810				
	15.3	54.2	30.5	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 817.234$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-16

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 16

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	22	14	14	37	73			
	2.8	1.8		4.7	9.2			
Shared	7	167		55	229			
	.9	21.1		6.9	28.9			
Superintendent	3	40		447	490			
	.4	5.1		56.4	61.9			
Total	32	221		539	792			
	4.0	27.9		68.1	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 481.759$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-17
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 17

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	269	19	8	296				
	33.0	2.3	1.0	36.4				
Shared	17	176	15	208				
	2.1	21.6	1.8	25.6				
Superintendent	6	36	268	310				
	.7	4.4	32.9	38.1				
Total	292	231	291	814				
	35.9	28.4	35.7	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 1067.211$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-18

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 18

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Board	111		33		14		158	
	13.7		4.1		1.7		19.4	
Shared	12		351		26		389	
	1.5		43.2		3.2		47.8	
Superintendent	13		57		196		266	
	1.6		7.0		24.1		32.7	
Total	136		441		236		813	
	16.7		54.2		29.0		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 786.049$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-19

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 19

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	40	31	28	99				
	5.0	3.9	3.5	12.3				
Shared	5	244	67	316				
	.6	30.4	8.4	39.4				
Superintendent	7	43	337	387				
	.9	5.4	42.0	48.3				
Total	52	318	432	802				
	6.5	39.7	53.9	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 548.002$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-20

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 20

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	12 1.5	4 .5	11 1.4	27 3.4
Shared	3 .4	53 6.6	24 3.0	80 9.9
Superintendent	5 .6	29 3.6	664 82.5	698 86.7
Total	20 2.5	86 10.7	699 86.8	805 100.0

$\chi^2 = 502.027$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance 0.0.

Table R6-21
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 21

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	32 4.0	17 2.1	29 3.6	78 9.7
Shared	6 .7	207 25.7	64 8.0	277 34.5
Superintendent	4 .5	47 5.8	398 49.5	449 55.8
Total	42 5.2	271 33.7	491 61.1	804 100.0

$\chi^2 = 554.559$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-22

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 22

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	25	7	9	41				
	3.4	.9	1.2	5.5				
Shared		62	16	78				
		8.3	2.2	10.5				
Superintendent	3	15	607	625				
	.4	2.0	81.6	84.0				
Total	28	84	632	744				
	3.8	11.3	84.9	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 811.885$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-23

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 23

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/	%	No/	%	No/	%	No/	%
Board	132		36		20		188	
	17.0		4.6		2.6		24.3	
Shared	13		255		34		302	
	1.7		32.9		4.4		39.0	
Superintendent	8		48		229		285	
	1.0		6.2		29.5		36.8	
Total	153		339		283		775	
	19.7		43.7		36.5		100.0	

$\chi^2 = 745.119$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-24

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 24

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	80	28	34	142				
	10.0	3.5	4.3	17.8				
Shared	8	185	28	221				
	1.0	23.1	3.5	27.6				
Superintendent	15	40	382	437				
	1.9	5.0	47.8	54.6				
Total	103	253	444	800				
	12.9	31.6	55.5	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 697.756$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-25
 Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from
 Superintendents on Issue 25

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	21	21	21	41	83			
	2.6	2.6	2.6	5.1	10.3			
Shared	1	118	118	73	192			
	.1	14.6	14.6	9.0	23.8			
Superintendent	2	36	36	495	533			
	.2	4.5	4.5	61.3	66.0			
Total	24	175	175	609	808			
	3.0	21.7	21.7	75.4	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 415.527$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-26

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 26

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Board	205		23		6		234	
		26.7		3.0		.8		30.5
Shared	18		315		14		347	
		2.3		41.0		1.8		45.2
Superintendent	3		35		149		187	
		.4		4.6		19.4		24.3
Total	226		373		169		768	
		29.4		48.6		22.0		100.0

$\chi^2 = 995.331$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-27

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Issue 27

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	221 27.9	25 3.2	9 1.1	255 32.2
Shared	7 .9	201 25.4	13 1.6	221 27.9
Superintendent	8 1.0	41 5.2	266 33.6	315 39.8
Total	236 29.8	267 33.8	288 36.4	791 100.0

$\chi^2 = 1036.942$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-28

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Category 1

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board		2		1		3		
		.3		.1		.4		
Shared	1	52	29		82			
	.1	7.2	4.0		11.3			
Superintendent		49	591		640			
		6.8	81.5		88.3			
Total	1	103	621		725			
	.1	14.2	85.7		100.0			

$\chi^2 = 201.255$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-29

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Category 2

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	4	7	3	14				
	.6	1.1	.5	2.2				
Shared	1	67	68	136				
	.2	10.5	10.6	21.3				
Superintendent		21	468	489				
		3.3	73.2	76.5				
Total	5	95	539	639				
	.8	14.9	84.4	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 331.693$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-30

