

A STUDY OF VARIABLES RELATED TO TURNOVER
OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN SELECTED
NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

by

Donald W. Bentley.

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate 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:

M. D. Alexander, Chairman

David J. Parks

J. W. Robinson

A. P. Johnston

Glenn I. Earthman

April 1976

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author of this dissertation wishes to express his sincere gratitude to the following individuals for their support, guidance, and assistance in the completion of the doctoral program and the preparation of this dissertation:

Dr. David Alexander, Committee Chairman;

Dr. David Parks, Dr. Perry Johnston, Dr. James Robinson and Dr. Glenn Earthman, Committee Members;

Dr. Patricia E. Gaynor, Appalachian State University for her assistance in statistical programming at the computer center;

Miss Agnes M. Davis, Librarian, Virginia Tech, for assistance in the collection of material;

Mrs. Jean Moy for many hours of typing and duplicating.

Finally, this study is dedicated to the researcher's wife, Audrey, who has been patient, understanding, and a source of continuing inspiration throughout this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background for the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Research Questions	5
Significance of the Study	8
Limitations of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	9
Organization of the Dissertation	10
2. REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE	12
Procedure and Introduction	12
Overview of Turnover	13
Organizational Variables	18
Administrative District Size	20
Board-Superintendent Relationship	21
Politics	27
Teacher Militancy	31
Staff Relationships	34

Chapter	Page
Social Problems	36
Competencies	37
Chapter Summary	41
3. METHODOLOGY	42
Population	42
Sample.	42
Instrument	44
Distribution and Collection of the Questions	47
Treatment of Data	48
Organizational Variable Data From Superintendents	50
Competency Data	51
Chapter Summary	52
4. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	54
Introduction	54
Demographic Data	54
Summary	74
5. ANALYSIS OF DATA	76
Factor Analysis	76
Analysis of Variance: Factors and Demographic Data	80
Analysis of Variable Data: Item by Item	91
Analysis of Satisfaction Scales and Demographic Data	110

Chapter	Page
Analysis of Competency Data	112
Discussion.	129
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	133
Summary	133
Purpose	133
Methodology	135
Results of the Analyses	135
Conclusions	137
Recommendations	139
BIBLIOGRAPHY	141
APPENDIXES	151
A. Letter Requesting Support for the Study From State Superintendent of Public Instruction	152
B. Letter Requesting Support for the Study From Executive Secretary of North Carolina School Boards Association	154
C. Letter of Support From State Superintendent of Public Instruction	156
D. Letter of Support From Executive Secretary of North Carolina School Boards Association	158
E. Trial Questionnaires	160
F. Questionnaires and Cover Letter Sent Out . . .	168
VITA	182

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Questionnaires Returned	49
2. Age	56
3. Sex	57
4. Demographic Background	58
5. Years in Present Position	59
6. Superintendencies Held in North Carolina . . .	61
7. Teaching Areas: One Area or Combination of Areas	62
8. Assistant Principalship	63
9. Principalships	64
10. Central Office Positions	65
11. Superintendencies in Other States	66
12. Highest Degree Earned	67
13. Age: First Teaching Position	69
14. Age: First Administrative Position	70
15. First Administrative Position	71
16. Student Enrollment	72
17. Present Positions Other Than the Superintendency	73
18. Positions Held Prior to the Last Superintendency	75
19. Rotated Factor Matrix	79

Table	Page
20. Correlation Coefficient	81
21. Results of Analysis of Variance Between Identified Factors and Demographic Data . . .	82
22. Variable Data	92
23. Results of Analysis of Variance Three Study Group and Variable Data	101
24. Rank in Importance of Variable Data	108
25. Results of Analysis of Variance Between Satisfaction Scale and Demographic Data . . .	113
26. Competency Data	115
27. Results of Analysis of Variance Three Study Groups and Competency Data	122
28. Results of Analysis of Variance: Three Study Groups and Total Scores of Competency and Importance Values	128
29. Comparison of Performance and Importance Scales on Competencies	130

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It has been well documented that the rapidity of change and the accompanying environmental turbulence which have been characteristic of recent decades have spawned a number of reactive patterns in public sector service policy, operations, and, not inconsequentially, careers. The elements of change are not to be viewed as reasons for complaint. Every public office-holder is in line for public scrutiny and action. Yet, those in leadership positions in education, and those who are planning for such positions, ought to understand that a certain degree of change is inherent in the superintendency in the public schools.

Constant change and increased workload are factors to which the superintendents must become accustomed. As the most visible position in the school system, the superintendency is the most sensitive to change. Moreover, demands on the superintendents are increasing, in part because there is neither a real job description for the position nor universally-accepted limits to the demands that can be placed upon the superintendents (South-

worth, 1967:38). The position demands adaptability to change. The superintendent is responsible for many tasks related to the position, such as personnel, budget, instruction and curriculum, and facilities. Beyond these duties, the superintendent is expected to stay abreast of the latest developments in education and to know more about education in general than any of his subordinates or the community. Southworth states, "It is unreasonable to expect one man to know all the answers to the variety of questions he may be asked. Yet, such is the temper of our times that people expect the superintendent to know (Southworth, 1967:38)."

A concern about the status of the superintendency in this country is being felt by candidates for the position. The high prestige once associated with the position has been eroded by increased work load, less time for personal study, and school boards are gradually removing administrative authority from superintendents. These demands are weakening the stature of the superintendent as an educational leader. Only a few years ago, the superintendency was considered the ultimate goal in the public school administrator's career. Although the position had some insecurity, it enjoyed status and, in general, commanded the respect of the educational community (Grieder, 1970:10).

Individuals, in selecting and controlling their careers, attempt to utilize prestige and recognition. School systems, controlling the higher level career positions, attempt to maximize the similarity between the individual's skills and the requirements for the position he occupies or seeks. While these are suggested determiners of career movement, it is recognized that competency, personal characteristics, and ideology, among other variables, may also influence turnover patterns of superintendents. It would seem, however, that the most prestigious positions are occupied by superintendents who have adopted organizational strategy, while the occupational strategists are likely to be passed over (Thompson, Avery, Carlson; 1968:24). The danger, however, is that if boards of education select superintendents on the basis of their readiness to conform to organizational norms alone, they may select individuals whose commitment to their profession is weak and whose competencies in professional educational leadership are lacking, thus establishing a climate for turnover in the superintendency.

The Thirtieth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators reported a nationwide investigation on the status of change in the superintendency. In 1950, questionnaires were sent to 3220 superintendents with about 50 percent responding. The median tenure was

6.1 years for the group with nearly 51 percent of those reporting having held two to seven superintendent positions (A.A.S.A. Yearbook, 1952:28).

The American Association of School Administrators also studied the profile of superintendents in 1960 and 1970. The median tenure served in a position for 1960 was 6.6 years with seven percent of the superintendents serving in five or more positions and 44.2 percent serving their first districts. In 1970, the profile showed that the median tenure for superintendents was 4.7 years in the first four superintendencies and only 4.3 percent of those profiled had held more than five positions while 75 percent of the subjects had served two or fewer districts (A.A.S.A.; 1960:82, 1970:39).

The American Association of School Administrators also reported that over 2000 superintendencies are filled each school year. There are approximately 15,000 superintendents in the United States (A.A.S.A. Yearbook, 1970:1). During the last study year approximately 13 percent of the superintendencies were turnovers during that year.

In the research and literature found related to the turnover in the superintendency of public schools, no definite pattern of variables holds true in every state across the nation. The variables that relate to turnover and the competencies perceived to be desirable for the

superintendency are the areas which the writer hopes to investigate in this study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was to investigate the turnover of superintendents in selected North Carolina School Districts as related to organizational variables, demographic data of superintendents, and competency data.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How were the superintendents who responded to the questionnaire distributed in the following demographic areas? Due to the nature and length of question, the results are in a chapter by itself (Chapter 4).
 - A. Age
 - B. Sex
 - C. Community background
 - D. Length of current position
 - E. Number of superintendencies in this state
 - F. Positions prior to superintendency
 - G. Superintendencies in other states
 - H. Highest degree
 - I. Age of entry into teaching
 - J. Age of entry into administration
 - K. Enrollment in unit
 - L. Present position
 - M. Immediate preceding position to superintendency

2. What was the relationship of the three factors from factor analysis and the demographic data areas? The factors are:
 1. Board of education interference
 2. Non-support - finances
 3. Pressures
3. How do superintendents in non-turnover units, superintendents who were forced out of a position, and superintendents who left a position on their own will differ in the importance given to each of the following variables related to superintendency turnover?
 - A. Board of education performing administrative duties normally assigned to the superintendent.
 - B. Board of education failing to work together as a unit.
 - C. Term of contract too short: two or less years.
 - D. Size of school system small: moved for advancement.
 - E. Conflict of personality of superintendent and board.
 - F. Involvement in partisan politics by the Board of Education.
 - G. Higher salary elsewhere.
 - H. Militant teacher organization demanding power and decision making.
 - I. Racial disturbances.
 - J. Poor support from local governing board on budget and other school support.
 - K. Interference from pressure groups - choice of books, teacher selection, transportation, etc.
 - L. Poor staff relations in central office.
 - M. Frequent board turnover.

*This question was inserted for consideration after the Factor Analysis Program was run.

- N. Retirement: age or pressure.
 - O. Lack of fringe benefits.
 - P. Intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials.
 - Q. Lack of community confidence and support of superintendent or poor public relations.
 - R. Living and social facilities.
 - S. Special locale for seasonal activities in new position.
 - T. Family ties.
 - U. Lower cost of living in new locale.
 - V. Others
4. What was the relationship of the extent of job-satisfaction of superintendents who have been in a position five or more years to the demographic data?
5. How do superintendents in non-turnover units, superintendents who were forced to leave a position, and superintendents who left a position on their own volition differ in performance on the following competencies as perceived by chairman of board of education?
- A. Instructional Leadership
 - B. School-Community Relationships
 - C. Personnel Management - Staffing
 - D. Pupil Personnel Services
 - E. Plant Operations
 - F. Decision Making
 - G. Interpersonal Relationships
 - H. Business Management
 - I. Recording
 - J. Reporting

- K. Accounting
 - L. Organizing
 - M. Co-ordinating
 - N. Planning
 - O. Appraising
6. What is the relationship of the performance level of the superintendent and importance level of each of the above competencies as perceived by the board chairman?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

When a superintendency is vacated, there will be much planning for securing a qualified person to fill the position. If research dealing with variables and competencies related to turnover in the superintendency were available to superintendents, prospective superintendents, and boards of education, the information could be used by each group to deal effectively with the underlying causes of turnover. This perhaps would lead to fewer turnovers and a consistency in the working relationships within the administration. With the superintendents and boards of education having such information, each group could match their expectations in order to eliminate possible early turnover in the superintendency.

Further, if research were available on areas that create turbulence in the superintendency, educational institutions could provide training to deal with the situa-

tion to alleviate the frequency of many administrators being forced out of their positions.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to the examination of variables related only to the turnover in the superintendencies in North Carolina. The study was also limited to data from (1) the superintendents of North Carolina public schools and (2) chairmen of boards of education. No information was sought from assistant superintendents or other board members. Finally, the study was limited by the reliance upon the perception of the respondents to the study.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions were formulated to clarify specific ideas and information pertinent to this study:

Superintendency turnover. A superintendent leaving a position and subsequent replacement of superintendent, usually expressed as the proportion of change in a specific group during a stated time period.

Job-satisfaction. The level of satisfaction with the position of superintendent.

Competency. The skill needed to fulfill a desired quality of job performance as measured by importance and

performance level rating by board chairman.

Importance level. The value placed on a competency area.

Performance level. The rating placed on the performance of a superintendent on competencies in the superintendency.

Turnover - own volition unit. A unit where the superintendent resigned of his own will, but could have been rehired.

Turnover unit. A district which has experienced change in the superintendency within the past three year period.

Non-turnover unit. A unit which has retained its present superintendent for five or more years.

Forced-turnover unit. A unit in which the superintendent was asked to resign or a contract was not renewed.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

The dissertation is divided into six chapters:

Chapter 1 contains the introduction and background for the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, and the definitions of terms.

Chapter 2 contains a review of literature concerning a description of the turnover of superintendents and variables and competencies related to the turnover.

The methodology of the study is described in Chapter 3. The identification of the population, development of the questionnaires, the data collection procedures, and the analytical techniques are explained in this chapter.

Chapter 4 includes an analysis of the demographic data gathered from the superintendents.

Chapter 5 contains the analysis of the data gathered by the questionnaires used to determine the variables related to turnover in the superintendency.

In Chapter 6 the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research are presented.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

PROCEDURE AND INTRODUCTION

An extensive attempt was made to locate and review all significant literature and research on variables related to the turnover in the superintendency. An Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) search was conducted using the key expressions of turnover, competencies, mobility, tenure, superintendent, superintendency, school board relationships, community variables, chief administrators, and occupational mobility. The results of this search were very productive.

The researcher then proceeded to search manually all available indexes and references at the Library of Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina, and the Library of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

This chapter presents the results of a review of selected related literature in nine sections. These are overview of turnover, organizational variables, administrative district size, board-superintendent relationships,

politics, teacher militancy, staff relationships, social problems, and competencies. A general overview of turnover was first investigated to determine the various variables that other studies relate to turnover in the superintendency. In the remaining sections an investigation of turnover patterns, an in depth look at variables, and competencies that superintendents are expected to have were dealt with as they were determined to be related to the turnover in the superintendency.

OVERVIEW OF TURNOVER

Changes in school superintendencies occur frequently. Each year about 2000 school boards across the United States search for and elect new superintendents of schools (A.A.S.A. Yearbook, 1970:1). One survey reports that one out of every five superintendents is new to his position each fall (Mosier and Baker, 1952:44); another states that the median length of service is about 6.6 years (A.A.S.A., 1960:81). This does not mean that the replacement is unimportant. With turnover comes the sense of excitement, apprehension, and expectation. Some see the change as an opportunity; others as a threat to their security.

A few researchers have attempted to determine or describe the causes leading to executive turnover.

Bradshaw identified causes which result in turnover: superintendent-board conflict, economic conditions, and community pressures (Bradshaw: 1968).

Lutz reported that the size of school units was the first variable related to turnover in the superintendencies of Michigan. He further determined that lack of demarcation between roles, boards failing to work as a body, and short term contracts were high priority variables related to the turnover (Lutz, 1963).

In a study of Colorado school district superintendent mobility, Dorland found that low salaries, inadequate administrative assistance, special-interest group pressures, insufficient community support, and board-superintendent communications related to role and objectives were contributors to turnover of superintendents. Superintendents involved in turnover did not, for the most part, improve their career status but were inclined to accept positions at the same or lower level. This movement was to avoid pressures of the job (Dorland, 1973:5).

A study in Connecticut revealed that community size, party affiliation, population growth, and expenditures were factors in turnover, but not to a significant degree as in other areas of the nation (Porter, 1971). In contrast to the study by Porter, Crosby found that superintendents in New Jersey viewed community variables to be

very significant in turnover. This study was centered upon the conflicts generated by population stability, socioeconomic status, board stability, interest group activities, and teacher militancy within the educational community (Crosby, 1972).

There is a need for concern about the future status of the superintendency in this nation, according to Southworth. He feels that the attractiveness of the position of superintendent has been eroded by heavier demands made by school boards, greater expected workload, decline in the stature as an educational leader, greater public pressures, and complete exposure to the public (Southworth, 1967:39). Due to these changing conditions, superintendents are often retiring as early as possible. They are looking for less demanding positions.

Nearly one-tenth of the superintendents in California are new to their positions each year. Many of these vacancies were created because the superintendents were promoted from small units into larger ones as vacancies occurred. The largest turnover comes in the city or unified districts, with the smallest coming in the elementary districts (Dils, 1954:62).

In a study conducted by Sales and Taylor, it was found that superintendents in the smallest districts tended to stay a shorter time in their first superinten-

dency than did the superintendents of all other districts. The median years in the first superintendency in this Arkansas study was 3.0 years. The median time spent in each district from small to over 4800 student population was 4.6 years (Sales and Taylor, 1973:19).

Carlile's investigation of the superintendencies of the Middle Atlantic area in the early 1950's found that four variables were the major contributors to turnover. The areas of concern were the low salary an administrator received, administrators seeking position of less responsibility, size of the school system controlled finance, and length of contract was too short (Carlile, 1953:20).

During the years 1932 to 1947, Spaulding conducted a study of turnover of superintendents in large cities. His findings revealed nine to 14 percent turnover during those years. The factors related to turnover in this study were somewhat different from those of other studies. Twenty-five percent of turnovers were from death of the superintendents, 29 percent of the other superintendents went into less demanding employment, 21 percent of those involved in the study retired, and 16 percent of superintendents were dismissed by boards of education (Spaulding, 1958:37).

Samson (1955, as reported in the Administrators' Notebook) conducted a study in three North Central states which had small units. First, as in many other studies, it was found that the size of the district tended to be a significant factor in turnover. Second, the board of education turnover apparently is closely related to the stability of the superintendency. Finally, promotion from within contributed to the stability of the superintendency.

No two urban school superintendents are alike but they share one particular factor in that they do not last long in their administrative positions. In 1970, the average length of tenure was less than four years in the large urban districts and is getting shorter. The factors behind these moves are board turnover, community pressures, and school disruptions (Morrow, Foster, and Estes, 1974:283).

Frequently turnover of superintendents is unfair to the system but even more so to the person whose contract is terminated (Barr, 1951:37). This statement refers to those who are forced to move because of activities not related to the superintendency brought about by persons who have personal grudges against public officials. For persons in education there is but one employer in the community. Persons employed in fields other than education

can find other employers but in education the superintendent of the schools has no alternative other than to leave the community to find employment suitable to his training.

ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES

School superintendents, with few exceptions, rise from the ranks of educational personnel. Most states require professional training and credentials. Generally by the time these requirements are met, most individuals who are interested in the superintendency have had teaching and administrative experiences at a lower level. Two courses are open to the prospective superintendent; one is to wait until the superintendency comes to him, and the other is to seek a superintendency wherever it can be found. The person who simply waits continues to work in the home school district until he obtains the higher position.

There is a motivational distinction between superintendents who arrive at a position from a promotion within to promotion from outside. This distinction is to the importance they place on career and location. The person who wants a superintendency only within the home system values place over career (Adams, 1955). Superintendents who are promoted by this method are called "place-bound" or "insiders." The individual who is promoted from out-

side and leaves his home system for the superintendency is classified as a "career-bound" or "outsider" (Carlson, 1972:40-41).

Carlson (1972) makes a distinction within the ranks of the career-bound superintendents. The career-bound superintendents may be "hoppers" or those who move horizontally into units of the same size, and are applying for a new superintendency. The hopper likes to initiate projects but never wants to work for their completion. Another type may be the "specialist." Unlike the hopper, the specialist undertakes a task and sees it to completion. The third is the "statesman." This career-bound superintendent carries the total program as far as possible and is very aware of impression and reputation. This superintendent is the one whom boards seek because of his work and the long range consequences of his acts.

The place-bound and career-bound superintendents have also been classified in studies as cosmopolitan or local. The cosmopolitan is the mobile superintendent while the local prefers to remain in his present locale (Fenske, 1970:64). Tansky and Dubin carried this classification another step further. They divide these groups into three categories. First, there is the upward mobile, the one who wants to reach the top in his profession. Second, the ambivalent, who wants to move up but will not

sacrifice previous standards to reach this goal. Finally, there is the downward mobile, who does not care to strive for higher levels (Tansky and Dubin, 1965:725).

Each of these mobility patterns is affected by many variables. Each responds to the pressure in direct relationship to its nature of movement.

ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT SIZE

The frequency of administrative turnover at the top levels of administration is directly related to the size of the organization or district (Grusky, 1961:269). A study of the short term tenure of superintendents in Michigan showed that one of the major factors related to the problem was the size of the district. The size of the district indirectly influences the availability of housing, shopping areas, professional services, and cultural interests in the community. Administrators and applicants for superintendencies use these community services as part of the decision if to move or take a position within an administrative unit (Lutz, 1963).

A study by the American Association of School Administrators (1952:284, 312) found that most turnovers were due to taking positions for higher salary, prestige, and authority. Only six percent of the respondents from cities were leaving for reasons other than advancement

and 18 percent of the respondents from rural districts were leaving for reasons other than advancement in the field of education.

Mobility and salaries are correlated to a high degree in that salaries vary considerably according to the student population of the district. Salaries as a whole are much larger as the unit size increases. Therefore, the turnover in the smaller districts may be quite rapid due to the efforts of the superintendent to seek a better paying position in a larger unit or in other fields of employment (Campbell, 1970:208).

In addition to the above studies which indicate that the size of the incumbent's administrative unit as compared to the opportunities in larger units plays a very important part in the turnover of the superintendency, others in similar studies have found this same variable to be strongly related to turnover (Selke, 1940; Carlile, 1953; Samson, 1955; Crosby, 1972; Porter, 1971).

BOARD-SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIPS

The policy making administrative relationship existing between a board of education and its superintendent is the most important relationship in a school district. Its effectiveness will permeate each and every aspect of the operation of the district. Regardless of the extent

to which a community provides material support, it may still lack an adequate school program if the local board and superintendent fail to recognize their respective responsibilities and areas of control. When this happens, controversy that generally leads to a turnover in the superintendency begins (Mayer and Wilson, 1972:20).

The board of education has legal power only as a unit, not as individuals. However, in a study of school responsibilities, one-third of the superintendents questioned responded that their board members worked on an individual basis and at times had given the superintendent specific directions, therefore breaking the board-superintendent relationship (Gross, 1958:14). Problems posed by board members who act individually in school matters still plague many boards of education. School board members have no power or authority except that expressed in a formal board session (North Carolina Public School Law, 115-27).

A study made in 1951 on practical school board procedures outlined a very clear structure for the relationship of the board of education and the superintendent. According to ideal practices as conceived at the time, the board of education formulates the policies for the school system and the superintendent puts the policies into effect. He reports frequently to the board as to how

its policies are functioning. The board decides whether they are good or bad in their results and thus performs its other major function: evaluating. When a board makes policies after careful consideration, when the superintendent executes them, and when the board appraises the results, a school system has the proper relationship and the balance that should exist between a board and a superintendent. We know this is the ideal relationship to maintain, but realize that it can not and does not always exist due to variations in superintendents and boards of education's willingness to formulate such distinctions between policy making and administrative tasks (Davies, 1951:128).

Using the knowledge and training of the superintendent, then, means that the board gives its superintendent the authority to carry out his task as chief executive officer of the system. It means that the board will not interfere with the superintendent's activities unless there is a failure to carry out the policies effectively. Unfortunately, some boards fail to use the resources of the superintendent because they have not worked out the basic division of functions. Any board that finds itself in this type of situation should set up this basic division. Through a study of the literature, dealing with the functions of a board of education, through discussions

with members of successful boards, and through consultation with its superintendent the board will soon discover what the basic division should be. The division-of-labor principle is that legislative, policy-making, and evaluating powers and functions belong to the board and executive powers and functions, to the superintendent. After the board has decided what powers rightfully are its to exercise, it should proceed to the implementation of its policies and statement of the superintendent's responsibilities as he executes them. When these fail a turnover will probably occur (McCarty, 1960).

Questions of policy have been found to be a source of trouble in board-superintendent relationships. A study in Montana showed that board members are not reluctant to disagree with the superintendent on policy matters, and, further, will also disagree among themselves (Sletten, 1958:4). It is evident that most of the conflict surrounding the superintendent-board relationship centers on values and attitude differences relating to policy making. Each side knows what should be done but neither works hard to formulate the necessary policy understandings (Brause, 1966).

In a national study it was discovered that many school board members become heavily involved in the administrative aspects of the school operation. In Ohio,

superintendents were asked to leave the board meeting while personnel policies were discussed. In other states, curriculum, discipline, and personnel problems are being handled by the board of education or individual members of the board (Mullins, 1974:16). These failures to see the separation of the role of the superintendent and the board develop into situations which often lead the turnover in the superintendency (Lutz, 1963; Appleby, 1949).

Campbell (1952:49) provided an answer to some of the problems listed in the above study. He recommends that the board of education not only should be permitted, but also should be asked to take part in all policy formulation. The idea behind this statement is that many boards only "rubber stamp" policies made by administrators or staff committees. The professional should get the research on particular issues and pass this research on to the board for their consideration, then the board should be responsible for the acceptance or rejection of the materials in the formulation of the policy on the merits of the findings. Separation of duties and powers then would be a matter of policy.

Hunkins (1949) also stated that in industrial communities the board of education is made up of people who are accustomed to delegating duties. It is common for these boards to refer administrative duties to those

trained for this work. In small communities the board is made up of members who like to deal personally with conflicts. As a result, the board takes over the administrative duties rather than delegating them to the superintendent.

In an analysis of the relationships between supervisor-subordinate, Likert states that the subordinate's response to an act by the supervisor depends upon perception of the act and the expectations of the subordinate. The same is true with the supervisor's response to the subordinate. He further states that expectations constitute a major role in the perception process, but expectations need to be fully understood by both parties in the relationship (Likert, 1961).

Where contradictory expectations give rise to conflict, as in the superintendent-board relationship, and the board has the power to control the superintendent's behavior, the superintendent may well be faced with intensified conflicts. The increased tensions may be associated with the various aspects of the position and may decrease confidence in the board and the organization as a whole (Kahn, 1964).

POLITICS

Politics plays a major role in the turnover in the superintendency. This was illustrated by the mayoralty campaign in Philadelphia. The candidate ran on a platform which included the removal of the superintendent of schools. The politician won and removed the incumbent superintendent (Anderson, 1972:18).

Walden (1967) completed a study focusing on the political role of the superintendent which illustrated that a change in social and economic values would also lead to political changes. The superintendent, being associated with the policy-making body, was vulnerable to removal with the turnover of the board of education. The results of the research revealed that turnover was more frequent following the seating of a new board than when the incumbents had not suffered defeat. The research further pointed out how the political role of the superintendent linked him with the community power structure, therefore making politics positively related to turnover cases.

A case study was conducted in Washington on the effects of politics in education. One member of the board of education was to be elected. The incumbent was defeated and a shift in leadership took place. The new

member took the leadership role. While a single defeat would seem insignificant, in this case the turnover culminated in the search for a new superintendent (Iannoccone, 1967:84).

It is universally recognized that politics and the superintendency are hard to separate in the actual performance of duties. By the nature of the role, the superintendent must take part in political activities. The superintendent's role is best defined as a political role with educational support (Campbell, 1970:214). The board and superintendent's link to the power structure of a community has been illustrated by Goldhammer and others and it can be assumed that the offices of these positions would be the focal point for those who compete for control of the community's decision-making process (Goldhammer, 1964:20; Kimbrough, 1964; Griffith, 1956:108).

The superintendent, playing a role heavily political in nature, would be closely identified with the board of education and his position would be in jeopardy if the incumbents suffered defeat or not re-appointed. By the virtue of the changes in the board and political orientation of a new board, a possible conflict might arise due to political philosophy and lead to a turnover in the superintendency.

A significant relationship between the defeat of

board members and the superintendency turnovers was found in a study conducted in Pennsylvania. The turnover in cases where the defeat was in the primary election was higher than in the general elections. The turnover would take place within three years after the new officials took office if the party in power changed internally. The study indicated that the nature of partisan elections did not have total influence over turnovers. The turnover came as a result of dissatisfaction within the power structure in office. The non-partisan appearance is given to turnover in the superintendency but it is far from being non-political (Moen, 1971).

Based upon the findings of earlier studies, Iannacone and Lutz (1970:175) determined that the non-partisan nature of school politics might contribute to the long delay in social change and educational policy reforms. Although there is a long delay in social change and policy, it is still related to turnover because of dissatisfaction and possibly forceful leadership of the superintendent. The defeat of the incumbents denotes a dissatisfaction with policy and performance in the office of the superintendent and is strongly related to turnover.

In a study by Kirby, it was found that the superintendents who had career-mobility patterns of change took a more active part in politics. They tended to limit

themselves somewhat to areas of non-partisan politics. The non-mobile superintendent, usually in a large unit, tends to avoid political involvement other than in areas of school support and financing. The highly mobile superintendents were more conflict-tolerant. Turnover in position was customary and expected when involvement in politics at a high level was exercised (Kirby, 1971:7).

Traditionally, school superintendents have been warned to refrain from political activities in order to avoid the turnover dangers inherent in this behavior (Marland, 1970:365). Recently, however, educators have begun to question the desirability of the superintendent's refraining from taking an active part in politics. It is questionable if the separation could ever exist. Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee (1965:339) maintain that the public schools have not been and never can be separated from the political arena. Even with the hazards of losing their positions, superintendents must assert themselves as the primary link between the school and community agencies and become good enough politicians to get other politicians to commit themselves to educational improvement. This means that the superintendent should avoid partisan politics but be an active participant in political policies (Goldhammer, 1964:21; Kimbrough, 1964:109).

TEACHER MILITANCY

The precise role of the school superintendent in dealing with teacher organizations is unclear and becoming more unclear each year. The superintendent's traditional role as mediator between teachers and board is rapidly falling victim to growing teacher militancy. As teachers become more successful in acquiring decision-making powers, the superintendent can no longer satisfactorily manipulate both his board and his teachers by being a neutral third party or mediator.

The superintendent's dual role has never been comfortable. To teachers he has been the board's chief executive; to the board he has been the spokesman for teachers. This role is inherently contradictory. As chief executive to the board, he is expected to carry out its policy, and if this means constraining teachers or dampening their militancy, so much for that.

To do this, however, is to abrogate his other role: a spokesman for teachers, an advocate in their behalf, a channel for complaints. Such a role has never been easy, and in the present environment of teacher militancy, must be self-defeating (Urich and Shermin: 1973).

In order to identify current problems facing the school superintendents in Nebraska, a study was conducted which investigated problems routine in nature, problems

with some solution, most pressing problems, and problems with no solution. The results of the study indicated that teacher personnel problems lead the list of problems. In each area -- problems routine in nature, problems with some solution, most pressing problems, and problems with no solution -- those difficulties related to teachers were twice the number occurring in other areas of concern. In solving such problems to reduce turnover, the study revealed the need for new effort in the training of administrators to deal effectively with teacher militancy and personnel problems (Norton, 1971:13).

The leader of the New York union of teachers announced that salary was not the only issue in teacher disturbances; teachers wanted administrative power. The power they want is the right to change curriculum, choose innovative ideas, and dismiss administrators. If these demands are met, there are more disruptions ahead (Grieder, 1944:13).

An opinion poll was taken from 16,000 school administrators by Nation's School staff. From the 54 percent who returned the opinionnaire, teacher militancy ranked third on the list of possible problems that face the superintendent following board related and financial problems (Hickman (ed.), 1968:81).

Militant teachers are forcing the superintendent

into a role that allies him with the board of education to a larger degree than with the teacher organization. Teachers want direct contact with the board and are willing to by-pass the authority and responsibility of the superintendent. This demand to approach the board without the leadership of the superintendent comes about by the increased board-related activities placed upon the superintendent by the board; therefore, the alliance of the superintendent must be with the board, not the teachers (Wilson, 1965:28). Many superintendents are changing positions to avoid pressures by organized teacher groups.

Administrators are finding that the task of the superintendent has taken on new dimensions of teacher unrest as well as quantity. Few administrators foresaw the rapid escalation of teacher aggressiveness which causes today's superintendent so much concern. Squarely in the middle of this upheaval is the superintendent. The role of this position is demanding of the highest order of leadership (Burbank, 1968:14).

The rise of the teacher organizations is challenging the school superintendent to re-assess the role the superintendent will play in teacher-board relationships. Direct lines of communication are being demanded, raising the question of the role of the administrator in this dialogue. It is agreed the role of the administrator will

change its nature from the past as more controversy takes place and new administrators are employed to replace those who do not choose to encounter the teacher challenge along with other pressures of today's society (Burbank, 1968:32).

STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

The concept of a team approach to the superintendency has long been opposed by many school administrators due to lack of funds to properly implement the concept. The typical central office staff in the school systems today is less than adequate in number to fulfill its duties properly. Most school boards and governing bodies remain insensitive to allocating additional funds for the staff (Knezevich, 1969:253).

The addition of more staff members is only one dimension of the superintendent's task in organizing an effective team that will work in harmony. To a great extent the superintendent is only as good as his subordinates. In many cases where a new superintendent is employed, the administrative assistants can jeopardize the position of the superintendent, and the best efforts of the superintendent cannot improve the administration, if his assistants are without loyalty or the necessary qualifications. The assistants in many cases are those who have been

passed over in promotion and are the place-bound educators (Wilson, 1966:89).

Tying the security of key assistant administrative personnel to the fate of the superintendent yields benefits to the superintendent. Failure to support the superintendent, by not keeping him informed on outcomes of assigned duties or not carrying out the duties assigned, becomes a threat to all administrators involved in a team approach. This security aspect of the superintendent's relationship to the staff emphasizes the importance of the chain of command. The administrative staff, if properly managed, will contribute to the power of the superintendent rather than diminish it. Failure of the staff relationship will lead to a turnover in the superintendency (Fensch, 1964:40).

Still another problem that brings about conflict and turnover is the inability of the superintendent to communicate willingly with the staff about problems and to keep them informed about needs. Without needed information and assurances of dependability many subordinates will make many mistakes and will create a feeling of distrust throughout the educational community (Campbell, Cunningham, McPhee, Nystrand, 1970:231). Breakdowns at this point are among the most common causes of administrative failure and turnover.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Most superintendents are frustrated by the racial problems which they continue to encounter. One of the major problems is that they are not fully convinced that this societal problem should look to the schools for its solution (Goldhammer, 1967:44). The superintendent is under pressure to keep balances in the ratio of students and faculty. Many administrators give up their positions rather than be harrassed with the problem. Racial antagonisms rank high with issues facing school superintendents today; therefore, almost any action taken on racial issues becomes embroiled in conflict (James, 1967:9).

Religious antagonisms account for another persistent conflict facing the administrator. For example, the question of religious holidays is difficult to resolve, and there are concerns for other issues such as prayer in schools, shared facilities, released time, and textbooks. Extremists in any sect create problems in education that are hard to overcome for the superintendent and his staff (Goldhammer, 1964:49). Parents have taken school boards and superintendents to court and brought pressures not to allow required religious exercises in the schools. Pressure has been brought to the superintendent by those who were against such activities and protests have come from

those who opposed the court actions. These problems must be evaluated in light of the court ruling (Harting, 1974:402).

As true in most social conflicts, a number of issues were involved in the West Virginia textbook dispute. Some issues stemmed from religious groups; others came from those in the community who would like a change in the superintendency. The superintendent was a career-bound "outsider" with progressive ideas, and some board members ran for election with the intention of removing the administrator; racial prejudices, and political motivations were all inherent in the conflict. The removal of the superintendent seemed to be the real controversy with the other pressures to force the issue (Young, 1974:262; Jones, 1974:31).

Other disruptions have caused many turnovers in recent years. The human rights movement, like other social movements, brought forth the students, minorities, and the poor seeking their "rights" and willing to use any means to obtain their goals. Many school systems were closed as a result of these pressures (Zimmerman, 1971:243).