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Category 3

Category of Responsibility	Board		Shared		Superintendent		Total	
	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	6	7	1	14				
	.8	.9	.1	1.8				
Shared	2	125	26	153				
	.3	16.4	3.4	20.0				
Superintendent		36	561	597				
		4.7	73.4	78.1				
Total	8	168	588	764				
	1.0	22.0	77.0	100.0				

$\chi^2 = 665.075$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R6-31

Percentage of How It Is Responses by How It Should Be Responses from Superintendents on Category 4

Category of Responsibility	Board No/%	Shared No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	9 1.1	1 .1	3 .4	13 1.6
Shared	3 .4	157 19.6	44 5.5	204 25.5
Superintendent	2 .2	57 7.1	525 65.5	584 72.9
Total	14 1.7	215 26.8	572 71.4	801 100.0

$\chi^2 = 704.743$ with 4 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0.

Table R7-1
 Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 1

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	127 23.7	107 13.1	234 17.3
Shared	128 23.9	153 18.7	281 20.8
Superintendent	280 52.3	557 68.2	837 61.9
Total	535 39.6	817 60.4	1352 100.0

$\chi^2 = 38.458$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7-2

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 2

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	103 19.7	105 13.4	208 15.9
Shared	158 30.2	158 20.2	316 24.2
Superintendent	263 50.2	519 66.4	782 59.9
Total	524 40.1	782 59.9	1306 100.0

$\chi^2 = 34.191$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000

Table R7-3

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 3

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	211 39.5	292 36.0	503 37.4
Shared	207 38.8	379 46.7	586 43.6
Superintendent	116 21.7	140 17.3	256 19.0
Total	534 39.7	811 60.3	1345 100.0

$\chi^2 = 9.117$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0105.

Table R7-4

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 4

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	26	45	71
	4.9	5.5	5.3
Shared	122	140	262
	23.1	17.2	19.5
Superintendent	381	629	1010
	72.0	77.3	75.2
Total	529	814	1343
	39.4	60.6	100.0

$\chi^2 = 7.053$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0294

Table R7-5

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 5

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	146 29.4	235 31.3	381 30.6
Shared	157 31.7	265 35.3	422 33.8
Superintendent	193 38.9	251 33.4	444 35.6
Total	496 39.8	751 60.2	1247 100.0

$\chi^2 = 4.029$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.1333

Table R7-6
 Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 6

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	69 13.1	55 6.8	124 9.3
Shared	209 39.7	289 35.6	498 37.2
Superintendent	248 47.1	467 57.6	715 53.5
Total	526 39.3	811 60.7	1337 100.0

$\chi^2 = 21.746$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7-7

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 7

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	11	11	22
	2.1	1.4	1.7
Shared	58	41	99
	10.9	5.1	7.4
Superintendent	463	749	1212
	87.0	93.5	90.9
Total	532	801	1333
	39.9	60.1	100.0

288

$\chi^2 = 16.807$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0002.

Table R7-8

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 8

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	63	80	143
	11.8	9.8	10.6
Shared	247	380	627
	46.3	46.6	46.4
Superintendent	224	356	580
	41.9	43.6	43.0
Total	534	816	1350
	39.6	60.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 1.430$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.4891.

Table R7-9

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 9

Responsibility/ Position	School Board		Superintendent		Total	
	Member No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	136	138	274			
	26.2	17.7	21.1			
Shared	199	303	502			
	38.3	38.9	38.7			
Superintendent	185	337	522			
	35.6	43.3	40.2			
Total	520	778	1298			
	40.1	59.9	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 15.1370$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0005.

Table R7-10

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 10

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	26 4.9	39 4.8	65 4.8
Shared	101 19.1	140 17.2	241 18.0
Superintendent	403 76.0	633 78.0	1036 77.2
Total	530 39.5	812 60.5	1342 100.0

$\chi^2 = 0.748$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.6879.

Table R7-11

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 11

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	99 18.6	64 7.9	163 12.1
Shared	103 19.4	117 14.4	220 16.4
Superintendent	329 62.0	633 77.8	962 71.5
Total	531 39.5	814 60.5	1345 100.0

$\chi^2 = 47.008$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7-12

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 12

Responsibility/ Position	School Board		Superintendent		Total	
	Member No/%	No/%	Member No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	153	207	360			
	28.8	25.4	26.7			
Shared	193	375	568			
	36.3	46.0	42.2			
Superintendent	186	233	419			
	35.0	28.6	31.1			
Total	532	815	1347			
	39.5	60.5	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 12.796$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0017.

Table R7-13

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 13

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	27	21	48
	5.0	2.6	3.6
Shared	240	301	541
	44.9	36.8	40.0
Superintendent	268	495	763
	50.1	60.6	56.4
Total	535	817	1352
	39.6	60.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 17.086$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0002.