COMPETENCIES

Organizational variables alone do not create the turnovers in the superintendency. A board of education

also expects its superintendent to possess administrative competencies to carry out the educational program of the system. It is not enough to say that there are competencies which are expected of a successful administrator. The question is, of course, what the competencies are and how they are recognized in an administrator.

According to Campbell, a competency is related to the ability to do something; in the case of the school administrator, it is the ability to behave in a way which shows effective administrative behavior. Competencies may include personal attributes, knowledge, understanding, abilities, and skills; to be classified as a competency for educational leaders, however, each of these attributes must be related to actions that bring about effective administrative behavior (Campbell, 1971:316).

Until recent years it has been almost impossible to delineate either the specific characteristics of the superintendent's job or the personal and professional attributes of the man holding the position. It is still difficult to accomplish such an analysis with much accuracy. It is still true that no single pattern of administration guarantees success in the superintendency; at the same time, it is possible for experienced board chairmen to identify certain emerging patterns of operation and

competencies which are likely to be the most successful (Wilson, 1966:809).

Campbell uses Gulick's formulation of the competencies used for activities of any chief executive. This formulation of competencies was described as "POSDCoRB." These letters stand for the areas of activities in which an administrator should be competent, including planning, organizing, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting, and budgeting (Campbell, 1971:140).

It appears that Sears was one of the first writers in education to apply a design to the administrative process in a comprehensive fashion. Sears used Fayol's and Gulick's formulation but placed staffing and reporting within the other competency areas. The competency formulation by this writer includes planning, organization, direction, coordination, and control (Sears: 1950).

The American Association of School Administrators took cognizance of the administrative competency process. After noting that the administrative process is essentially a way of working with people to accomplish an educational purpose, it enumerated some competency areas crucial to this relationship. The competencies enumerated were planning, allocation, stimulation, coordination, and evaluation.

Gregg applied still other competencies to the administrative area. He included decision-making and in-

fluencing along with those of the above writers (Gregg, 1957:8).

The superintendent must possess the preceding administrative competencies and add another dimension, according to Reeves, who stresses that a superintendent must possess the ability to handle interpersonal relationships at all levels of the community and school system. As the head of the schools, the superintendent must have competencies in leadership in order to develop a high standard of interpersonal relationships. He must be able to inspire in others a feeling of loyalty to the schools and to develop good morale and attitudes of cooperative endeavor among the members of the school staff; he should be able to secure and to welcome participation of his staff in the determination of educational policies and plans for attaining the goals that have been cooperatively formulated and adopted; he should be able to view situations from the standpoint of others and help his staff to view matters from the standpoint of the board and the public; he should have the ability to select competent or potentially competent administrative assistants and develop leadership qualities in them; he should be able to inspire those working in the system to achieve great accomplishments in their several stations; he should be able to express himself clearly both orally and in writing; and

he should be able to gain and retain the confidence of people in the community (Reeves, 1954:241).

Svenson and Bryson have classified the competencies needed in school administrators as managerial tasks. They see four areas that must be mastered. These areas are curriculum and plant, personnel, plant operations, and public relations. Each competency area would include long-range planning and decision-making (Svenson and Bryson: 1969:81).

CHAPTER SUMMARY

A report on the review of literature related to the study of turnover in the superintendency was provided in this chapter.

An overview from studies, types of turnover, competencies, and variables that are much discussed were analyzed to show trends in turnover or mobility. These variables are national, yet are evident in most locales.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The selection of the population in the questionnaire survey, the development of the instrument, the distribution and collection of the questionnaires, and the methods to be used in treatment and analysis of data are presented in this chapter.

POPULATION

The population of this study consisted of all public school superintendents and chairmen of boards of education in units with no turnover within the past five years (88 units) and the 24 units with turnover within the past three years in North Carolina. The 24 units were selected at the three year limit because the present chairmen were serving at the time of turnover.

SAMPLE

A random selection of 24 superintendents and board chairmen was taken from those questionnaires returned by the 88 districts which had no turnover within the past five years. The remaining 24 respondents were superinten-

dents who had left their jobs within the past three-year period by being forced out or leaving of their own volition. The board chairmen of the 24 units were also selected because they were active on their boards when the turnovers took place. The sample, therefore, consisted of 48 superintendents and 48 chairmen of boards of education in North Carolina; 24 in non-turnover situations, 11 who were forced to leave, and 13 who left their positions on their own volition.

The guides used for determining the status of turnover or non-turnover superintendencies were Patterson's American Education (Patterson's American Education, 1971) and Education Directory of North Carolina (Education Directory of North Carolina, 1971-1975) which listed: (1) all of the school units of North Carolina, (2) names of the superintendents for each year, (3) the addresses of each superintendent, (4) and the chairmen of boards of education with their addresses.

On April 14, 1975, letters (see Appendix A and B) were sent to Dr. Craig Phillips, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of North Carolina and Dr. Raleigh Dingman, Executive Secretary of the North Carolina School Boards Association, requesting their support of this study. Dr. Phillips' and Dr. Dingman's letters were received in support of the study (see Appendix C and D) and were

mailed with the questionnaire.

INSTRUMENT

In attempting to determine the importance of variables related to turnover and competency level held by superintendents and the level of importance of the competency in the superintendency of North Carolina school units, a direct line of communication had to be established between the respondents and the researcher. Good (1966:190) states that there are three major methods usually used to obtain needed information: (1) a personal, confidential interview, (2) direct observation, and (3) a confidential questionnaire. Since the first two methods presented difficulties in terms of time and expense in gathering data from a large area, a questionnaire was developed to investigate the organizational variables related to the turnover and competencies held by superintendent and their importance as perceived by board chairmen in the superintendency in North Carolina.

The questionnaire was designed to provide data which, when analyzed, allowed for comparisons of variables related to turnover as perceived by superintendents who moved on their own volition, those who were forced to move, and those who have not moved in the past five year period. The questionnaire was further designed to provide data on

competencies held by superintendents and their importance as perceived by board chairmen as being related to the turnover in the superintendency. The instrument was developed by the writer after a study of the literature related to turnover in the superintendency and competencies desirable for the position.

The variable data part of the questionnaire was critiqued by a panel of former superintendents to ascertain opinions for revision of non-pertinent items. The revisions were made on items that were judged inadequate in completeness and understanding for the instrument (Appendix E). The competency data sheet was also administered to three active superintendents to gather needed input on completeness of the items and their relevancy to the needs of the superintendency.

The instrument was developed in three parts: Part I, Demographic Data, Part II, Organizational Variable Data, and Part III, Competency Data. The demographic data sheet was divided into two sections: a satisfaction scale and a personal data section (Appendix F).

The satisfaction scale was designed to ascertain the level of satisfaction with the present position of the superintendents who are active in the profession as superintendents at the present time. The scale was rated from one (1) as extremely low to seven (7), extremely high.

Each respondent was asked to circle his degree of satisfaction with the present position. These data were used to identify categories or areas where turnover is most likely to occur.

The demographic items were designed to gather data from the superintendents regarding age, sex, community size, number of years in present position, number of superintendencies held, educational positions held prior to the first superintendency, service in other states, degrees earned, age of entry into each educational position, position prior to the present position, and enrollment of the present units.

The second section of the instrument contained 22 variables identified through literature as being related to turnover in the superintendency. Each superintendent or former superintendent in the study was asked to state his opinion on a seven point scale as to the degree to which each variable had or would influence him in a decision to leave a position. The scale ranged from one (1) as low to seven (7) as high.

The competency data were contained in the third part of the instrument. These data sheets were designed to gather information from chairmen of boards of education about superintendents' or former superintendents' competencies in their position and the value placed on each competency.

This instrument contained 15 competency areas identified in literature as being necessary for the superintendency. The board chairmen were asked to rate their superintendents or former superintendents on each competency area and place a value on the importance of the item. The rating scale was one (1) for low to seven (7) as high.

The questionnaire was selected as the instrument for data gathering because it afforded an opportunity to collect the opinion of a large number of superintendents and board chairmen in a relatively short period of time. The instrument appears in Appendix F.

DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

On September 25, 1975, questionnaires, Part I and Part II, were mailed to 112 superintendents and Part III chairmen of boards of education in North Carolina school systems. These people were requested to complete and return the questionnaires within five days.

A support letter from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (see Appendix C), a stamped, self-addressed return envelope, and a cover letter were enclosed with the questionnaires to the superintendents.

A letter of support from the Executive Secretary of the North Carolina School Boards Association (see Appendix D), a cover letter, and a stamped, self-addressed

return envelope were also enclosed with the questionnaires to the chairmen of the boards of education.

By October 3, 1975, 60 percent of the questionnaires were returned from the superintendents and 57 percent by the board chairmen. By October 6, 1975, a follow-up letter was sent to encourage non-respondents to complete and return the questionnaires by October 13, 1975. On October 20, 1975, this phase of the study was complete with telephone calls being made to gather the non-respondents' questionnaires (see returns - Table 1).

TREATMENT OF DATA

Demographic Data From Superintendents

The demographic data were categorized into the three study groups - non-turnover, forced to leave, and left on own volition, edited for usefulness, and then plotted on charts. The data were analyzed to prepare a profile of the superintendents in North Carolina school systems. This profile illustrates numbers, percent, and statistical data on all the respondents who took part in the study.

Part I, Section A, the satisfaction scale, for those of the non-turnover group served as the dependent variable and the eight items in Part I, Section B, as the independent variables. An analysis of variance was applied

TABLE 1
QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED

Respondents	Number	Percent
Non-Turnover Superintendents	81	92
Non-turnover Chairmen of Board	79	89
Turnover Superintendent	23	95
Turnover Chairman of Board	22	92

to these data to determine if there were significant differences in scores on the feeling of satisfaction in the present position of the study group members who were active as superintendents. An analysis of the results shows where there were areas in which turnover was most likely to take place.

ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLE DATA FROM SUPERINTENDENTS

The data from the instrument received from superintendents were transferred to computer cards. After the cards were punched a factor analysis of the data was run using the Biomedical BMD 08M computer package (Dixon, 1973). Factor analysis, according to Kerlinger, is a method used in determining the number and nature of underlying variables among larger numbers of measures. It reduces the multiplicity of tests, items, or measures to greater simplicity and, in effect, indicates what tests or measures belong together (Kerlinger, 1973:659). By use of factor analysis of the items, individual items or variables in the instrument were grouped according to that common factor which the items were measuring. This grouping technique enabled the researcher to identify some important turnover areas encompassing the position of the superintendent.

The factors were used in the analysis of variance program with the demographic data and charted, giving num-

bers, percentages, and rank of importance of each variable.

It is recognized that the number of subjects should have been several times larger than the number of variables. With the topic under investigation, this was not possible, therefore, the results might not be as accurate as they would have been by using a larger sample.

The data from the organizational variable questionnaire were used in an analysis of variance program and the Scheffé test of comparison. This operation was performed by using the three study groups and the scores on the variable questionnaire item by item. The .10 confidence level was used to determine the level of significance of the means of the items.

COMPETENCY DATA

The data from the questionnaires received from the chairmen of boards of education were categorized into the three study groups, those who have been in the same position five or more years, those who left a position within the last three years of their own volition, and those who were forced to leave the superintendency within the last three years.

An analysis of variance test was used to treat the data related to the 15 competency items. The performance level and importance values were used in the program to

compare the significance placed on each of the 15 competencies by chairmen of the board. Comparisons were made among the three study groups on each item of the questionnaire. These comparisons were accomplished by using Scheffé's test for multiple comparisons. The .10 level of confidence was used in determining the significance in the study as suggested by Ferguson (Ferguson; 1971:271).

One-way analysis of variance was used on the total scores of the 15 competencies for the three groups. Where a significance was found the Scheffé test was used to make the comparison of means.

A Social Science Computer Package Program was used to get frequency counts, percentages, and ranking of competency items by performance level and by importance value as perceived by chairmen of boards of education. The ranking of items by performance level and importance value illustrate areas most related to turnover in the superintendency.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The design and method of research used in the study were described in Chapter 3. Identification of variables related to turnover in the superintendency of North Carolina was accomplished through development of an instrument of personal data, organizational data, and competency data.

The organizational data and competency data were rated on a seven point scale. The instrument was mailed to 112 superintendents and 112 chairmen of boards of education in selected counties and cities in North Carolina. One hundred and four superintendents and 101 chairmen of boards responded with usable returns.

Data description, variance of analysis, F ratios, factor analysis of the data were accomplished by use of Biomedical and Social Science Computer Packages. The grouping of variables formed by factor analysis was useful in making other analyses to determine relationships among respondents. A presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data are provided in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the demographic data obtained from the respondents to the superintendents' questionnaire and are a summary of responses from the population being studied. These data are charted with numbers, percentages and means of respondents in all the study groups combined. An analysis of the findings is presented as the profile of the superintendents and former superintendents.

The profile is divided into 12 categories: age, sex, size of home community, years in current position, superintendencies held in North Carolina, position before the superintendency, superintendencies in other states, degrees held, age at each educational level, unit enrollment, present position, and the immediate past position.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The age range was divided into five divisions for analysis. Nine superintendents or former superintendents were in the 25 to 35 year age range. This group of re-

spondents constituted 8.7 percent of the study group who returned the questionnaire. Thirty-eight, or 36.6 percent, of the respondents were 26 to 45 years of age. The second largest age group was from 46 to 55. Thirty-five were in this category, which made up 33.7 percent of the returned data. The 56 to 65 age category had 19 respondents, who constituted 18.2 percent of the respondents. The smallest age category was those men who were 65 or older. Only three respondents were in this group, representing 2.8 percent of the respondents (Table 2).

Item two of the demographic data, sex, indicated that all respondents to the questionnaire were male. At the time of the survey, no females were employed as superintendents in North Carolina (Table 3).

The superintendents came from varied backgrounds. The largest percentage came from small towns, while the smallest percentage came from cities of 10,001 to 50,000 in population. Still others came from large cities, rural, and farm areas (Table 4).

The superintendents and former superintendents had held their present positions for periods of time ranging from three months to 29 years. The median number of years of service for the respondents to the study was 7.4 years (Table 5).

Of the members of the study group, most had held

TABLE 2

AGE

Age Group	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
25 - 35	9	8.7
36 - 45	38	36.6
46 - 55	35	33.7
56 - 65	19	18.2
Over 65	3	2.8
TOTAL	104	100
MEDIAN AGE - 46.9		

TABLE 3
SEX

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	104	100
Female	0	0
TOTAL	104	100

TABLE 4
DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Area	Number	Percent
Small Town 10,000 or less	38	36.5
City 10,001 - 50,000	11	10.6
City 50,001 or more	12	11.5
Rural	19	18.3
Farm Area	24	23.1
TOTAL	104	100

TABLE 5
YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION

Years	Number	Percent
0 - 2	16	15.4
3 - 5	9	8.7
6 - 8	29	27.9
9 - 11	15	14.4
12 - 14	10	9.6
15 - 17	7	6.7
18 - 20	3	2.9
21 - 23	3	2.9
24 - 26	1	.9
27 - 29	3	2.9
Retired	8	7.7
TOTAL	104	100
Median	7.4	

single superintendencies in North Carolina. Seventy-two (72), or 69 percent of the respondents, were in this category. Many of those had been long term superintendents while others were in their first term at this level of administration. There were 22 who had served in two superintendencies, eight who had served three units and one who had served six units (Table 6).

The superintendents of North Carolina had had experience in many fields of educational employment. They came from 11 teaching areas and numerous supervisory and administrative positions. Only six had not had teaching experience in public schools. The teaching experience ranges from one year to 17 years. (Illustrated in Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10).

The data reveal that most of the superintendents in North Carolina were filled from within the state. The two percent who came from other states were from border towns in Virginia (Table 11).

The typical superintendent in North Carolina holds a masters degree as his highest academic achievement. Almost 50 percent of the respondents in the study were in this category. The specialist (6 year) degree and the doctorate were second and third in ranking. Only one respondent had remained at the bachelors degree level (Table 12).

TABLE 6
SUPERINTENDENCIES HELD IN NORTH CAROLINA

Superintendencies	Number	Percent
1	72	69.2
2	22	21.2
3	9	8.6
4	-	-
5	-	-
6	1	.96
TOTAL	104	100

TABLE 7
TEACHING AREAS: ONE AREA OR
COMBINATION OF AREAS

Area	Number	Percent*
Science	31	29.8
Math	29	27.9
Social Studies	24	23.1
Elementary	15	14.4
Coaching	12	11.5
English	5	4.8
Business Ed	2	1.9
Speech	1	.96
Foreign Language	1	.96
Agriculture	1	.96
College Ed	<u>2</u>	<u>1.9</u>
TOTAL	123	118.18

*Percent does not equal one hundred percent due to some respondents teaching in combination areas from the above chart.

TABLE 8
ASSISTANT PRINCIPALSHIP

	Number	Percent
Assistant Principalship	12	11.5

TABLE 9
PRINCIPALSHIPS

Principalship	Years	Number	Percent	Median
Elementary	1	2	3.8	3.5
	2	3	2.9	
	3	8	7.7	
	4	3	2.9	
	5	1	.96	
	7	2	1.9	
	8	4	3.8	
	14	1	.96	
	16	1	.96	
TOTAL		<u>27</u>	<u>25.88</u>	
Secondary	1	4	3.8	6.0
	2	3	2.9	
	3	6	5.8	
	4	4	3.8	
	5	3	2.9	
	6	3	2.9	
	7	4	3.8	
	8	4	3.8	
	9	2	1.9	
	10	3	2.9	
	12	1	.96	
	13	3	2.9	
	18	1	.96	
TOTAL		<u>42</u>	<u>39.32</u>	
Union	1	3	2.9	6.4
	2	3	2.9	
	3	6	5.8	
	4	4	3.8	
	5	4	3.8	
	6	7	6.7	
	7	4	3.8	
	8	5	4.8	
	9	3	2.9	
	10	3	2.9	
	11	1	.96	
	13	3	2.9	
	15	2	1.9	
	16	1	.96	
	20	2	1.9	
	22	1	.96	
TOTAL		<u>52</u>	<u>49.88</u>	

TABLE 10
CENTRAL OFFICE POSITIONS

Position	Number	Percent
Assistant Superintendent	30	16.3
Associate Superintendent	8	7.7
Guidance Director	1	.96
General Supervisor	10	9.6
Director of Instruction	5	4.8
Federal Programs	<u>3</u>	<u>2.9</u>
	57	42.26

TABLE 11
SUPERINTENDENCIES IN OTHER STATES

Number	Percent	States
2	2	Virginia
<u>102</u>	<u>98</u>	North Carolina
104	100	

TABLE 12
HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED

Degree	Number	Percent
Bachelors	1	.96
Masters	50	48.0
Specialist (6 yr.)	31	29.8
Doctorate	<u>22</u>	<u>21.2</u>
TOTAL	104	100

The early entry into teaching was characteristic of most superintendents. Only one respondent indicated that he was over 30 when entering teaching. The majority of respondents were below the age 25. (Illustrated in Table 13).

Most of the respondents became administrators when they were between 21 and 35 years of age. Only one superintendent entered into the administrative field for the first time after the age of 45. The largest number of men entered their administrative careers at the principalship level (Tables 14 and 15).

Student enrollment in the 104 units where a response was received covers a span of from 500 to more than 20,000. One unit reported fewer than 1,000 students while six units reported 20,000 or more in enrollment (Table 16).

Sixteen (16) members of the study group are at the present time in areas of work other than the superintendency or had retired from the educational field. Their reasons for leaving the superintendency vary. Some were forced to resign while others left of their own will (Table 17).

The superintendents of North Carolina come from a wide background of experiences. The 104 who responded to the study came from eight educational fields and one educational foundation. These areas were the immediate past

TABLE 13
AGE: FIRST TEACHING POSITION

Age	Number	Percent*
21 - 25	81	77.9
26 - 30	18	17.3
31 - 35	1	.96
Over 35	0	0

*Percentages not always equal to 100 percent due to round-off.

TABLE 14
AGE: FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

Age	Number	Percent
21 - 35	93	89.4
36 - 45	10	9.6
46 & Above	<u>1</u>	<u>.96</u>
	104	99.96

TABLE 15
FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

Position	Number	Percent
Assistant Principal	12	11.6
Principal	80	76.9
Ass't/Assoc. Superintendent	8	7.7
Superintendent	<u>4</u>	<u>3.8</u>
TOTAL	104	100

TABLE 16
STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Students	Number of Units	Percent
500 - 1,000	1	.96
1,001 - 2,500	14	13.5
2,501 - 5,000	30	28.8
5,001 - 10,000	38	36.5
10,001 - 20,000	15	14.4
20,000 and above	<u>6</u>	<u>5.8</u>
TOTAL	104	100

TABLE 17
PRESENT POSITIONS OTHER
THAN THE SUPERINTENDENCY

Retirement	9
Director of Student Teaching	1
Administrative Ass't. to U.S. Congressman	1
President of Community College	1
Associate Superintendent	1
Principal	1
Director of Training Center	1
Assistant Superintendent	1

positions held by the superintendents before the last superintendency. The superintendents had held many other positions in prior years in education (Table 18).

SUMMARY

The typical superintendent in North Carolina, as profiled from the information received from the 104 questionnaires, was a male between 46 and 55 years of age. He came from a small town, holds a masters degree, and was employed as a high school teacher, a union (1 - 12) school principal, and an assistant superintendent before assuming his superintendency. Having entered teaching when he was between 21 and 24 and having become an administrator when he was between 21 and 35, he now serves a medium-size school system (5,001 - 10,000 students).

The percentages used in this chapter may not always total 100 percent as a result of the round-off factor in calculation.

TABLE 18
POSITIONS HELD PRIOR TO THE
LAST SUPERINTENDENCY

Position	Number	Percent
Principalship	44	42
Assoc. Superintendent	8	8
Ass't. Superintendent	33	32
College Teaching	5	5
State Department	2	2
Coaching	1	1
Supervision	3	3
Other Superintendency	7	7
Educational Foundation	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	104	100

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is a presentation of the analysis of data collected from superintendents and chairmen of boards of education. The data from superintendents (variable data) are presented from the statistical programs of factor analysis and analysis of variance. Rankings, frequency counts, percentages, and significance levels were obtained by using an SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 1970) program available at Appalachian State University Computer Center. The data from the chairmen of boards of education (competency data) were processed through a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 6.01.

Analysis of the results of the statistical programs are presented with tables for comparisons and illustrations.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

To determine the variance components of the total common factor variance, BMD 08M General Factor Analysis (Dixon, 1973) was applied. This program performed a

principle component solution and an orthogonal rotation of the factor matrix, i.e., the items were arranged in a rectangular array (matrix) and the axes rotated. Communalities were estimated from the squared multiple correlation coefficients constituting the diagonal elements. Communality was defined as the sum of the squares of the factor loading and was the variable's common factor variance.

The factor analysis included the items which made up the variable data questionnaire. The limits of the eigenvalues determined by the BMD 08M (Dixon, 1973) program were specified to be greater than 1.00. The number of rotations to determine the items with the highest correlation and the number of factors levels were to be not less than one and not more than twenty-one (the number of variable data items). The analysis produced the best fit on the matrix with three factors rotated on four iteration cycles. The rotated factors were then amenable to interpretation.

Inspection of the items used in this study suggested that the first factor was a board interference factor. Five items had high loadings. These items were: Item 1, "Board of Education performing administrative duties normally assigned to the superintendent"; Item 2, "Board of Education failing to work together as a unit";

Item 5, "Conflict of personality of superintendent and board"; Item 6, "Involvement in partisan politics by the board of education"; and Item 10, "Poor support from local governing board on budget and other school support."

Inspection of the items with high loading on the second factor suggested that this was a financial and support factor. The items with high loading in this factor were: Item 3, "Term of contract too short: two or less years"; Item 4, "Size of school system small: moved for advancement"; Item 7, "Higher salary elsewhere"; Item 12, "Poor staff relations in the central office"; Item 15, "Lack of fringe benefits"; Item 16, "Intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials"; and Item 21, "Lower cost of living in new locale."

The rotated factor matrix produced a third factor labeled as a pressure factor. The highest loading for items within this factor were for: Item 8, "Militant teacher organizations demanding power and decision making"; Item 9, "Racial disturbances"; Item 11, "Interference from pressure groups - choice of books, teacher selection, transportation, etc."; Item 13, "Frequent board turnovers"; Item 14, "Retirement: age or pressure"; and Item 22, "Other pressures."

Presented in Table 19 are the item factor loadings within each factor and the communality produced from

TABLE 19
ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

Variables	Factor Loadings			Communality
	Factor 1 (Board Inter- ference)	Factor 2 (Finances) (Non-Support)	Factor 3 (Pressures)	
1	0.81070	0.19830	0.02035	0.69698
2	0.82075	0.18713	0.05279	0.71144
3	0.27462	0.39230	0.15373	0.25294
4	0.03440	0.85372	0.01220	0.73016
5	0.76948	0.26219	0.32339	0.76543
6	0.63990	0.15506	0.39160	0.58686
7	0.08403	0.83082	-0.10921	0.70925
8	0.48379	0.37780	0.47602	0.60339
9	0.34258	0.32830	0.68951	0.70057
10	0.57167	0.38462	0.41166	0.64420
11	0.54632	0.24500	0.56160	0.67388
12	0.41517	0.59723	0.32124	0.63225
13	0.31492	0.43231	0.45381	0.49201
14	-0.06743	0.00187	0.68137	0.46881
15	0.31618	0.71247	0.40483	0.77147
16	0.43304	0.58924	0.21874	0.58257
17	0.79294	0.28701	0.14048	0.73086
18	0.53057	0.46648	0.18394	0.53295
19	0.16506	0.57716	0.09651	0.36967
20	0.26065	0.49091	0.24795	0.37041
21	0.25617	0.81076	0.18547	0.75734
22	-0.28300	0.00029	-0.33957	0.19539

the factor analysis. Also from the factor analysis program is a presentation of the correlation coefficient of the variable data. The correlation coefficients for the seven items of the first factor ranged from .01 (Item 1) to .79 (Item 5). The range for the nine items for the second factor was .01 (Item 2) to .85 (Item 4), while the six items for the third factor had coefficients ranging from .16 (Item 13) to .70 (Item 8). Table 20 presents the correlation coefficient by item.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: FACTORS AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Upon completion of the factor analysis program, the three factors identified were presented in an analysis of variance program (Fortran IV Program SPSS, Statistical Package). This statistical operation provided analysis of variance among each of the eight areas of demographic data and the three identified factors of board interference, finances, and pressures. These are illustrated in Table 21.

One-way analysis of variance indicated a significant difference for two areas on factor one. Age and length of time in current position produced the difference at the .05 confidence level. A comparison suggested that there was a difference in the responses for those who were over sixty-five as compared to those of lesser age groups.

TABLE 20
CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1		.69	.30	.20	.73	.54	.23	.49	.39	.51	.44	.51	.26	.01	.42	.40	.63	.60	.32	.28	.35	-.26
2	.69		.37	.16	.62	.56	.16	.52	.41	.59	.55	.42	.47	-.13	.40	.57	.65	.45	.28	.32	.37	-.23
3	.30	.37		.37	.35	.27	.28	.31	.36	.46	.36	.46	.43	-.01	.40	.42	.25	.22	.20	.44	.40	-.09
4	.20	.16	.37		.32	.26	.85	.33	.36	.38	.30	.49	.35	-.01	.56	.52	.20	.40	.38	.32	.63	.01
5	.73	.62	.35	.32		.72	.29	.59	.62	.60	.63	.58	.41	.24	.56	.46	.79	.60	.27	.45	.46	-.28
6	.54	.56	.27	.27	.72		.20	.36	.49	.70	.66	.42	.46	.28	.39	.51	.55	.36	.16	.33	.41	-.24
7	.23	.16	.28	.55	.29	.20		.30	.22	.37	.29	.53	.23	-.03	.55	.48	.31	.40	.39	.29	.56	.05
8	.49	.52	.33	.33	.59	.36	.30		.70	.58	.70	.67	.54	.25	.63	.44	.62	.56	.33	.35	.49	-.24
9	.39	.41	.31	.36	.62	.49	.22	.70		.54	.58	.58	.52	.46	.63	.47	.41	.55	.37	.29	.43	-.30
10	.51	.59	.36	.38	.60	.70	.37	.58	.54		.69	.55	.56	.26	.53	.59	.60	.50	.43	.44	.50	-.29
11	.44	.55	.46	.30	.62	.66	.28	.62	.58	.69		.52	.61	.29	.56	.57	.53	.40	.12	.39	.32	-.35
12	.51	.42	.36	.49	.58	.42	.53	.67	.58	.55	.52		.42	.25	.66	.63	.57	.64	.47	.42	.63	-.24
13	.26	.47	.43	.35	.41	.46	.23	.54	.52	.57	.61	.42		.16	.63	.63	.37	.35	.36	.45	.50	-.14
14	.01	-.13	-.01	-.01	.24	.28	.03	.25	.46	.26	.29	.25	.16		.25	.01	.09	.11	.13	.15	.14	-.24
15	.42	.40	.40	.56	.56	.39	.55	.63	.63	.53	.56	.66	.63	.25		.61	.58	.61	.53	.59	.77	-.26
16	.40	.57	.42	.52	.46	.51	.48	.44	.47	.59	.57	.63	.63	.01	.61		.44	.47	.35	.45	.62	-.28
17	.68	.65	.25	.20	.79	.55	.31	.62	.41	.60	.53	.57	.38	.10	.58	.44		.65	.34	.41	.50	-.26
18	.60	.45	.22	.40	.60	.36	.39	.56	.55	.50	.40	.64	.35	.11	.61	.47	.65		.43	.32	.58	-.34
19	.32	.28	.20	.38	.27	.16	.39	.33	.34	.43	.12	.47	.36	.31	.53	.35	.34	.43		.36	.61	-.03
20	.28	.32	.44	.32	.45	.33	.29	.35	.29	.44	.40	.42	.45	.15	.58	.45	.41	.32	.36		.65	-.16
21	.35	.37	.40	.63	.46	.41	.56	.49	.43	.50	.31	.63	.50	.14	.77	.62	.50	.58	.61	.65		-.19
22	-.26	-.23	-.09	.01	-.28	.24	.05	-.24	-.03	-.29	-.35	-.24	-.15	-.24	-.26	-.28	-.26	-.34	-.03	-.16	-.19	

TABLE 21
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN
IDENTIFIED FACTORS AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Item	Response Groups	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	F Ratio
<u>Factor 1</u>					
Age	2 (36 - 45)	6	28.6667	12.8478	5.136*
	3 (46 - 55)	25	36.0400	7.8977	
	4 (56 - 65)	12	22.7500	15.2621	
	5 (Over 65)	3	12.6667	5.5076	
 <u>Factor 2</u>					
Age	2 (36 - 45)	6	31.0000	14.7377	1.034
	3 (46 - 55)	25	27.4000	11.5733	
	4 (56 - 65)	12	21.5833	14.4251	
	5 (Over 65)	3	17.6667	10.2632	
 <u>Factor 3</u>					
Age	2 (36 - 45)	6	18.1667	7.6790	1.896
	3 (46 - 55)	25	24.8000	7.1122	
	4 (56 - 65)	12	19.5000	11.0823	
	5 (Over 65)	3	19.0000	6.0828	

*Significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

TABLE 21 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	F Ratio
<u>Factor 1</u>					
Grew up in	1 Small town (10,000 or less)	17	29.0000	12.7720	.231
	2 City (10,001 - 50,000)	6	29.0000	8.1486	
	3 City (50,001 or more)	7	33.7143	11.8563	
	4 Rural	8	31.2500	17.0859	
	5 Farm	9	28.2222	13.5072	
 <u>Factor 2</u>					
Grew up in	1 Small town (10,000 or less)	17	26.1176	11.1180	.584
	2 City (10,001 - 50,000)	6	22.3333	5.4283	
	3 City (50,001 or more)	7	28.5714	13.8306	
	4 Rural	8	29.1250	17.5779	
	5 Farm	9	21.3333	14.3178	
 <u>Factor 3</u>					
Grew up in	1 Small town (10,000 or less)	17	23.4706	8.9451	.251
	2 City (10,001 - 50,000)	6	20.6667	3.6148	
	3 City (50,001 or more)	7	21.1429	9.7370	
	4 Rural	8	22.1250	12.0171	
	5 Farm	9	20.2222	7.5627	

TABLE 21 (continued)

Item	Response Groups	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
<u>Factor 1</u>						
Current	1 (1-3 yrs.)	14	30.7857	9.7915	3	3.319*
Position	2 (4-6 yrs.)	5	29.4000	15.4693	43	
	3 (7-10 yrs.)	14	36.6429	7.5101		
	4 (11 or more yrs.)	14	22.5714	15.4706		
<u>Factor 2</u>						
Current	1 (1-3 yrs.)	14	23.9286	12.0797	3	2.271
Position	2 (4-6 yrs.)	5	31.0000	13.8924	43	
	3 (7-10 yrs.)	14	30.9286	11.3914		
	4 (11 or more yrs.)	14	20.0000	12.6855		
<u>Factor 3</u>						
Current	1 (1-3 yrs.)	14	20.0000	7.5955	3	2.242
Position	2 (4-6 yrs.)	5	22.2000	11.8617	43	
	3 (7-10 yrs.)	14	26.5714	6.8468		
	4 (11 or more yrs.)	14	19.0714	9.0848		

*Significant difference at the .05 confidence level.