Table R7-14

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 14

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	165 32.1	238 30.3	403 31.0
Shared	257 50.0	447 56.9	704 54.2
Superintendent	92 17.9	101 12.8	193 14.8
Total	514 39.5	786 60.5	1300 100.0

$\chi^2 = 8.377$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0152.

Table R7-15

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 15

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	67	124	191
	12.6	15.3	14.2
Shared	209	396	605
	39.3	48.8	45.0
Superintendent	256	291	547
	48.1	35.9	40.7
Total	532	811	1343
	39.6	60.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 19.950$ with 2 degrees of freedom.. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7-16

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 16

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	27	73	100
Shared	147	229	376
Superintendent	345	491	836
	66.5	61.9	63.7
Total	519	793	1312
	39.6	60.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 7.651$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0218.

Table R7-17

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 17

Responsibility/ Position	School Board		Superintendent		Total	
	Member No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No	%
Board	191	296	296	487		
	35.8	36.3	36.3	36.1		
Shared	161	208	208	369		
	30.2	25.5	25.5	27.4		
Superintendent	181	311	311	492		
	34.0	38.2	38.2	36.5		
Total	533	815	815	1348		
	39.5	60.5	60.5	100.0		

$\chi^2 = 4.162$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.1248.

Table R7-18

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 18

Responsibility/ Position	School Board		Superintendent		Total	
	Member No/%	No/%	Member No/%	No/%	Member No/%	No/%
Board	74	158	232			
	13.9	19.4	17.3			
Shared	243	389	632			
	45.8	47.8	47.0			
Superintendent	214	266	480			
	40.3	32.7	35.7			
Total	531	813	1344			
	39.5	60.5	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 11.093$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0039.

Table R7-19

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 19

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	89 16.9	99 12.3	188 14.1
Shared	198 37.6	316 39.4	514 38.7
Superintendent	240 45.5	387 48.3	627 47.2
Total	527 39.7	802 60.3	1329 100.0

300

$X^2 = 5.413$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0667.

Table R7-20

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 20

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	17	27	44
	3.2	3.3	3.3
Shared	43	80	123
	8.1	9.9	9.2
Superintendent	469	699	1168
	88.7	86.7	87.5
Total	529	806	1335
	39.6	60.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 1.273$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.5289.

Table R7-21

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 21

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	51 9.6	79 9.8	130 9.7
Shared	170 32.0	277 34.4	447 33.5
Superintendent	310 58.4	449 55.8	759 56.8
Total	531 39.7	805 60.3	1336 100.0

$\chi^2 = 0.944$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.6235

Table R7-22

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 22

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	26	41	67
	5.1	5.5	5.3
Shared	56	78	134
	11.0	10.5	10.7
Superintendent	426	626	1052
	83.9	84.0	84.0
Total	508	745	1253
	40.5	59.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 0.171$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.9178.

Table R7-23

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 23

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	132 25.7	188 24.2	320 24.8
Shared	218 42.4	303 39.0	521 40.4
Superintendent	164 31.9	285 36.7	449 34.8
Total	514 39.8	776 60.2	1290 100.0

$\chi^2 = 3.194$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.2024.

Table R7-24

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 24

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	111 21.7	142 17.8	253 19.3
Shared	146 28.5	221 27.6	367 28.0
Superintendent	255 49.8	437 54.6	692 52.7
Total	512 39.0	800 61.0	1312 100.0

$\chi^2 = 3.963$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.1378.

Table R7-25

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 25

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	56 10.5	83 10.3	139 10.4
Shared	144 27.0	192 23.7	336 25.0
Superintendent	333 62.5	534 66.0	867 64.6
Total	533 39.7	809 60.3	1342 100.0

$\chi^2 = 2.022$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.3637.

Table R7-26

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 26

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	109 20.8	234 30.5	343 26.5
Shared	194 37.0	347 45.2	541 41.9
Superintendent	221 42.2	187 24.3	408 31.6
Total	524 40.6	768 59.4	1292 100.0

$\chi^2 = 47.262$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R7-27

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Issue 27

Responsibility/	School Board		Superintendent		Total
Position	Member No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	115	255	370		
	21.9	32.2	28.1		
Shared	168	221	389		
	32.1	27.9	29.6		
Superintendent	241	315	556		
	46.0	39.8	42.3		
Total	524	791	1315		
	39.8	60.2	100.0		

$\chi^2 = 16.511$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0003.

Table R7-28

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Category 1

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	2 .4	3 .4	5 .4
Shared	83 17.5	82 11.3	165 13.8
Superintendent	388 82.0	642 88.3	1030 85.8
Total	473 39.4	727 60.6	1200 100.0

$\chi^2 = 9.505$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0086.

Table R7-29

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Category 2

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	7	14	21
	1.6	2.2	1.9
Shared	112	140	252
	25.5	21.7	23.3
Superintendent	320	490	810
	72.9	76.1	74.8
Total	439	644	1083
	40.5	59.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 2.405$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.3004.