TABLE 21 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
<u>Factor 1</u> Superintendent	1 - 2 yrs.	41	31.844	13.190		
	3 - 4 yrs.	3	32.667	18.824	2	0.818
	5 or more yrs.	2	29.346	11.622	44	
<u>Factor 2</u> Superintendent	1 - 2 yrs.	41	21.973	8.898		
	3 - 4 yrs.	3	22.200	11.862	2	0.198
	5 or more yrs.	2	17.666	10.262	44	
<u>Factor 3</u> Superintendent	1 - 2 yrs.	41	36.040	12.847		
	3 - 4 yrs.	3	31.000	14.737	2	0.902
	5 or more yrs.	2	28.214	11.281	44	

TABLE 21 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Factor 1						
Degree	1 No	0	--	--	5	0.391
	2 Assoc.	0	--	--	41	
	3 BS	1	12.0000	--		
	4 MA	23	30.3043	13.2817		
	5 6 yr.	13	29.7692	12.9496		
	6 Dr.	10	31.1000	11.6281		
 Factor 2						
Degree	1 No	0	--	--	5	0.676
	2 Assoc.	0	--	--	41	
	3 BS	1	10.0000	--		
	4 MA	23	23.3043	14.0339		
	5 6 yr.	13	28.8461	11.3640		
	6 Dr.	10	28.2000	10.6333		
 Factor 3						
Degree	1 No	0	--	--	5	0.782
	2 Assoc.	0	--	--	41	
	3 BS	1	13.0000	--		
	4 MA	23	22.7391	8.2639		
	5 6 yr.	13	24.0769	9.3938		
	6 Dr.	10	18.1000	8.1711		

TABLE 21 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Factor 1						
Teacher Age	1 (21 - 25)	39	29.5897	12.9508	3	0.053
	2 (26 - 30)	8	31.6250	12.2350	43	
	3 (31 - 35)	0	--	--		
	4 (Over 35)	0	--	--		
 Factor 2						
Teacher Age	1 (21 - 25)	39	25.8718	12.5597	3	0.034
	2 (26 - 30)	8	24.2500	14.4296		
	3 (31 - 35)	0	--	--		
	4 (Over 35)	0	--	--		
 Factor 3						
Teacher Age	1 (21 - 25)	39	21.9743	8.8897	3	0.003
	2 (26 - 30)	8	21.6250	8.1053	43	
	3 (31 - 35)	0	--	--		
	4 (Over 35)	0	--	--		

TABLE 21 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
<u>Factor 1</u>						
Adminis- tration Age	1 (21 - 35)	6	36.0000	9.4657	2	0.681
	2 (36 - 45)	36	29.8333	12.1902	42	
	3 (About 45)	3	32.6667	18.8237		
<u>Factor 2</u>						
Adminis- tration Age	1 (21 - 35)	6	29.6667	9.1579	2	0.481
	2 (36 - 45)	36	25.3889	13.4191	42	
	3 (About 45)	3	30.6667	5.0333		
<u>Factor 3</u>						
Adminis- tration Age	1 (21 - 35)	6	25.0000	10.5830	2	0.656
	2 (36 - 45)	36	22.2500	8.2128	42	
	3 (About 45)	3	18.0000	11.3578		

∞
∞

TABLE 21 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
<u>Factor 1</u> Enroll- ment	1	1	41.0000	--	5	0.204
	2	8	29.6250	12.8945	41	
	3	10	30.2000	13.6203		
	4	18	30.5555	12.3823		
	5	10	27.7000	14.2521		
	6	0	--	--		
<u>Factor 2</u> Enroll- ment	1	1	29.0000	--	5	0.358
	2	8	25.2500	13.8332	41	
	3	10	23.6000	11.3157		
	4	18	28.5000	13.1831		
	5	10	22.3000	13.7845		
	6	0	--	--		
<u>Factor 3</u> Enroll- ment	1	1	26.0000	--	5	
	2	8	20.7500	10.4437	41	
	3	10	23.8000	8.3640		
	4	18	22.3889	7.4923		
	5	10	19.7000	10.5415		
	6	0	--	--		

Length of time in the current position also indicated a difference in responses for those who have remained in the current position for eleven or more years as compared to those with ten or less years in their position.

On the six remaining demographic data areas, no significant differences were indicated on Factor 1. These are illustrated in Table 21.

From the examination of the one-way analysis of variance between the eight demographic data items and Factors 2 and 3, there were no significant differences in the responses as to these factors.

The analysis of variable data revealed that the superintendents who are presently serving rated the variables dealing with relationships with boards of education and pressure groups as being most important in consideration of leaving a superintendency. This category was followed by items related to finances and pressures.

The analyses of data from the study group which was made up of superintendents who had left their positions on their own volition illustrated another pattern. This group viewed variables related to finances as most important in causing turnover in superintendencies followed by pressures and board related variables. The variable of retirement was rated highest among these respondents with all other variables rated from low in importance to low

moderate in importance.

Study group three, those who were forced to leave their positions, rated the variable in somewhat the same order as did those now in the superintendency. The ranking of variables were heavy on board related items, finance items, and pressure. This group gave more importance to variables than did the non-forced groups but far less importance to variables than did those of the in-service superintendents.

ANALYSIS OF VARIABLE DATA: ITEM BY ITEM

Through the item by item analysis the non-turnover study group was referred to as group 1, the turnover on own volition group as group 2, and the forced turnover as group 3.

The twenty-two items of the variable data were subjected to a Fortran program with the three study groups. The analysis of these data were item by item. This program produced a frequency count, percentage by item scale. The results of this program are illustrated in Table 22.

The variable data were further analyzed through a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSH - Version 6.01). This package provided one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffé Multiple Range Test.

Item 1, board performing administrative duties, produced a significant difference when the three means

TABLE 22
VARIABLE DATA

Variable	Group One - Non-Turnover						
	Extremely Low						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely High 7
1	0	0	0	1	6	3	14
2	0	0	1	1	10	9	3
3	7	3	2	7	3	0	2
4	7	3	1	8	2	1	2
5	0	0	0	5	3	9	7
6	1	1	1	8	3	2	8
7	4	3	1	8	4	2	2
8	1	3	4	6	4	4	2
9	1	4	4	5	3	4	3
10	1	3	1	4	3	6	6
11	2	1	3	4	3	7	4
12	3	6	4	3	6	2	0
13	5	5	1	5	6	2	0

TABLE 22 (continued)

Variable	Group One - Non-Turnover						
	Extremely Low						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely High 7
14	2	0	3	9	4	4	2
15	3	4	4	6	3	3	1
16	3	3	2	6	2	6	2
17	1	1	0	3	2	5	12
18	3	2	0	10	3	2	4
19	6	5	3	5	4	0	1
20	4	4	3	6	3	1	3
21	6	6	2	6	2	2	0
22	1	0	0	0	0	2	4
TOTAL	60	57	40	116	79	74	78
PERCENTAGE	12	12	8	23	16	15	16

TABLE 22 (continued)

Variable	Group Two - Own Will Turnover						
	Extremely Low			Extremely High			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	7	2	1	0	1	0	1
2	4	3	3	0	0	1	1
3	7	2	1	1	0	0	1
4	7	0	1	2	0	1	1
5	8	2	1	0	0	1	0
6	6	2	1	1	0	2	0
7	6	1	0	3	0	1	1
8	6	1	3	0	2	0	0
9	5	3	1	2	1	0	0
10	6	2	1	0	0	2	1
11	5	4	0	2	0	1	0
12	9	1	0	1	0	1	0
13	5	3	0	3	1	0	0

TABLE 22 (continued)

Variable	Group Two - Own Will Turnover						
	Extremely Low						Extremely High
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	3	1	1	0	0	1	6
15	7	2	1	1	1	0	0
16	6	2	2	0	0	1	1
17	6	4	0	1	0	1	0
18	8	2	1	0	1	0	0
19	8	1	2	0	0	0	1
20	7	0	4	0	1	0	0
21	7	0	5	0	0	0	0
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
TOTAL	133	38	29	17	8	13	14
PERCENTAGE	53	15	12	7	3	5	6

TABLE 22 (continued)

Variable	Group Three - Forced Turnover						
	Extremely Low			Extremely High			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	0	0	1	1	0	3	6
2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4
3	3	1	2	3	0	1	1
4	7	1	0	1	1	1	0
5	3	1	1	1	1	1	3
6	3	1	0	0	2	2	3
7	6	1	1	2	0	0	1
8	2	4	2	3	0	0	0
9	6	0	1	3	0	1	0
10	3	1	1	3	1	1	1
11	3	3	2	0	1	1	1
12	7	0	0	2	1	1	0
13	6	0	1	1	0	1	2

TABLE 22 (continued)

Variable	Group Three - Forced Turnover						
	Extremely Low			Extremely High			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	7	3	0	0	0	0	1
15	7	1	1	1	1	0	0
16	4	1	0	0	2	3	1
17	2	2	1	2	1	1	2
18	7	1	0	0	2	1	0
19	7	1	1	0	0	1	1
20	7	1	1	1	0	1	0
21	8	1	1	0	0	1	0
22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
TOTAL	98	24	17	26	14	25	27
PERCENTAGE	42	10	7	11	6	11	12

were compared. There was a difference between group 2, the non-forced turnover group and the non-turnover study group. No significant differences were found between groups one and three.

The board of education not working in unity, Item 2, produced the same results as Item 1. The mean score were different but the significant differences were among the same groups.

Items 3 and 4, length of contract and size of administrative unit, produced no significant differences among the three study groups.

Conflict of personality of superintendent and board, Item 5, indicated differences among all study groups. A significant difference was indicated between group 1 and group 2, group 1 and 3, and between group 2 and group 3.

Item 6, the board involved in partisan politics, produced a significant difference between group 2 and the other groups. No significant difference was indicated between groups 1 and 3.

Higher salary in other units did not produce any significant differences within the three study groups. The mean scores were relatively even with each study group on this variable item.

Analyses of Items 8 and 9, militant teacher or-

ganizations and racial disturbances, produced significant differences between group 2 and 1 and group 1 and 3 but no significant difference between group 2 and 3 when subjected to the Scheffé multiple comparison test.

Variable 10, poor support from local governing board on finances, indicated differences between group 1 and 2 only. No significant differences were found between the turnover groups or between the non-turnover group and the forced-turnover group. The difference found was a small variance in the mean scores.

Four items, when compared, showed the same relationship among the study groups. These variable data areas were pressure groups, fringe benefits, living and social facilities, and family ties. Significant differences were found between group 1 and group 2 and group 1 and group 3. No difference was found between the two turnover groups on either of the four variable data areas.

Item 12, poor staff relationships, and Item 16, intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials, revealed slight significant differences when compared by the analysis of variance program and the multiple range test. There was a difference found between the non-turnover study group and the non-forced group on both of these items. No differences were found between the two turnover groups or between the non-turnover and the forced-

turnover groups.

No statistical significant differences were found on the analyses of the items dealing with board turnover, special locale, lower cost of living, and other general pressures. The mean scores for each of these items were similar and the F ratio indicated that no differences existed.

Item 14, retirement, exhibited significant differences between group 3 and group 1 and between group 3 and group 2. No difference was indicated between group 1 and group 2.

Lack of community confidence or poor public relations revealed interesting results. There were differences among each of the study groups. The mean scores ranged from 1.916 on the forced-turnover group to 5.792 on the non-turnover group.

The analyses of the 22 items are given in Table 23. This table illustrates the results of the analysis of variance of each item.

Table 24 presents the 22 variables in order of importance as rated by the superintendents of the three study groups.

TABLE 23
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE THREE STUDY GROUPS
AND VARIABLE DATA
SCHEFFE MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
1	1	24	6.2500	0.9891	2	38.64*
	2	12	2.0833	2.0207	44	
	3	11	6.0909	1.3751		
2	1	24	5.5000	0.9325	2	16.36*
	2	12	2.5833	2.0652	44	
	3	11	5.3636	1.8040		
3	1	24	3.1667	1.8805	2	1.76
	2	12	2.0000	1.9069	44	
	3	11	3.2727	2.0045		
4	1	24	3.2500	1.9393	2	1.25
	2	12	2.5000	2.2764	44	
	3	11	2.1818	1.8878		
5	1	24	5.7500	1.1132	2	25.87*
	2	12	1.6667	1.5570	44	
	3	11	4.0909	2.4271		

*Significance found at .10 level on Scheffe comparison of mean scores.

TABLE 23 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
6	1	24	5.0417	1.7565	2	6.89*
	2	12	2.3333	2.0151	44	
	3	11	4.2727	2.6867		
7	1	24	3.7917	1.8411	2	2.47
	2	12	2.6667	2.2697	44	
	3	11	2.3636	1.9633		
8	1	24	4.2083	1.6413	2	8.74*
	2	12	2.1667	1.6422	44	
	3	11	2.5455	1.1282		
9	1	24	4.2083	1.7932	2	7.16*
	2	12	2.1667	1.5275	44	
	3	11	2.4545	1.8091		
10	1	24	4.9583	1.8761	2	5.83*
	2	12	2.5833	2.3916	44	
	3	11	3.5455	1.9679		
11	1	24	4.7500	1.8474	2	8.61*
	2	12	2.1667	1.6967	44	
	3	11	2.9091	2.1659		

TABLE 23 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
12	1	24	3.3750	1.6101	2	4.27*
	2	12	1.6667	1.6697	44	
	3	11	2.3636	1.9633		
13	1	24	3.3333	1.7362	2	1.26
	2	12	2.2500	1.6026	44	
	3	11	3.0000	2.5690		
14	1	24	4.3750	1.5551	2	7.14*
	2	12	4.5833	2.9064	44	
	3	11	1.8182	1.7787		
15	1	24	3.6250	1.7147	2	7.10*
	2	12	1.8333	1.4668	44	
	3	11	1.9091	1.4460		
16	1	24	4.1250	1.9182	2	2.90*
	2	12	2.3333	2.1462	44	
	3	11	3.7273	2.4936		
17	1	24	5.7917	1.6934	2	18.88*
	2	12	1.9167	1.6214	44	
	3	11	3.8182	2.2279		

TABLE 23 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
18	1	24	4.2500	1.8708	2	10.41*
	2	12	1.5833	1.3114	44	
	3	11	2.3636	1.9633		
19	1	24	3.0000	1.6940	2	1.72
	2	12	1.8333	1.8505	44	
	3	11	2.2727	2.1950		
20	1	24	3.6250	1.9295	2	5.51*
	2	12	1.9167	1.4434	44	
	3	11	1.9091	1.7003		
21	1	24	2.9167	1.6396	2	3.57
	2	12	1.7500	1.1382	44	
	3	11	1.7273	1.5551		
22	1	24	1.7083	2.9411	2	1.48
	2	12	2.9167	3.6045	44	
	3	11	3.6364	3.5291		

TABLE 23 (continued)
RESULTS OF SCHEFFE MULTIPLE RANGE COMPARISON
OF MEAN SCORES ON VARIABLE DATA

Variable	Group 1	Significant Differences Found Between Group 2		Group 3
1	X	-----	X X -----	X
2	X	-----	X ----- X	X
3				
4				
5	X	-----	X	
	X	-----	----- X -----	X X
6	X	-----	X X -----	X
7				
8	X	-----	X	
9	X	-----	-----	X
10	X	-----	X	

TABLE 23 (continued)

Variable	Significant Differences Found Between		
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
11	X	----- X	
	X	-----	X
12	X	----- X	
13			
14	X	-----	X
		X -----	X
15	X	----- X	
	X	-----	X
16	X	----- X	
17	X	----- X	
	X	-----	X
		X -----	X
18	X	----- X	
	X	-----	X
19			
20	X	-----	X
	X	----- X	

TABLE 23 (continued)

Variable	Group 1	Significant Differences Found Between Group 2	Group 3
21			
22			

TABLE 24
RANK IN IMPORTANCE OF VARIABLE DATA

-
-
1. Board of Education performing administrative duties normally assigned to the superintendent.
 2. Board of Education failing to work together as a unit.
 3. Conflict of personality of superintendent and board.
 4. Lack of community confidence and support of superintendent or poor public relations.
 5. Involvement in partisan politics by the Board of Education.
 6. Poor support from local governing board on budget and other school support.
 7. Interference from pressure groups - choice of books, teacher selection, transportation, etc.
 8. Retirement: age or pressure.
 9. Intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials.
 10. Living and social facilities.
 11. Militant teacher organization demanding power and decision making.
 12. Racial disturbances.
 13. Frequent board turnover.
 14. Higher salary elsewhere
 15. Poor staff relations in central office.
 16. Size of school system small: moved for advancement.

TABLE 24 (continued)

- 17. Family ties.
 - 18. Lack of fringe benefits.
 - 19. Term of contract too short: two or less years.
 - 20. Lower cost of living in new locale.
 - 21. Special locale for seasonal activities in new position.
-

ANALYSIS OF SATISFACTION SCALES AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

A one-way analysis of variance was run between the satisfaction scale and the eight demographic areas. These areas are: age, community background, years current position, number of superintendencies, highest degree held, age of entry into teaching, age of first administrative position, and enrollment in administrative unit of employment for those of the non-turnover unit. Because of the varied counts within each of these demographic areas the program did not afford the results that could be analyzed with a sufficient degree of meaning. Therefore, the researcher used the means scores to analyze and compare the responses.

Within the five age groups there were no significant statistical differences found, but there were differences found between the 36-45 age group and the other age levels. This was illustrated through the means score.

The backgrounds from which the superintendents grew up were divided into five areas. There were no significant differences revealed at the .05 confidence level among the total study group. Comparisons did indicate a difference between those from small cities (10,001 - 50,000) and those from rural areas as compared to the remaining three divisions. The mean scores varied from

each other and from the total mean score.

The relationship between number of years in the current position and the satisfaction scale produced no noticeable differences. The mean scores did not vary to any considerable degree from the total mean score or from each other.

The number of superintendencies held in the state brought the expected division. This demographic area was divided into only two divisions. These being those who have held only one or two positions (22) and those who have held three or four positions (2). There was a difference shown between these two groups.

The relationship between the degrees held and the satisfaction with the present position produced a difference of little significance. The greatest difference observed was in the confidence interval for the means. The range was 3.87 to 6.46 for those with a Masters Degree and $-.07$ to 11.40 for those with the Doctorate.

The age of entry into teaching indicated no significant difference in response to the satisfaction scale. In contrast to the entry age into teaching, those who intend an administrative position at an early age did show less satisfaction with the present position than those who took administrative positions at a later age.

The mean scores for the enrollment satisfaction

relationship were ranged from 5.00 to 6.00 with the total mean score of 5.37. The variation was illustrated to some degree between those in the 500 - 1,000 enrollment category and the 2500 - 5000 enrollment group.

The analysis of the data from the satisfaction scale and the eight demographic data areas are presented in Table 25.

ANALYSIS OF COMPETENCY DATA

A Fortran Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to analyze the competency data received from the chairmen of boards of education. This program provided frequency counts and rankings for the competency and importance scale (Table 26).

Those data were categorized into three groups. The groups were from board chairmen of non-turnover units, group 1; turnover on own volition, group 2; and forced turnover, group 3. After being categorized into the study groups and the frequency counts, percentages, and rankings obtained from the above program, another program was used to compare the data.

A Statistical package for the Social Sciences, Version 6.01, was used to determine the statistical significant differences in the data from board chairmen dealing with level of competency and level of importance.

TABLE 25
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN
SATISFACTION SCALE AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
GROUP 1 - IN-SERVICE

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean $\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation	F Ratio
Age	1 (25 - 35)	0			
	2 (36 - 45)	3	6.667	0.577	.495
	3 (46 - 55)	17	5.352	1.998	
	4 (56 - 65)	4	4.500	2.082	
	5 (Over 65)	0	0	0	
Size of Community	1 town (10,000 or less)	11	5.273	1.902	.540
	2 city (10,000 - 50,000)	2	7.000	0.000	
	3 city (50,000 or more)	2	5.500	2.121	
	4 rural	4	4.500	2.646	
	5 farm area	5	5.600	1.949	
Current Position	1 5 - 6 years	3	6.000	1.732	.127
	2 7 - 9 years	2	5.500	2.121	
	3 10 - 12 years	12	5.333	2.309	
	4 13 or more	7	5.143	1.574	
Superintendents	1 (1 - 2)	22	5.636	1.787	2.801
	2 (3 - 4)	2	2.500	0.707	
	3 (same)	0	0.000	--	

TABLE 25 (continued)

Item	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean $\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation	F Ratio
Degree	1 None	0	0.000	--	.046
	2 Associate	0	0.000	--	
	3 Bachelors	0	0.000	--	
	4 Masters	12	5.167	2.038	
	5 Specialist	9	5.556	1.878	
	6 Doctorate	3	5.667	2.309	
Teaching Age	1 (21 - 25)	19	5.316	1.974	.025
	2 (26 - 30)	5	5.600	1.949	
	3 (31 - 35)	0	0.000	--	
	4 (Over 35)	0	0.000	--	
Adminis- tration Age	1 (21 - 35)	2	3.500	0.707	1.707*
	2 (36 - 45)	20	5.400	1.957	
	3 (46 and above)	2	7.000	0.000	
Enroll- ment	1 (500 - 1,000)	1	6.000	--	.100
	2 (1,001 - 2,500)	5	5.800	1.643	
	3 (2,501 - 5,000)	6	5.000	1.897	
	4 (5,001 - 10,000)	7	5.429	2.439	
	5 (10,001 - 20,000)	5	5.200	2.168	
	6 (above 20,000)	0	0.000	--	

*Significance shown

TABLE 26

COMPETENCY DATA
BOARD MEMBERS ONLY

		Group One - Non-Turnover						
Item		Extremely Low			Extremely High			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Competency	0	0	0	2	6	7	9
	Importance	0	0	0	0	2	5	17
2	Competency	1	1	3	3	5	5	6
	Importance	0	0	0	1	3	11	9
3	Competency	0	0	0	4	6	6	8
	Importance	0	0	0	0	8	7	9
4	Competency	0	0	0	2	9	7	6
	Importance	0	0	2	12	8	1	1
5	Competency	0	1	2	1	3	9	8
	Importance	0	0	0	1	2	7	14
6	Competency	1	0	1	2	5	8	7
	Importance	0	0	0	0	6	10	8
7	Competency	0	1	4	2	6	6	5
	Importance	0	0	0	2	8	9	5
8	Competency	0	0	1	1	4	8	10
	Importance	0	0	0	0	1	10	13

TABLE 26 (continued)

		Group One - Non-Turnover						
Item		Extremely Low			Extremely High			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	2 0	2 2	4 6	3 5	13 11
10	Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	1 0	3 2	8 6	5 8	7 8
11	Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	1 0	1 2	5 6	6 6	11 10
12	Competency Importance	0 0	1 0	0 0	3 3	8 11	4 7	8 3
13	Competency Importance	1 0	0 0	0 0	2 2	8 12	8 9	5 1
14	Competency Importance	0 0	1 0	2 0	2 0	3 3	11 6	5 15
15	Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	1 0	2 2	7 11	10 9	4 2
TOTAL Competency		3	5	18	32	87	103	112
TOTAL Importance		0	0	2	29	93	110	126
%	Competency	1	1	5	9	24	29	31
%	Importance	0	0	.6	8	25	31	35

TABLE 26 (continued)

Group Two - Turnover - Own Will							
Item	Extremely Low					Extremely High	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	1 0	0 1	5 2	3 3	2 5
2 Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	1 0	3 0	5 3	1 6	1 2
3 Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	2 0	2 1	2 5	4 5	1 0
4 Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	1 0	2 7	5 3	1 0	2 1
5 Competency Importance	0 0	1 0	0 0	1 0	4 3	2 4	3 4
6 Competency Importance	1 0	0 0	0 0	3 0	2 1	3 3	2 7
7 Competency Importance	0 0	1 0	1 0	2 0	5 6	0 4	2 1
8 Competency Importance	0 0	0 0	2 0	1 1	2 2	3 5	3 3

TABLE 26 (continued)

Group Two - Turnover - Own Will							
Item	Extremely Low				Extremely High		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9 Competency	0	1	1	1	2	2	4
Importance	0	0	0	4	4	3	1
10 Competency	0	1	2	1	2	2	3
Importance	0	0	0	3	5	2	1
11 Competency	0	0	1	1	3	2	4
Importance	0	0	0	4	3	3	1
12 Competency	0	0	1	3	5	1	1
Importance	0	0	0	5	4	1	1
13 Competency	0	2	0	3	3	3	0
Importance	0	0	0	7	2	2	0
14 Competency	0	1	2	2	2	4	0
Importance	0	0	0	1	0	3	7
15 Competency	0	0	2	3	2	2	2
Importance	1	0	0	3	5	2	0
TOTAL Competency	1	7	17	28	49	33	30
TOTAL Importance	1	0	0	37	48	45	34
% Competency	1	4	10	17	30	20	18
% Importance	.6	0	0	22	29	27	21

TABLE 26 (continued)

Group Three - Turnover - Forced							
Item	Extremely Low					Extremely High	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Competency Importance	1 0	3 0	0 0	4 0	1 1	1 7	1 3
2 Competency Importance	2 0	6 0	2 0	0 0	1 5	0 4	0 2
3 Competency Importance	0 0	2 0	3 0	2 2	4 7	0 2	0 0
4 Competency Importance	0 0	1 0	2 0	1 5	5 4	2 2	0 0
5 Competency Importance	1 0	2 0	4 0	0 0	1 1	2 3	1 7
6 Competency Importance	2 0	2 0	3 0	3 0	0 1	1 3	0 7
7 Competency Importance	2 0	3 0	2 0	2 0	1 2	1 7	0 2
8 Competency Importance	4 0	0 0	1 0	4 0	0 3	2 5	0 3

TABLE 26 (continued)

Group Three - Turnover - Forced							
Item	Extremely Low					Extremely High	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9 Competency Importance	2 0	1 0	3 0	2 0	1 4	2 5	0 2
10 Competency Importance	2 0	0 0	4 0	4 0	1 4	0 5	0 2
11 Competency Importance	3 0	0 0	1 0	3 0	2 4	2 5	0 2
12 Competency Importance	0 0	3 0	3 0	2 0	3 9	0 2	0 0
13 Competency Importance	0 0	1 0	5 0	2 0	3 10	0 1	0 0
14 Competency Importance	0 0	5 0	3 0	3 0	0 1	0 3	0 7
15 Competency Importance	0 0	1 0	7 0	3 1	0 9	0 1	0 0
TOTAL Competency	19	30	43	35	23	13	2
TOTAL Importance	0	0	0	8	65	55	37
% Competency	12	18	26	21	14	8	1
% Importance	0	0	0	5	39	33	23

placed on each competency area as perceived by the board chairmen. One-way analysis of variance was run on these data and a Scheffe test of comparison was made on the mean score of the three study groups. These operations were made item by item and on the total scores by groups. Upon completion of the analysis of variance program and the Scheffé Multiple Range Test, the results fall into five patterns.

Item 1, instructional leadership, Item 2, school-community relationship, Item 6, decision making, Item 8, budgeting, and Item 14, planning, produced significant differences and when subjected to comparison revealed the following results. No differences were found between group 1 and group 2 on the five items cited above. Significant differences were revealed between group 3 and group 2 and between group 1 and group 3. The analysis of those and the remaining competency items are given in Table 27.

The competency data on personnel management produced differences among all of the groups. Each of the mean scores varied from each other and from the total mean score.

Analysis of data on Item 4 revealed no significant difference to these data. The mean scores were fairly equal for all groups.

Five other competency items produced significant

TABLE 27
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE THREE STUDY GROUPS
AND COMPETENCY DATA AND SCHEFFE MULTIPLE
COMPARISON TEST

Item Competency	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
1	1	24	39.542	7.9180	2	10.48*
	2	11	33.818	10.860	43	
	3	11	23.273	12.175		
2	1	24	30.750	10.755	2	11.97*
	2	11	28.818	9.009	43	
	3	11	13.546	8.480		
3	1	24	34.708	8.089	2	16.58*
	2	11	27.273	9.188	43	
	3	11	18.364	5.662		
4	1	24	25.583	7.058	2	0.78
	2	11	23.727	10.169	43	
	3	11	21.818	9.293		
5	1	24	36.375	9.735	2	4.77*
	2	11	33.091	11.743	43	
	3	11	24.182	12.262		

*Significant differences found between mean score on the Scheffe Test.

TABLE 27 (continued)

Item Competency	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
6	1	24	34.125	10.465	2	7.10*
	2	11	33.636	13.170	43	
	3	11	19.545	10.153		
7	1	24	29.042	9.434	2	5.08*
	2	11	26.818	11.089	43	
	3	11	17.727	9.339		
8	1	24	39.375	8.469	2	13.52*
	2	11	31.818	11.116	43	
	3	11	19.818	13.152		
9	1	24	36.292	11.312	2	8.01*
	2	11	26.818	10.916	43	
	3	11	20.545	11.596		
10	1	24	33.042	9.210	2	8.97*
	2	11	26.000	11.916	43	
	3	11	18.545	7.435		

TABLE 27 (continued)

Item Competency	Response Group	Number Observed	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
11	1	24	36.250	9.387	2	7.57*
	2	11	29.091	10.435	43	
	3	11	21.727	12.499		
12	1	24	30.208	8.973	2	8.10*
	2	11	23.636	9.489	43	
	3	11	17.909	6.640		
13	1	24	29.458	8.070	2	10.95*
	2	11	20.091	7.436	43	
	3	11	18.545	5.411		
14	1	24	35.583	9.491	2	12.31*
	2	11	30.091	11.484	43	
	3	11	18.545	6.593		
15	1	24	30.542	7.466	2	14.52*
	2	11	22.182	10.505	43	
	3	11	16.000	3.924		

TABLE 27 (continued)
RESULTS OF SCHEFFE MULTIPLE RANGE COMPARISON
OF MEANS SCORES OF COMPETENCY DATA

Variable	Significant Differences Found Between		
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
1		X -----	X
	X -----		X
2		X -----	X
	X -----		X
3	X -----	X	
	X -----		X
		X -----	X
4			
5	X -----		X
6	X -----		X
		X -----	X
7	X -----		X
8	X -----		X
		X -----	X

TABLE 27 (continued)

Variable	Significant Differences Found Between		
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
9	X	----- X	
	X	-----	X
10	X	-----	X
11	X	-----	X
12	X	-----	X
13	X	-----	X
	X	----- X	
14		X -----	X
	X	-----	X
15	X	----- X	
	X	-----	X

differences in the analysis of variance program. These items were plant operations, Item 5, interpersonal relationships, Item 7, reporting, Item 10, accounting, Item 11, and organizing, Item 12. When the Scheffe' analysis was applied each of these data items produced a significant difference between group 1 and group 3. No differences were found between group 2 and 3 or between group 1 and 2.

The final pattern that emerged involved three competency items. These three were Item 9, recording, Item 13, coordinating, and Item 15, appraising. The analysis of variance produced F ratios that were significant. Upon comparison of the mean scores, differences were revealed between group 1 and group 2 and group 1 and group 3. No difference was indicated between groups 2 and 3.

The combined scores of performance and importance value on the 15 competencies were subjected to one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe' test of comparisons. The analysis produced a significant difference at the .10 confidence level. The results are illustrated in Table 28. The difference was indicated between group 1, the non-turnover group and group 3, the forced-turnover. Some difference was shown between group 2, own-will turnover and the forced turnover group. No significant difference was indicated between the non-turnover group and the own-

TABLE 28

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: THREE STUDY GROUPS
AND TOTAL SCORES OF COMPETENCY AND IMPORTANCE VALUES
SCHEFFE TEST RESULTS

Group	Item Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
I	15	33.303	4.021	2	53.366
II	15	27.578	4.366	42	
III	15	19.162	2.726		
TOTAL	45	26.681	6.933		
TOTAL	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3
	X -----		X		
	X -----				X
			X -----		X

volition turnover study group.

After the statistical analyses were completed, the competency areas were rated in order of level of performance of the superintendents as perceived by the board chairmen and compared to the importance placed on each competency by the board chairman. These comparisons are illustrated in Table 29.

DISCUSSION

At the completion of the analyses of data used in this study, numerous correlation between this study and other research projects and literature were found.

Across the nation, literature indicated that organizational variables dealing with board policy, politics, enrollment size, pressure groups, and financial non-support played a major role in turnover in the superintendencies. This study substantiates these findings to national as well as in the locale of this study.

From this study, as in other literature, lack of competency in working areas of physical nature was found to be highly related to turnover in the superintendencies. Board chairmen view physical competencies, leadership, decision-making, and planning as major priorities in the qualifications of a superintendent.

Turnovers in superintendencies across the nation

TABLE 29
COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE AND IMPORTANCE
SCALES ON COMPETENCIES

<u>Performance Level Ranking</u>	<u>Competencies</u>	<u>Importance Ranking</u>
5	Instructional Leadership - ability to organize and implement a good educational program	3*
12	School-Community Relationships - ability to coordinate school- community activities for the betterment of the educational program	7*
8	Personnel Management - Staffing ability to employ and manage personnel to develop and carry out educational programs and school policies	10
10	Pupil Personnel Services - ability to provide services to the students in public interest and organize data on the school population	14
4	Plant Operations - ability to provide, operate, and maintain facilities for an ade- quate educational program. Ability to operate efficiently to maximize the use of facilities and financial resources	2*
7	Decision Making - ability to determine needs and set policies and plan for their ful- fillment and implementation	4*
5	Interpersonal Relationships - ability to relate to others, util- ize opinions of others, help sub- ordinates do their best, get poli- cies formulated cooperatively, and work for group consensus by a democratic process	11

<u>Performance Level Ranking</u>	<u>Competencies</u>	<u>Importance Ranking</u>
3	Business Management - Budgeting - ability to plan a budget for an adequate in- structional program within the bounds of the resources	5
1	Recording - ability to keep proper records and accounts of all financial transactions	6
6	Reporting - ability to report all transactions properly to the board	9
2	Accounting - ability to keep the budget in balance and eliminate discrepancies	8
9	Organizing - ability to formulate goals and objectives and guide all facets of the system in working for unified goals	12
15	Co-ordinating - ability to keep all facets of the school system organization working as a single unit	15
14	Planning - ability to conceptualize the program in operation and anticipate needs of the future with possible solutions for fulfilling the needs	1*
13	Appraising - ability to evaluate how well the organizational objectives have been met	13

*Areas of lower performance on the competency than expected by the rating of importance.

are concerns of many people. This study and other pieces of research cited as background for this study were designed to eliminate this problem by giving facts that can guide boards of education, educational institutions, and superintendents into providing education and understanding of the problems and their solutions.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

PURPOSE

The central problems of the study was to determine the differences in how superintendents perceived selected variables that are related to turnover, to ascertain how board chairmen perceived the level of competencies held by their superintendent, to investigate the importance level of the competencies as perceived by the board chairmen, to study the demographic data, and to determine satisfaction in relationship to the factor and demographic data gathered.

The vehicle used to gather information on organizational variables, demographic data, and competency data was a questionnaire developed by the researcher. The questionnaire consists of three parts. Part one contained two sections. Section A was a satisfaction scale which ranged from one (extremely low) to seven (extremely high) with two through six being intervening levels. Section B consisted of 12 demographic statements. Each demographic

area was subdivided into smaller categories for more meaning in analyzing.

Part II of the questionnaire consisted of 21 organizational variables from literature and research that were related to turnover in the superintendency and one open-ended statement for other variables deemed important by the respondents. The scale on this part of the questionnaire ranged from one (extremely low) to seven (extremely high) with the intervening levels.

Part III of the questionnaire was made up of two sections with 15 competency areas to be evaluated. Section A was used to determine the level of competency held by the superintendents on the 15 areas. Section B was a repeat of competency area, but an importance value level of the competencies was given by the chairmen of the boards of education. The scale of this part of the instrument was on a range from one to seven as was the variable data.

The instrument was administered to 112 superintendents and chairmen of boards of education in North Carolina. Accompanying each questionnaire were letters of explanation and support from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of North Carolina, the Executive Secretary of the North Carolina School Board's Association and the researcher's advisor and researcher. All distribution, follow-up, returns, were handled by the researcher.

METHODOLOGY

A total of 224 questionnaires were distributed; 112 to superintendents and 112 to board chairmen, 92 percent of the total were returned for the study. The instruments were separated into three groups: non-turnover, forced turnover, and turnover on own volition, screened for completeness of responses, coded on scan sheets for punching on computer cards and computer analysis.

To obtain the necessary information, computer programs were designed and written. After programs were ready, Statistical Packages for Social Sciences were employed to determine frequency counts, percentages, correlations, and analysis of variance. Also employed were the Biomedical Computer Program to determine the factors in the study and the Scheffe' Multiple Range Package to compare the difference of the mean scores.

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSES

General Factor Analysis, using BMD 08M (Dixon, 1973), was used to determine the variance components of the common factor variance. The inputs were the 22 organizational variable items. This analysis, in which the rotated factor matrix was used, produced three factors. After inspection of the results, the three factors were

deduced to be: board of education interference, non-support finances, and pressure.