Table R7-30

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Category 3

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	17	14	31
	3.4	1.8	2.4
Shared	127	153	280
	25.1	20.0	22.0
Superintendent	362	599	961
	71.5	78.2	75.6
Total	506	766	1272
	39.8	60.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 8.357$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0153.

Table R7-31

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Is Category 4

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	9 1.7	13 1.6	22 1.7
Shared	121 23.1	205 25.6	326 24.6
Superintendent	393 75.1	584 72.8	977 73.7
Total	523 39.5	802 60.5	1325 100.0

$\chi^2 = 1.008$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.6041.

Table R8-1
 Percentage of Responsibility for Position on How It Should Be Issue 1

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	124 23.2	106 13.0	230 17.0
Shared	154 28.8	193 23.6	347 25.7
Superintendent	257 48.0	518 63.4	775 57.3
Total	535 39.6	817 60.4	1352 100.0

$\chi^2 = 36.456$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-2
 Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 2

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	124 23.6	93 11.9	217 16.6
Shared	203 38.6	213 27.2	416 31.8
Superintendent	199 37.8	478 61.0	677 51.7
Total	526 40.2	784 59.8	1310 100.0

$\chi^2 = 71.613$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-3

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 3

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	223 41.8	251 31.0	474 35.3
Shared	248 46.4	458 56.5	706 52.5
Superintendent	63 11.8	101 12.5	164 12.2
Total	534 39.7	810 60.3	1344 100.0

$\chi^2 = 16.960$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0002.

Table R8-4

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 4

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	27 5.1	30 3.7	57 4.2
Shared	188 35.5	211 25.9	399 29.7
Superintendent	314 59.4	573 70.4	887 66.0
Total	529 39.4	814 60.6	1343 100.0

$\chi^2 = 17.414$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0002.

Table R8-5

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 5

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	160 32.1	244 32.3	404 32.2
Shared	181 36.3	313 41.5	494 39.4
Superintendent	158 31.7	198 26.2	356 28.4
Total	499 39.8	755 60.2	1254 100.0

$\chi^2 = 5.185$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0748.

Table R8-6

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 6

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	83 15.7	99 12.1	182 13.5
Shared	322 60.8	519 63.6	841 62.5
Superintendent	125 23.6	198 24.3	323 24.0
Total	530 39.4	816 60.6	1346 100.0

318

$\chi^2 = 3.436$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.1794.

Table R8-7

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 7

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	11	13	24
	2.1	1.6	1.8
Shared	69	33	102
	13.0	4.1	7.6
Superintendent	451	758	1209
	84.9	94.3	90.6
Total	531	804	1335
	39.8	60.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 36.529$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-8

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 8

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	87 16.3	72 8.8	159 11.8
Shared	307 57.5	434 53.2	741 54.9
Superintendent	140 26.2	310 38.0	450 33.3
Total	534 39.6	816 60.4	1350 100.0

$\chi^2 = 29.797$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-9

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 9

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	153 29.3	81 10.3	234 17.9
Shared	229 43.9	324 41.3	553 42.3
Superintendent	140 26.8	379 48.3	519 39.7
Total	522 40.0	784 60.0	1306 100.0

$\chi^2 = 99.997$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-10

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 10

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	34	36	70
	6.4	4.4	5.2
Shared	156	185	341
	29.4	22.8	25.4
Superintendent	340	592	932
	64.2	72.8	69.4
Total	530	813	1343
	39.5	60.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 11.538$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0031.

Table R8-11

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 11

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	108 20.3	56 6.9	164 12.2
Shared	124 23.4	115 14.1	239 17.8
Superintendent	299 56.3	643 79.0	942 70.0
Total	531 39.5	814 60.5	1345 100.0

$\chi^2 = 86.743$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-12

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 12

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	155 29.1	199 24.4	354 26.3
Shared	263 49.3	451 55.3	714 53.0
Superintendent	115 21.6	165 20.2	280 20.8
Total	533 39.5	815 60.5	1348 100.0

$\chi^2 = 5.129$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0769.

Table R8-13

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 13

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	43 8.0	27 3.3	70 5.2
Shared	338 63.2	487 59.6	825 61.0
Superintendent	154 28.8	303 37.1	457 33.8
Total	535 39.6	817 60.4	1352 100.0

$\chi^2 = 21.252$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance 0.0000.

Table R8-14

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 14

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	184 35.6	263 33.2	447 34.2
Shared	287 55.5	466 58.9	753 57.6
Superintendent	46 8.9	62 7.8	108 8.3
Total	517 39.5	791 60.5	1308 100.0

$\chi^2 = 1.554$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.4598.

Table R8-15
 Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 15

Responsibility/ Position	School Board		Superintendent		Total	
	Member No/%	No/%	Member No/%	No/%	No	%
Board	71	124	195			
	13.3	15.3	14.5			
Shared	263	440	703			
	49.4	54.3	52.3			
Superintendent	198	247	445			
	37.2	30.5	33.1			
Total	532	811	1343			
	39.6	60.4	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 6.693$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0352.