Analysis of variance was used on the demographic data using the eight areas as dependent variables and the factor as independent variables. Significance difference was found using a one-way analysis of variance test on the questions related to age comparisons showed a significance difference between those over 65 and the other age levels. Analysis also produced a significant difference between those who have served 11 or more years and the other division of length of time.

Analysis of variance and the Scheffé Multiple Comparison Test were employed on the three study groups, non-turnover, forced turnover, and turnover on own volition. Significant differences were found on all variables except Items 7, 19, 20, 21, and 22.

The same procedures were employed in the competency data as the variable data. Only Item 4 did not produce some significance difference. Differences were found to exist between particular groups and did not cross each group except in items for which no group differed significantly from any other.

From the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences, rank in order of importance was achieved in the variable data and the competency data. These variables

ranked in order are given in Table 24. The competency importance rank order and performance level ranking are illustrated in Table 29.

CONCLUSIONS

The study of variables and competencies related to turnover in the superintendency of North Carolina school systems may help strengthen the relationship of those in the position of superintendents and their boards of education.

By including data from superintendents of personal and professional nature and data from board chairmen concerning the competencies of the superintendents, conclusions were drawn as to factors that contribute to the turnover in the superintendency. It must be emphasized that this study represented only a sample of the superintendents in North Carolina.

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Boards of education interfere to an excessive degree in administrative affairs normally assigned to superintendents.
2. Turnover occurs many times due to poor support and confidence in the superintendent.

3. Pressure groups tend to overly influence policy making.
4. Specific demographic backgrounds are not required in administration.
5. Superintendents in non-turnover units place higher importance on board related variables than turnover units.
6. Variables related to personal activities play the least role in turnover of superintendents.
7. Age is an important factor in job-satisfaction.
8. Entry into administration at middle age or older tends to bring dissatisfaction.
9. Ability to handle competencies of a physical nature rank high in priority of board members.
10. Personnel competencies rank low in priority as being important in the superintendency.
11. Emphasis needs to be placed on leadership, decision-making, and planning.
12. A general weakness is indicated in competency of superintendent as perceived by board chairmen.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Reflections upon and evaluation of the findings and conclusions of this study provided a basis for making the following recommendations:

1. Boards of education should work closer together to develop guidelines, policies, and procedures to eliminate the overlapping in performance of duties. Separation of duties should be established and followed.
2. The study should be replicated again at a later date to include more study units.
3. The turnover study group should be questioned again at periodic intervals, preferably on a yearly basis, to see if suggestions for improvements are being used.
4. All boards of education should keep on hand a written list of expected competencies for prospective candidates for the superintendency.
5. Prospective superintendents and boards of education should frankly discuss policy and expectation.
6. Educational institutions should provide more extensive training or retraining in fields of competency where weaknesses were indicated such as leadership, planning, decision-

making, plant operation, and school-community relationships.

7. Educational institutions need to be supported by state agencies in providing a closer working relationship between classroom activity and field studies.
8. Training sessions in policy making, school law, and duties of board members should be established as part of the requirement for membership on boards of education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Robert. "Interview With a New Superintendent," School Management, XVI (August, 1972), 18.
- American Association of School Administrators. The American School Superintendency. Washington: A.A.S.A., 1952.
- American Association of School Administrators. The American School Superintendent. Washington: A.A.S.A., 1970.
- American Association of School Administrators. Profile of the School Superintendent. Washington, D.C.: A.A.S.A., 1960.
- American Association of School Administrators. Role, Responsibility, Relationship of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff. Washington: A.A.S.A., 1963.
- American Association of School Administrators. The Thirtieth Yearbook. Washington: A.A.S.A., 1952.
- Appleby, Paul H. Policy and Administration. University of Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1949.
- Barr, H.M. "Should School Superintendents be Gypsies?" American School Board Journal, CXXII (January, 1951), 33-37.
- Bradshaw, Fred H. "Illinois Twelve-Grade Superintendent Mobility and Relationship to Selected Cost-Quality Indices." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation. Illinois State University, 1968.
- Brause, Dorsey W. "Identification of Major Factors Affecting the Demands of School Superintendents." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Ohio State University, 1963.
- Burbank, Natt B. The Superintendent of Schools. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968.

- Campbell, Clyde M. "The Administrator Treads a Perilous Path Between School Board and Professional Staff," The Nation's Schools, XLIX (March, 1952), 49-50.
- Campbell, Roald, E.M. Bridges, J.E. Corbally, R.O. Nystrand, and J.A. Ranseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Campbell, Roald, L.T. Cunningham, R.F. McPhee, and R.O. Nystrand. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.
- Carlisle, William. "Turnover and Demand in Public School Administration." Dissertation Abstracts, W-1953, 1960.
- Carlson, Richard O. School Superintendents: Career and Performances. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972.
- Carpenter, Charles C. "Relationships of School Board Members to Superintendents." Dissertation Abstracts. 25:3-1675, University of Southern California, 1964.
- Cohodes, Aaron. "How Should Board Review Superintendent Performance?" The Nations Schools, XCII (October, 1973), 14.
- Cohodes, Aaron. "Where School Boards Fail Their Administrators," The Nation's Schools, XCI (January, 1973), 9.
- Crosby, Charles W. "The Impact of Selected Community Variables Upon Involuntary Superintendent Turnover: A Case Study." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Rutgers University, 1972.
- Culbertson, Jack W., P.B. Jacobson and T.L. Riller. Administrative Relationship. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Davies, Daniel and E.L. Prestwood. Practical School Board Procedures. New York: Chartwell House, Inc., 1951.
- DeGood, Kenneth C. "Can Superintendents Perceive Community Viewpoints," Administrator's Notebook, VII (November, 1969), no. 3.

- Dickson, William E. New Dimensions in School Board Leadership: A Seminar Report. Evanston, Illinois: National School Board Association, Inc., 1969.
- Dils, Eugene. "How Administrators Climb the Ladder," The School Executive, LXXIV, September, 1954, 62-63.
- Dixon, W.J. Biomedical Computer Programs. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973.
- Dorland, Lyle T. "A Study of Colorado School District Superintendent Mobility." Dissertation. University of Colorado, 1973.
- Educational Research Service. "Large-City Superintendents Brings Benefits." E.R.S. Circular No. 2, 1973.
- Elliott, Norman. Patterson's American Education. Mount Prospect, Illinois: Educational Directories, Inc., LXVI (1970), 364-374.
- Fensch, Edwin A. The Superintendency Team. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Book Company, Inc., 1964.
- Finley, Robert. "How to Survive the Political Jungle," The School Management, XII (June, 1968), 60-66, 69.
- Goldhammer, Keith, John Suttle, W.D. Aldridge and G.L. Becker. Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1967.
- Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.
- Graff, Orin, C.M. Strut, R.B. Kimbrough and A.R. Dykes. Philosophic Theory and Practice in Educational Administration. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.
- Gregg, Russell. "Beginning of Administration of Public Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd edition, 1960, 19-24.
- Gregg, Russell T. "The Administrative Process," in R.F. Campbell and R.T. Gregg (eds.), Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

- Gregg, Russell and Stephen Knezevich. "The Superintendent: What Makes Him What He Is," The American School Board Journal, CLVIII (June, 1971), 12-17.
- Grieder, Calvin. "Better Staff Leadership Can Ease Teacher Power Demands," Nation's Schools, LXXI (April, 1963), 12.
- Grieder, Calvin. "School Boards Should Team to Let Go of Small Decisions," The Nation's School, LXXX (July, 1967), 42.
- Grieder, Calvin. "Stabilize the Small-Town Superintendency," The American School Board Journal, XVIII (March, 1944), 13-14.
- Grieder, Calvin. "The Appeal of Administrative Careers Declining Fast," The Nation's Schools, LXXXV (May, 1970), 10.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. (ed). Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Gross, Neal and R.E. Herriott. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Gross, Neal, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachem. Explorations in Role Analysis - Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Grusky, Oscar. "Corporate Size, Bureaucratization and Managerial Succession," American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (November, 1961), 269.
- Gulliksen, Harold. Theory of Mental Tests. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1950.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Administrative Theory in Education. London: McMillan Company, 1958.
- Halpin, Andrew. "Training of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders," Harvard Educational Review, XXV (Winter, 1955), 18-21, 30-31.

- Harting, A. Bruce. "Religion: Courts and the Schools," Clearing House, XLVII (March, 1974), 102-104.
- Heistand, Dale L. Changing Careers After 35. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.
- Hencley, Stephen P. "The Conflict Pattern of School Superintendents," Administrator's Notebook, VIII (May, 1960), no. 9.
- Hickman (ed.) Nation's Schools. "School Survey," Nation's Schools, LXXXI (June, 1968), 81.
- Huff, Russell. "Schoolmen Worry Most About Teachers and Money Shortages," The Nation's Schools, LXXXI (January, 1968), 81-82.
- Hunkins, Ralph J. Superintendent and School Board. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1949.
- Iannaccone, Laurence. Politics in Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1967.
- Iannaccone, Laurence and F. W. Lutz. Politics, Power, and Policy: The Study of a Local School Board. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishers, 1970.
- James, Thomas. "School Board Conflict is Inevitable," The American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), 5-9.
- Jones, Philip G. "A Clash Over 'Dirty Books' is Dividing a School Board, Threatening a Superintendent and Shattering a Community," The American School Board Journal, CLXI (November, 1974), 31.
- Kahn, Robert L. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Kennan, Richard B. "Can You Fire a Superintendent Without Damaging Your District?" School Management, XI (April, 1967), 94-100, 140.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.

- Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company, 1964.
- Kirby, David. "Superintendent's Political Behavior," Administrator's Notebook, XIX (March, 1971), No. 7.
- Kirk, Paul L. "So, You Are Moving to a New Job," The American School Board Journal, CXXXIV (April, 1957), 45-46.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishing Company, 1969.
- Kreisberg, Louis. "Career, Organization Size, and Succession," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVIII (November, 1962), 355.
- Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, Company, 1961.
- Lutz, Frank and Patricia Lynch. "School Board Incumbents Defeat in Partisan Elections," Journal of Educational Administration, XI (October, 1973), 195-202.
- Lutz, R. G. "Factors Associated With Short Tenure of School Superintendents in Michigan." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.
- Marland, Sidney P. "The Changing Nature of the School Superintendency," Public Administration Review, XXX (July/August, 1970), 365-371.
- Mayer, F. C. and Harold Wilson. The Effective Superintendent. Pendeal Publishing Company, Midland, Michigan, 1972:20.
- McCarty, D. J. and C. E. Ramsey. The School Managers. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1971.
- Morrow, John and Others. "Networking a Survival Mechanism For Urban Superintendents," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI (December, 1974), 283-285.
- Miller, Van, G. R. Madden and J. G. Kincheloe. The Public Administration of American Schools. New York: MacMillian Company, 1972.

- Moen, Walter A. "Superintendent Turnover as Predicted by School Board Incumbent Defeat in Pennsylvania Partisan Elections," Dissertation Abstracts, 32:9-4892, 1960.
- Mosier, Earl E. and John E. Baker. "Midwestern Superintendents on the Move," The Nation's Schools, XLIX (January, 1952), 44-46.
- Mullins, Carol. "The Way That School Boards Drive Their Superintendents up the Wall," The American School Board Journal, CLXI (August, 1974), 15-18.
- Newsome, George and Harold Gentry. "Logical Consistency, Values, and Authoritarianism in a Sample of Public School Superintendents," Journal of Teacher Education, XIV (September, 1963), 411-416.
- North Carolina State Board of Education. Public School Laws. Charlottesville, Va.: Michie Company, 1971.
- Norton, M. Scott. "Current Problems of the School Superintendent," The Clearing House, XLVI (September, 1971), 15-19.
- Popham, James W. and K. A. Sirotnik. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row Publishing Co., 1973.
- Porter, Wayne S. "A Study of Selected Factors Related to the Turnover of Public School Superintendents in Connecticut." Dissertation Abstracts, 32:4-1805, March, 1960.
- Pullen, Thomas G. "Superintendent's Authority Undermined," The American School Board Journal, CLIII (November, 1966), 12-16, 58-61.
- Reeves, C. E. School Boards. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1954.
- Reeves, David. "Would Your District Be Better Off With a Superintendent Who's a Businessman - Not an Educator?" The American School Board Journal, CXL (February, 1973), 19-25.
- Sales, M. Vance and J. C. Taylor. "The Arkansas School Superintendent," Research Bulletin. Arkansas State University, October, 1973.

- Samon, Gordon E. "School Board Effectiveness and Tenure of the Administrator," Administrator's Notebook, No. 5 (January, 1956), 1-4.
- Sletten, Vernon O. "Policy Questions - Do Board Members and Superintendents Agree?" Administrator's Notebook, VII (December, 1958), No. 4.
- Sears, Jesse B. The Nature of the Administrative Process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Selke, Erick. "Why Administrators Change Their Jobs," The Nation's Schools, XXV (May, 1940), 50.
- Southworth, William. "The Superintendency: A Position in Flux," The American School Board Journal, CLIII (May, 1967), 38-39.
- Southworth, William D. "The Superintendency - 1980, The Clearing House, XLIII (October, 1968), 79-81.
- Spaulding, W. B. "How Fares the Superintendent's Tenure?" The American School Board Journal, CXXXVII (September, 1958), 37-39.
- Spears, Harold. "Hunting and Finding a New School Superintendent," The Nation's Schools, LXXXII (September, 1968), 64-65, 92.
- Sullivan, Neil V. Walk, Run, or Retreat. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- Svenson, A. L. and Joseph Bryson. "Managers of Influence," Educational Administration (November, 1969), 85.
- Tausky, Curt and Robert Dubin. "Career Anchorage: Managerial Mobility," American Sociological Review, XXX (October, 1965), 725-735.
- Theisen, William W. The City Superintendent and the Board of Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1917.
- Tuttle, Edward M. School Board Leadership. Chicago: Interstate Printers, 1963.

- Urich, Ted and Samuel Shermis. "A New Role for Tired School Superintendents," The Clearing House, XLIII (January, 1969), 294-297.
- Walden, John C. "School Board Changes and Superintendents Turnover," Administrator's Notebook, XV (January, 1967), No. 5.
- Walker, W. G., A. R. Crane and Ross Thomas. Explorations in Educational Administration. New York: Crane, Russak and Company, Inc., 1973.
- Watson, D. Gene. "Superintendent's Mobility Constructs and Succession Patterns," A Paper Presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2-6, 1970, 1 - 15.
- Wilson, Charles H. "On These Issues Superintendents Stand - or Fall," The Nation's Schools, LXXV (June, 1965), 27-29, 50, 52.
- Wilson, Robert E. Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.
- Young, Ken M. "School Storm Center: Charleston," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI (December, 1974), 262.
- Zimmerman, William G. "Human Rights and Administrative Responsibility," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI (December, 1974), 243, 247.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
LETTER REQUESTING SUPPORT FOR THE STUDY
FROM STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC
INSTRUCTION



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

April 13, 1975

Dr. A. Craig Phillips
State Superintendent of
Public Instruction
Education Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Dear Dr. Phillips:

Mr. Donald Bentley, doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, is conducting a study entitled "A Study of the Variables That Are Related to Turnover of Superintendents in North Carolina." The study is specifically concerned with determining variables that are the major cause of turnover in the superintendency. Superintendents and chairmen of boards of education will be asked to respond to a questionnaire dealing with variables they perceive to affect the superintendency turnover. The results of this study will provide insights into the working relationships between the superintendents and board chairmen and possibly assure less turnovers and a consistency in the working relationship within the administration.

We are requesting a letter from your office supporting Mr. Bentley's study. The letter will accompany the questionnaire that will be administered to one hundred twelve superintendents across North Carolina. Eighty-eight units have retained their superintendent five or more years and twenty-four have had turnover within three years. These make up the population study.

We will be pleased to send you a summary of the study if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. David Alexander
Dissertation Chairman

Donald Bentley
Graduate Student

APPENDIX B

LETTER REQUESTING SUPPORT FOR THE STUDY
FROM EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF NORTH CAROLINA
SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

April 13, 1975

Dr. Raleigh E. Dingman
Executive Secretary
North Carolina School Boards Assoc.
P.O. Box 2476
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Dear Dr. Dingman:

Mr. Donald Bentley, doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, is conducting a study entitled "A Study of the Variables That Are Related to Turnover of Superintendents in North Carolina." The study is specifically concerned with determining variables that are the major cause of turnover in the superintendency. Superintendents and chairmen of boards of education will be asked to respond to a questionnaire dealing with variables they perceive to affect the superintendency turnover. The results of this study will provide insights into the working relationships between the superintendents and board chairmen and possibly assure less turnovers and a consistency in the working relationship within the administration.

We are requesting a letter from your office supporting Mr. Bentley's study. The letter will accompany the questionnaire that will be administered to one hundred twelve chairmen of boards of education across North Carolina.

We will be pleased to send you a summary of the study if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. David Alexander
Dissertation Chairman

Donald Bentley
Graduate Student

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM STATE SUPERINTENDENT
OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION



State of North Carolina

A CRAIG PHILLIPS
SUPERINTENDENT

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Raleigh 27602

May 13, 1975

Dr. David Alexander
Division of Administrative and
Educational Services
Virginia Polytechnical Institute
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Dear Dr. Alexander:

The purpose of this letter is to endorse Mr. Donald Bentley's study entitled "A Study of the Variables that are Related to Turnover of Superintendents in North Carolina." I think it is important that someone conduct an investigation of factors that might be related to the high turnover rates among local school superintendents in this State.

I understand that you will be sending a questionnaire to local superintendents and board chairmen. I hope that they will support your effort.

A summary of your study will be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

A. Craig Phillips
State Superintendent of Public
Instruction

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
OF NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

NORTH CAROLINA
School Boards Association, Inc.