Table R8-16

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 16

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	26	33	59
	5.0	4.2	4.5
Shared	172	221	393
	33.0	27.8	29.9
Superintendent	323	541	864
	62.0	68.1	65.7
Total	521	795	1316
	39.6	60.4	100.0

$\chi^2 = 5.117$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0774.

Table R8-17

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 17

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	202 37.9	292 35.9	494 36.7
Shared	177 33.2	231 28.4	408 30.3
Superintendent	154 28.9	291 35.7	445 33.0
Total	533 39.6	814 60.4	1347 100.0

$\chi^2 = 7.424$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0244.

Table R8-18

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 18

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	73 13.7	136 16.7	209 15.6
Shared	313 58.9	441 54.2	754 56.1
Superintendent	145 27.3	236 29.0	381 28.3
Total	531 39.5	813 60.5	1344 100.0

$\chi^2 = 3.436$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.1794.

Table R8-19

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 19

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	96 18.2	53 6.6	149 11.2
Shared	232 44.0	319 39.7	551 41.4
Superintendent	199 37.8	432 53.7	631 47.4
Total	527 39.6	804 60.4	1331 100.0

$\chi^2 = 57.004$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-20

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 20

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	16 3.0	20 2.5	36 2.7
Shared	51 9.6	86 10.7	137 10.3
Superintendent	462 87.3	701 86.9	1163 87.1
Total	529 39.6	807 60.4	1336 100.0

$\chi^2 = 0.6835$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.7105.

Table R8-21

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 21

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	52	42	94
	9.8	5.2	7.0
Shared	220	271	491
	41.4	33.7	36.7
Superintendent	260	492	752
	48.9	61.1	56.2
Total	532	805	1337
	39.8	60.2	100.0

$\chi^2 = 23.157$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-22

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 22

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	28	28	56
	5.5	3.7	4.4
Shared	69	86	155
	13.5	11.4	12.3
Superintendent	414	638	1052
	81.0	84.8	83.3
Total	511	752	1263
	40.5	59.5	100.0

$\chi^2 = 3.708$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.1565.

Table R8-23

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 23

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	139 26.9	155 19.8	294 22.7
Shared	249 48.3	341 43.7	590 45.5
Superintendent	128 24.8	285 36.5	413 31.8
Total	516 39.8	285 60.2	413 100.0

$\chi^2 = 21.659$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-24

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 24

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	128 25.0	103 12.8	231 17.6
Shared	201 39.2	255 31.8	456 34.7
Superintendent	184 35.9	444 55.4	628 47.8
Total	513 39.0	802 61.0	1315 100.0

$\chi^2 = 55.931$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-25

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 25

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	54 10.1	24 3.0	78 5.8
Shared	166 31.1	175 21.6	341 25.4
Superintendent	313 58.7	610 75.4	923 68.8
Total	533 39.7	809 60.3	1342 100.0

$\chi^2 = 52.814$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-26

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 26

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	121 23.0	227 29.4	348 26.8
Shared	225 42.9	376 48.6	601 46.3
Superintendent	179 34.1	170 22.0	349 26.9
Total	525 40.4	773 59.6	1298 100.0

$\chi^2 = 23.948$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-27

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Issue 27

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	130 24.8	237 29.9	367 27.9
Shared	205 39.0	267 33.7	472 35.8
Superintendent	190 36.2	288 36.4	478 36.3
Total	525 39.9	792 60.1	1317 100.0

$\chi^2 = 5.529$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0630.

Table R8-28

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Category 1

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board		1 .1	1 .1
Shared	123 25.7	106 14.4	229 18.8
Superintendent	356 74.3	630 85.5	986 81.1
Total	479 39.4	737 60.6	1216 100.0

$\chi^2 = 24.779$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-29

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Category 2

Responsibility/ Position	School Board Member No/%	Superintendent No/%	Total No/%
Board	8 1.8	5 .8	13 1.2
Shared	131 29.4	96 14.7	227 20.6
Superintendent	307 68.8	553 84.6	860 78.2
Total	446 40.5	654 59.5	1100 100.0

$\chi^2 = 38.501$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-30

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Category 3

Responsibility/ Position	School Board		Superintendent		Total	
	Member No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	26	8	34			
	5.1	1.0	2.7			
Shared	166	169	335			
	32.7	22.0	26.3			
Superintendent	316	590	906			
	62.2	76.9	71.1			
Total	508	767	1275			
	39.8	60.2	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 41.522$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0000.

Table R8-31

Percentage of Responsibility by Position on How It Should Be Category 4

Responsibility/ Position	School Board		Superintendent		Total	
	Member No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%	No/%
Board	11	14	25			
	2.1	1.7	1.9			
Shared	170	215	385			
	32.5	26.8	29.0			
Superintendent	342	574	916			
	65.4	71.5	69.1			
Total	523	803	1326			
	39.4	60.6	100.0			

$\chi^2 = 5.499$ with 2 degrees of freedom. Significance = 0.0639.

Table R9--1
 Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by Sex of
 Respondent Groups

How It Is Category	School Board				Superintendent			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%
1	78.9/20.8/0.3	88.5/10.9/0.6	88.4/11.2/0.4	87.0/13.0/0.0				
2	67.2/31.1/1.7	84.6/14.0/1.4	76.0/21.7/2.3	77.3/22.7/0.0				
3	67.8/28.7/3.6	79.2/17.9/3.0	78.0/20.1/1.9	84.6/15.4/0.0				
4	75.3/22.7/2.0	74.9/24.0/1.1	72.6/25.8/1.7	80.8/19.2/0.0				

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-2

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by Region of School Board Respondents

How It Is Categorized	Northeast		Central		Southern		Western		Pacific	
	Su	Sh/Bd	Su	Sh/Bd	Su	Sh/Bd	Su	Sh/Bd	Su	Sh/Bd
1	84.7	13.7/1.6	88.8	11.2/0.0	88.2	11.8/0.0	91.9	8.1/0.0	86.9	11.9/1.2
2	71.9	23.1/5.0	78.9	19.9/1.1	84.4	14.1/1.6	65.3	32.2/2.5	82.5	16.3/1.2
3	62.5	33.0/4.5	74.8	21.4/3.9	68.6	27.9/3.6	72.0	26.0/2.0	76.3	22.4/1.3
4	75.4	23.0/1.6	71.6	27.1/1.3	81.8	17.4/0.8	70.6	28.0/1.4	65.3	30.6/4.1

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-3

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by Region of Superintendent Respondents

How It Is Categorized	Northeast	Central	Southern	Western	Pacific
	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd
1	84.7/13.7/1.6	88.8/11.2/0.0	88.2/11.8/0.0	91.9/8.1/0.0	86.9/11.9/1.2
2	71.9/23.1/5.0	78.9/19.9/1.2	84.4/14.0/1.6	65.3/32.2/2.5	82.5/16.3/1.2
3	75.7/21.6/2.7	82.8/16.5/0.6	75.0/23.3/1.7	74.5/22.6/2.9	75.3/21.5/3.2
4	75.4/23.0/1.6	71.6/27.1/1.3	81.8/17.4/0.8	70.6/28.0/1.4	65.3/30.6/4.1

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-4

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by School District Enrollment Size of School Board Respondents

How It Is	Less than 1,000	1,000 to 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	More than 10,000
Category	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd
	%	%	%	%
1	83.0/17.0/0.0	80.9/18.7/0.4	88.2/10.6/1.2	84.3/15.7/0.0
2	57.0/43.0/0.0	71.1/26.5/2.4	84.4/14.3/1.3	83.7/16.3/0.0
3	71.8/24.3/3.9	68.9/27.9/3.2	77.9/20.9/1.2	75.5/20.8/3.7
4	72.2/24.0/3.8	74.3/25.7/0.0	79.8/18.0/2.2	82.1/14.3/3.6

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-5

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by School District Enrollment Size of Superintendent Respondents

How It Is Categorized	Less Than 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 9,999	10,000 to 24,999	More Than 25,000
Category	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd
	%	%	%	%	%
1	90.1/9.5/0.4	87.2/12.2/0.6	87.0/13.0/0.0	79.2/20.8/0.0	100.0/0.0/0.0
2	71.7/26.1/2.2	77.3/20.5/2.3	87.2/10.3/2.5	90.0/10.0/0.0	100.0/0.0/0.0
3	79.5/18.5/2.0	77.7/20.3/2.0	70.5/29.5/0.0	75.0/25.0/0.0	100.0/0.0/0.0
4	74.3/24.6/1.1	70.9/27.8/1.3	79.2/14.6/6.2	68.0/28.0/4.0	75.0/25.0/0.0

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-6

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by Community
 Description of School Board Respondents

How It Is Categorized	Urban		Suburban		Rural		Small Town		Other	
	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%
1	79.7/18.8/1.5		80.3/19.1/0.6		81.4/18.6/0.0		84.8/15.2/0.0		92.9/7.1/0.0	
2	80.0/15.0/5.0		80.3/19.1/0.6		57.8/42.2/0.0		71.9/25.4/2.7		81.8/18.2/0.0	
3	62.9/32.3/4.8		74.7/22.2/3.1		68.8/28.8/2.4		72.5/23.2/4.3		86.7/13.3/0.0	
4	73.9/21.7/4.4		75.9/22.3/1.8		74.2/25.0/0.8		75.2/23.4/1.4		80.0/20.0/0.0	

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-7

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by Community
 Description of Superintendent Respondents