P. O. BOX 2478
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27602
919/832-7024

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT

Mrs. Mary Scroggs
Chapel Hill

VICE-PRESIDENT

Dr. Harold E. Maxwell
Fayetteville

PAST PRESIDENT

Dr. M. Cade Covington
Sanford

NSBA OFFICER

1st VICE-PRESIDENT
Cecil Gillhott
Shelby

SRSBA OFFICER

PRESIDENT

William E. Pinn
Charlotte

DIRECTORS

Edwin Caldwell, Jr.
Chapel Hill

Roland Danielson
Raleigh

Mrs. Barbara Deverick
Lenoir

Frank E. Emory
Wilson

Paul Leonard
Salisbury

William McKay
Flat Rock

George S. McRorie
Robersonville

Mrs. W. G. Mitchell
North Wilkesboro

Mrs. Charles B. Neal III
Durham

Clarence Palmer
Shelby

Charlie W. Pickler
Albemarle

Mrs. Hugh Queen
Harris

George Stewart
Castalia

Mrs. Bernice
Hickory

Thad Tankard, Jr.
Hath

Tom Voss
Winston Salem

Mrs. C. L. White, Jr.
Thomasville

Clifford S. Winslow
Belvidere

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Dr. Raleigh E. Dingman

May 2, 1975

Dear Board Chairmen:

We hope you will take a few minutes of your very valuable time to respond to the questionnaire that accompanies this letter. This is part of a study of "Variables that are Related to Turnover of Superintendents in North Carolina."

The results should provide insights into the relationship between school boards and superintendents and may possibly lead to better board-superintendent relationships. If the study is effective, it will provide information of value to local boards and to your State Association. For that reason, we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the questionnaire.

Yours very truly,

Raleigh E. Dingman

RED:dc

"DEDICATED TO SEEKING IMPROVEMENTS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION"

APPENDIX E
TRIAL QUESTIONNAIRES

Superintendents:

(Sample-First Draft)

Following is a list of stated variables. Please indicate on the four point scale the degree of importance you would place on each variable if you were to change superintendencies or have changed position within the last five years. The four categories are VERY IMPORTANT (VI), IMPORTANT (I), LITTLE IMPORTANCE (LI), NO IMPORTANCE (NI). Encircle the category that best indicates your preference.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART II - VARIABLE DATA

1. Board of Education performing administrative duties	VI	I	LI	NI
2. Board of Education failing to work together	VI	I	LI	NI
3. Term of contract too short	VI	I	LI	NI
4. Size of school system	VI	I	LI	NI
5. Uncertainty of community growth	VI	I	LI	NI
6. Conflict of personality of superintendent and board	VI	I	LI	NI
7. Preference shown to selected board members	VI	I	LI	NI
8. Involvement in partisan politics	VI	I	LI	NI
9. No/low local supplement	VI	I	LI	NI
10. Militant teacher organization	VI	I	LI	NI
11. Racial disturbances	VI	I	LI	NI
12. Poor support from local governing board on budget	VI	I	LI	NI
13. Interference from pressure groups	VI	I	LI	NI

14. Lack of qualifications by Superintendent	VI	I	LI	NI
15. Poor staff relations in central office	VI	I	LI	NI
16. Frequent board turnover	VI	I	LI	NI
17. Retirement: age or pressure	VI	I	LI	NI
18. Lack of fringe benefits	VI	I	LI	NI
19. Intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials	VI	I	LI	NI
20. Lack of community confidence and support of superintendent or poor public relations	VI	I	LI	NI
21. Living and social facilities	VI	I	LI	NI
22. Prestigious position in the community	VI	I	LI	NI
23. Special locale for seasonal activities	VI	I	LI	NI
24. Family ties	VI	I	LI	NI
25. Curriculum and instructional planning	VI	I	LI	NI
26. Cost of living	VI	I	LI	NI
27. Facilities	VI	I	LI	NI

Superintendents:

(Sample-Second Draft)

Following is a list of stated variables. Please indicate on the four point scale the degree of importance you would place on each variable if you were to change superintendencies or have changed position within the last five years. The four categories are VERY IMPORTANT (VI), IMPORTANT (I), LITTLE IMPORTANCE (LI), NO IMPORTANCE (NI). Encircle the category that best indicates your preference.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART II - VARIABLE DATA

- | | | | | |
|--|----|---|----|----|
| 1. Board of Education performing administrative duties normally assigned to the superintendent. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 2. Board of Education failing to work together as a unit. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 3. Term of contract too short: two or less years. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 4. Size of school system small: moved for advancement. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 5. Conflict of personality of superintendent and board. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 6. Involvement in partisan politics by the superintendent. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 7. Salary too low. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 8. Militant teacher organization: demanding power and decision making. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 9. Racial disturbances. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 10. Poor support from local governing board on budget and other school support. | VI | I | LI | NI |
| 11. Interference from pressure groups - choice of books, teacher selection, transportation, etc. | VI | I | LI | NI |

12. Lack of qualifications by Superintendent.	VI	I	LI	NI
13. Poor staff relations in central office.	VI	I	LI	NI
14. Frequent board turnover.	VI	I	LI	NI
15. Retirement: age or pressure	VI	I	LI	NI
16. Lack of fringe benefits	VI	I	LI	NI
17. Intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials.	VI	I	LI	NI
18. Lack of community confidence and support of superintendent or poor public relations.	VI	I	LI	NI

Superintendent or Former Superintendent: (Third Draft)

The following is a list of variables which may be (or might have been) important factors in your decision to leave a Superintendency. Please indicate on the seven-point scale the degree of importance you placed on each variable when you left your last superintendency. The seven-point scale ranges from one (1) as high to seven (7) as low in importance. Encircle the category that best indicates your preference.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART II - VARIABLE DATA

	High			Moderate			Low	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Board of Education performing administrative duties normally assigned to the superintendent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. Board of Education failing to work together as a unit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. Term of contract too short: two or less years.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4. Size of school system small: moved for advancement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. Personality conflict between superintendent and board.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. Involvement in partisan politics by the superintendent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. Higher salary.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8. Militant teacher organization: demanding power and decision making.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
9. Racial disturbances.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

	High			Moderate			Low
10. Poor support from local governing board on budget and other school support.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Interference from pressure groups - choice of books, teacher selection, transportation, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Lack of qualifications by Superintendent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Poor staff relations in central office.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Frequent board turnover.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Retirement: age or pressure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Lack of fringe benefits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Lack of community confidence and support of Superintendent or poor public relations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Improved living and social facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Prestigious position in the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Special locale for seasonal activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Family ties.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Improved chances for curriculum and instructional planning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	High			Moderate			Low
24. Lower cost of living.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Better facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Others: Please specify							

APPENDIX F
QUESTIONNAIRES AND COVER LETTER SENT OUT

Dear Superintendent:

As many as 2,000 superintendencies are filled each year in public school districts in the United States. During the past five years, forty-one percent of the superintendencies in North Carolina have been filled. Superintendents should be aware of the variables related to turnover which might help determine his success or failure in a particular superintendency.

The purpose of the following questionnaire is to determine the significance of the various variables related to turnover of superintendents as perceived by superintendents and chairmen of school boards in one hundred twelve school units across the state.

Would you please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it within a few days, thereby assuring that your response will be part of this study? Your reply will be held in confidence and no reference will be made to any individual nor to any school unit.

Your cooperation in this research endeavor will be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Donald W. Bentley
Graduate Student

This study has the endorsement of the Division of Educational Administrative Services at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Dr. David Alexander
Advisor

Dear Chairman of the Board of Education:

As many as 2,000 superintendencies are filled each year in public school districts of the United States. During the past five years, forty-one percent of the superintendencies of North Carolina have been filled. Superintendents should be aware of the expectations in competency areas and the importance placed on the competencies as related to the position of superintendent which might help determine his success or failure in a particular superintendency.

The purpose of the following questionnaire is to determine the significance of the various competencies and their importance level to the superintendency as perceived by chairmen of boards of education from units across the state.

Would you please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it within a few days, thereby assuring that your response will be part of this study? Your reply will be held in confidence and no reference will be made to any individual nor to any school unit.

Your cooperation in this research endeavor will be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Donald W. Bentley
Graduate Student

This study has the endorsement of the Division of Educational Administrative Services at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Dr. David Alexander
Advisor

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Section A: Please circle the number on the scale that best describes your satisfaction with your present position.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Low			Neither High nor Low			Extremely High

Section B: Please answer the following questions. These statements will be used to prepare a profile of the Superintendents of North Carolina

1. Age: 25-35 ____ (1) 36-45 ____ (2) 46-55 ____ (3) 56-65 ____ (4)
Over 65 ____ (5)
2. Sex: Male ____ (1) Female ____ (2)
3. Grew up in: Small town (10,000 or less) _____ (1)
City 10,001 - 50,000 _____ (2)
50,001 or more _____ (3)
Rural _____ (4)
Farm Area _____ (5)
4. How long have you held your current position? ____ years
5. How many superintendencies have you held in this state? _____
6. Positions held before the superintendency:
 - A. Teacher: (area or grade) _____ years
 - B. Principal:
 - Elementary _____ (1) _____ years
 - Secondary _____ (2) _____ years
 - Union _____ (3) _____ years
 - C. Supervision: _____

7. Have you held a superintendency in another state?
 Yes ____ (1) No ____ (2) State(s) _____ Total Yrs. ____
8. Highest degree held: No degree _____ (1)
 Associate _____ (2)
 Bachelors _____ (3)
 Masters _____ (4)
 Specialist (6 year) _____ (5)
 Doctorate _____ (6)
9. Age each level of educational position:
- A. First teaching 21 - 25 _____ (1)
 26 - 30 _____ (2)
 31 - 35 _____ (3)
 Over 35 _____ (4)
- B. First Administrative (check first position and age):
1. Assistant Principal _____ 21 - 35 _____ (1)
 2. Principal _____ 36 - 45 _____ (2)
 3. Ass't. Superintendent _____ 46-above _____ (3)
 4. Superintendent _____
10. Student enrollment of your unit:
- 500 - 1,000 _____ (1)
 1,001 - 2,500 _____ (2)
 2,501 - 5,000 _____ (3)
 5,001 - 10,000 _____ (4)
 10,001 - 20,000 _____ (5)
 20,001 and above _____ (6)
11. If you are not holding a superintendency at the present time, what is your position or title? _____
12. What was your position immediately preceding the last superintendency? _____

Superintendent or Former Superintendent:

The following is a list of variables which may be (or might have been) important factors in your decision to leave a Superintendency. Please indicate on the seven-point scale the degree of importance you placed on each variable when you left your last superintendency. The seven-point scale ranges from one (1) as low to seven (7) as high in importance. Encircle the category that best indicates your preference.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART II - VARIABLE DATA

	Low			Moderate			High	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Board of Education performing administrative duties normally assigned to the superintendent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. Board of Education failing to work together as a unit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. Term of contract too short: two or less years.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4. Size of school system small: moved for advancement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. Conflict of personality of superintendent and board.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. Involvement in partisan politics by the Board of Education.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. Higher salary elsewhere.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8. Militant teacher organization demanding power and decision making.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
9. Racial disturbances.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

	Low		Moderate			High
10. Poor support from local governing board on budget and other school support.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
11. Interference from pressure groups -1 choice of books, teacher selection, transportation, etc.	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Poor staff relations in central office.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
13. Frequent board turnover.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
14. Retirement: age or pressure.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
15. Lack of fringe benefits.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
16. Intimidation by locally appointed or elected officials.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
17. Lack of community confidence and support of superintendent or poor public relations.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
18. Living and social facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
19. Special locale for seasonal activities in new position.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
20. Family ties.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
21. Lower cost of living in new locale.	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
22. Others: please specify						
(a) _____	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
(b) _____	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
(c) _____	1	2	3	4	5	6 7

Dear Board Chairman:

Below is a list of competencies that have been identified in research as being desirable for superintendents. Please circle on the seven point scale the level of competency held by your former superintendent. Please rate each area.

<u>Competencies</u>	<u>Low</u>							<u>High</u>
Instructional Leadership - ability to organize and implement a good educational program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
School-Community Relationships - ability to coordinate school-community activities for the betterment of the educational program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Personnel Management - Staffing ability to employ and manage personnel to develop and carry out educational programs and school policies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Pupil Personnel Services - ability to provide services to the students in public interest and organize data on the school population	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Plant Operations - ability to provide, operate, and maintain facilities for an adequate educational program. Ability to operate efficiently to maximize the use of facilities and financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Decision Making - ability to determine needs and set policies and plan for their fulfillment and implementation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

<u>Competencies</u>	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>			
Interpersonal Relationships - ability to relate to others, utilize opinions of others, help subordinates do their best, get policies formu- lated cooperatively, and work for group consensus by a democratic process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Business Management - Budgeting - ability to plan a budget for an adequate instructional program within the bounds of the resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Recording - ability to keep proper records and accounts of all financial trans- actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Reporting - ability to re- port all transactions properly to the board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Accounting - ability to keep the budget in balance and eliminate discrepancies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Organizing - ability to formulate goals and objectives and guide all facets of the system in working for unified goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Co-ordinating - ability to keep all facets of the school system organi- zation working as a single unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

<u>Competencies</u>	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>	
Planning -	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ability to conceptualize the program in operation and anticipate needs of the future with possible solu- tions for fulfilling the needs							
Appraising -	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ability to evaluate how well the organizational objectives have been met							

Dear Board Chairman:

Below is a list of competencies that have been identified in research as being desirable for the superintendency. Please circle on the seven point scale the level of importance you place on each competency held by your superintendent.

<u>Competencies</u>	<u>Low</u>							<u>High</u>
Instructional Leadership - ability to organize and implement a good educational program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
School-Community Relationships - ability to coordinate school- community activities for the betterment of the educational program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Personnel Management - Staffing ability to employ and manage personnel to develop and carry out educational programs and school policies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Pupil Personnel Services - ability to provide services to the students in public inter- est and organize data on the school population	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Plant Operations - ability to provide, operate, and maintain facilities for an adequate educational pro- gram. Ability to operate efficiently to maximize the use of facilities and financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Decision Making - ability to determine needs and set policies and plan for their fulfillment and implementation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

<u>Competencies</u>	Low					High	
Interpersonal Relationships - ability to relate to others, utilize opinions of others, help subordinates do their best, get policies formu- lated cooperatively, and work for group consensus by a democratic process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Business Management - Budgeting - ability to plan a budget for an adequate instructional program within the bounds of the resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recording - ability to keep proper records and accounts of all financial trans- actions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reporting - ability to re- port all transactions prop- erly to the board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Accounting - ability to keep the budget in balance and eliminate discrepancies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Organizing - ability to formulate goals and objectives and guide all facets of the system in working for unified goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Co-ordinating - ability to keep all facets of the school system organ- ization working as a single unit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

<u>Competencies</u>	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>	
Planning - ability to conceptualize the program in operation and anticipate needs of the future with possible solutions for fulfilling the needs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Appraising - ability to evaluate how well the organizational objec- tives have been met -	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Route #1, Box 120
Blowing Rock, N. Carolina

Gentlemen:

Eleven days ago you were mailed a questionnaire dealing with the variables related to the turnover of superintendents in North Carolina school systems. At the present I have not received a sufficient number of responses to complete my study. If you have a few minutes, I would appreciate your taking time to help me in my study.

Enclosed is a stamped self-addressed envelope and another questionnaire for your convenience.

Your help is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donald Bentley

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**

A STUDY OF VARIABLES RELATED TO
TURNOVER OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN
NORTH CAROLINA

by

Donald W. Bentley

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected variables and competencies that were related to the turnover in the superintendency in North Carolina and to study the differences in perception as to the level of importance placed on the variables by superintendents and on the competency data by the chairmen of boards of education.

The population of the three study groups included 104 superintendents and 104 board chairmen. The sample selected consisted of 24 superintendents who have not been in a turnover situation in five years, 12 forced turnover superintendents, 12 turnover superintendents who left a position on their own volition and 48 board chairmen that were categorized into study groups corresponding to the superintendency sample.

The data sought included demographic data, value placed on organizational variables in relationship to their part in turnover, level of performance in 15

competency areas, and value placed on each competency.

The results produced by using Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences, Factor Analysis, and Fortran Packages of Analysis of Variance and Scheffe' Multiple Comparison Test indicated that the non-turnover study group and the forced turnover group were in closer agreement on variables and importance placed on competency items.

The variables listed most frequently in importance were:

1. Board of Education performing administrative duties normally assigned to the superintendent.
2. Board of Education failing to work as a unit.
3. Conflict of personality of superintendent and board.
4. Lack of community confidence and support.
5. Involvement in partisan politics by board.
6. Poor support from local governing board.
7. Interference from pressure groups.
8. Intimidation by locally elected or appointed officials.

Board chairmen placed most importance on the following variables: Planning, Plant operations, Instructional leadership, Decision making, and Business management. These areas were those which produced

potential areas of conflict and possible turnover agents.

It is recommended that:

1. Boards of education should work closer together to develop guidelines, policies, and procedures to eliminate the overlapping in performance of duties. Separation of duties should be established and followed.
2. The study should be replicated again at a later date to include more study units.
3. The turnover study group should be questioned again at periodic intervals, preferably on a yearly basis, to see if suggestions for improvements are being used.
4. All boards of education should keep on hand a written list of expected competencies for prospective candidates for the superintendency.
5. Prospective superintendents and boards of education should frankly discuss policy and expectation.
6. Educational institutions should provide more extensive training or retraining in fields of competency where weaknesses were indicated such as leadership, planning, decision-making, plant operation, and school-community relationships.

7. Educational institutions need to be supported by state agencies in providing a closer working relationship between classroom activity and field studies.
8. Training sessions in policy making, school law, and duties of board members should be established as part of the requirement for membership on boards of education.