How It Is Categorized	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Small Town	Other
Category	%	%	%	%	%
1	84.6/12.8/2.6	85.1/14.9/0.0	88.9/10.9/0.2	89.6/10.4/0.0	94.4/0.0/5.6
2	82.9/14.3/2.8	82.9/16.2/0.9	72.8/24.9/2.3	76.7/20.9/2.4	77.8/16.7/5.5
3	79.4/17.6/3.0	73.0/25.4/1.6	78.5/19.7/1.8	80.9/17.3/1.8	82.4/17.6/0.0
4	60.6/36.8/2.6	74.5/24.1/1.4	74.3/24.6/1.1	70.6/27.1/2.3	72.2/22.2/5.6

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-8

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Is Categorized by Average Years of Experience of Respondent Groups

How It Is Category	School Board		Superintendent	
	Su/Sh/Bd %	Su/Sh/Bd %		
1	79.5/20.5/0.0	82.9/17.1/0.0		
2	51.6/45.2/3.2	87.1/12.9/0.0		
3	68.3/29.3/2.4	78.4/21.6/0.0		
4	63.6/31.8/4.6	76.3/23.7/0.0		

Su = Superintendent Responsibility
 Sh = Shared Responsibility
 Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-9

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categories by Sex of Respondent Groups

How It		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Should Be	Category	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%
1		73.8/26.2/0.0		75.5/24.5/0.0		85.4/14.4/0.2		87.0/13.0/0.0	
2		65.2/32.8/2.0		76.2/22.4/1.4		84.5/14.7/0.8		85.7/14.3/0.0	
3		57.9/36.5/5.5		70.8/25.0/4.2		77.2/21.7/1.1		69.2/30.8/0.0	
4		66.4/30.7/2.9		63.4/36.0/0.6		71.3/26.9/1.8		76.9/23.1/0.0	

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-10
 Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categorized by Region
 of School Board Respondents

How It Should Be Category	Northeast		Central		Southern		Western		Pacific	
	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%
1	70.0/30.0/0.0		74.7/25.3/0.0		75.3/24.7/0.0		77.1/22.9/0.0		75.7/24.3/0.0	
2	56.3/40.2/3.5		71.0/27.9/1.1		69.1/29.4/1.5		73.3/26.7/0.0		76.2/20.6/3.2	
3	47.2/42.7/10.1		65.5/29.1/5.4		60.5/36.0/3.5		68.0/30.0/2.0		68.8/28.6/2.6 ³	
4	66.3/31.6/2.1		69.9/27.8/3.2		66.3/31.5/3.2		59.6/40.4/0.0		55.1/42.3/2.6	

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-11

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categorized by Region of Superintendent Respondents

How It Should Be Categorized	Northeast		Central		Southern		Western		Pacific	
	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%
1	87.1/12.9/0.0		87.6/12.1/0.3		87.6/12.4/0.0		79.2/20.8/0.0		82.4/17.6/0.0	
2	82.1/15.4/2.5		87.6/12.0/0.4		85.3/13.2/1.5		76.1/23.9/0.0		90.0/10.0/0.0	
3	77.9/19.5/2.6		82.2/17.5/0.3		72.2/27.0/0.8		70.8/27.7/1.5		73.1/25.8/1.1 ³	
4	74.6/23.8/1.6		73.3/25.7/1.0		74.4/24.8/0.8		67.1/30.1/2.8		46.3/31.6/4.1 ⁴	

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-12

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categorized by School District Enrollment Size for School Board Respondents

Should Be	Less Than		1,000 to		5,000 to		10,000 to		More Than	
	1,000	4,999	9,999	24,999	25,000	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd
Category	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	Su/Sh/Bd	%	%	%	%	%
1	70.8/29.2/0.0	75.5/24.5/0.0	77.9/22.1/0.0	72.5/27.5/0.0	66.7/33.3/0.0					
2	59.3/39.5/1.2	62.1/35.5/2.4	84.8/13.9/1.3	79.6/20.4/0.0	87.0/8.7/4.3					35
3	63.1/32.0/4.9	58.2/36.9/4.9	72.1/23.3/4.6	64.8/29.6/5.6	57.1/33.3/9.6					51
4	65.4/29.8/4.8	66.4/33.2/0.4	65.9/30.7/3.4	62.5/35.7/1.8	60.0/36.0/4.0					

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-13

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categorized by School District Enrollment Size of Superintendent Respondents

Should Be	Less Than		1,000 to		5,000 to		10,000 to		More Than	
	1,000	Su/Sh/Bd	4,999	Su/Sh/Bd	9,999	Su/Sh/Bd	24,999	Su/Sh/Bd	25,000	Su/Sh/Bd
Category	%		%		%		%		%	
1	84.1/15.6/0.3		86.0/14.0/0.0		87.0/13.0/0.0		87.5/12.5/0.0		100.0/0.0/0.0	
2	82.1/17.9/0.0		85.0/13.4/1.6		90.0/10.0/0.0		95.0/5.0/0.0		100.0/0.0/0.0	³ ⁵ ⁶
3	74.2/25.2/0.6		80.0/18.3/1.7		79.5/20.5/0.0		62.5/37.5/0.0		87.5/12.5/0.0	
4	70.3/28.3/1.4		71.8/26.9/1.3		83.3/12.5/4.2		60.0/32.0/8.0		75.0/25.0/0.0	

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Superintendent

Table R9-14

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categorized by Community
Description of School Board Respondents

How It Should Be Categorized	Urban		Suburban		Rural		Small Town		Other	
	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%
1	70.3/29.7/0.0		71.4/28.6/0.0		78.0/22.0/0.0		74.4/25.6/0.0		92.9/7.1/0.0	
2	78.3/15.0/6.7		73.2/26.1/0.7		65.0/34.0/1.0		61.3/37.0/1.7		72.7/27.3/0.0	
3	48.4/43.8/7.8		61.7/33.3/5.0		65.6/31.2/3.2		62.7/31.0/6.3		93.3/6.7/0.0	
4	56.5/40.6/2.9		65.7/32.5/1.8		70.3/27.3/2.4		63.4/34.5/2.1		80.0/20.0/0.0	

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-15

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categorized by
Community Description of Superintendent Respondents

Should Be	Urban		Suburban		Rural		Small Town		Other	
	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%	Su/Sh/Bd	%
1	92.3/7.7/0.0		83.7/16.3/0.0		84.5/15.3/0.2		85.9/14.1/0.0		100.0/0.0/0.0	
2	91.7/8.3/0.0		90.8/8.3/0.9		81.6/17.2/1.2		84.8/15.2/0.0		83.3/16.7/0.0	
3	82.4/11.8/5.8		72.4/26.8/0.8		77.0/21.8/1.2		78.5/21.5/0.0		82.4/17.6/0.0	
4	65.8/31.6/2.6		77.4/20.4/2.2		69.8/28.9/1.3		72.4/25.3/2.3		72.2/27.8/0.0	

Su = Superintendent Responsibility

Sh = Shared Responsibility

Bd = Board Responsibility

Table R9-16

Percent of Areas of Responsibility for How It Should Be Categorized by Average Years of Experience of Respondent Groups

Category	How It Should Be	
	School Board	Superintendent
	Su/Sh/Bd %	Su/Sh/Bd %
1	76.2/23.8/0.0	80.0/20.0/0.0
2	54.2/42.9/2.9	83.9/16.1/0.0
3	59.5/35.7/4.8	75.7/21.6/2.7
4	53.3/40.0/6.7	68.4/31.6/0.0

Su = Superintendent Responsibility
 Sh = Shared Responsibility
 Bd = Board Responsibility

Appendix H

States by Region

Northeast Region		
Connecticut	Maryland	New York
Delaware	Massachusetts	Pennsylvania
District of Columbia	New Hampshire	Rhode Island
Maine	New Jersey	Vermont

Central Region		
Illinois	Kentucky	Missouri
Indiana	Michigan	Ohio
Iowa	Minnesota	Wisconsin

Southern Region		
Alabama	Louisiana	Tennessee
Arkansas	Mississippi	Texas
Florida	North Carolina	Virginia
Georgia	South Carolina	West Virginia

Western Region		
Colorado	Nebraska	Oklahoma
Kansas	New Mexico	South Dakota
Montana	North Dakota	Wyoming

Pacific Region		
Alaska	Hawaii	Oregon
Arizona	Idaho	Utah
California	Nevada	Washington

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

A National Survey of the Separation of Responsibilities
between School Boards and Superintendents

by

Donald T. Alvey

(ABSTRACT)

The theory of separation of responsibilities in the operation of school systems has been documented as the school board setting policy and the superintendent implementing that policy. At the same time, that theory has been difficult to put into practice. The purpose of this study was to investigate the similarities and inconsistencies of responses between two national sample groups--school board members and superintendents--on four general categories of responsibility in school systems: Administration and Organization of the School System, Pupil and Professional Personnel, Financial Management, and Curriculum and Instruction. The population for this descriptive research was superintendent and school board member subscribers to The American School Board Journal. A random sample of 2,488 superintendents and a separate random sample of 2,488 school board members received the National Questionnaire on the Separation of Responsibilities

between School Boards and Superintendents. Responses were analyzed using frequency distributions and cross-tabulation procedures to determine significance between the two sample group's attitudes and demographic variables. School board respondents in each of the four categories reported the largest percent of responses in the area of superintendent responsibility, but indicated that some of that responsibility should be shifted towards themselves. Superintendent respondents reported the majority of responses as their own responsibility, indicating that some of the responsibility should be shifted towards the school board in each category except Pupil and Professional Personnel, where more of the responsibility should be reserved for themselves. The respondents did not differ in attitude significantly toward the areas mentioned across demographic variables.