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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The most recent status report of the American Association of School Administrators$^1$ contains the following statistics on the tenure of the school superintendent in the United States. Almost thirty percent have held their present positions for three years or less. Over fifty percent have held more than one superintendency and 13.1 percent of the superintendents surveyed answered that they had left their previous superintendency within the last year. Statistics like these have prompted some to describe the superintendency as a "revolving door"$^2$ or to coin a more euphemistic phrase "Superintendent Shuffle."$^3$ Other studies take a less pessimistic view of superintendent turnover.

---


$^3$Ibid.
Superintendents are not a highly mobile lot. Over three-fourths have stayed in two or fewer districts... Superintendents are not likely to move from state to state.

Studies, however, indicate that superintendents do move between districts and that new superintendents almost always rise up through the educational ranks. This means that school organizations are faced with the problem of replacing their chief executive officer at fairly regular intervals.

Richard O. Carlson studied superintendent succession in the late 1950's and published the results of his work in the monograph Executive Succession and

---


Organizational Change. He later updated some of his data and published the book *School Superintendents: Careers and Performance* which expands on the ideas developed in the earlier work. In his research he develops a dichotomy along the paths that superintendents take to gain their top positions in school districts. Very simply, a superintendent appointed from inside the district is said to be "place-bound" and a superintendent employed from outside the district is said to be "career-bound." Carlson, using interview data from a sample of Oregon superintendents as well as secondary analysis of data from other studies, including studies conducted by AASA, supported several hypotheses about the differences between career-bound and place-bound superintendents.

The differences between "insiders" and "outsiders" are not ideas that were born with Carlson. One of the

---


earliest to write about these differences was Gouldner. He studied social roles among the faculty of a small college. Two social roles became evident, which Gouldner labeled "locals" and "cosmopolitans."

"Locals" were defined as "those high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation." "Cosmopolitans" were "those low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an outer reference groups orientation."

The distinction between locals and cosmopolitans is not exactly the same as that between career-bound and place-bound superintendents, but the similarities are apparent.

Other terms have been applied to the two categories of career origin. Hughes wrote of the "itinerant" and

---


9 Ibid., p. 290

10 Ibid.

the "home guard" in medical field, and Marvick has written about "institutionalists" and "specialist" in a federal agency. All these terms are defined with only slight variations from the common meanings associated with the insider - outsider dichotomy.

While the terms vary, the importance of the dichotomy to the enduring organization remains. When a vacancy occurs in a key organizational position, like that of a superintendent of schools, those charged with the selection of a replacement must make a decision whether to fill that position by promotion from within the organization or by the selection of someone from outside. Whether an "insider" or an "outsider" is chosen will make a difference in the degree of social disturbance caused by the changeover, and in the style of leadership displayed by the replacement.¹³

¹² Swaine Marvick, Career Prospectives in a Bureaucratic Setting; Richard O. Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change, p. 9.

Carlson's classic works on the differences between career-bound and place-bound superintendents are dated. Much of the data were collected in the late 50's and early 60's and then revised in the late 60's. Much has changed in the world of the superintendent in this period of time. There has been a shift from homogenous to pluralistic values, from trust to doubt about schools, from teacher quiescence to teacher militancy, from growth to decline, from autonomy to dependence, and from consensus to conflict. \(^{14}\) David Tyack describes the change as follows:

Instead of rushing to find new teachers and classrooms, superintendents today often face cutbacks and the task of improving education in a time of scarcity. Instead of focusing on centralization and "taking education out of politics," many administrators now seek to decentralize decision-making within the system and to make schooling more responsive to pluralistic constituencies. \(^{15}\)

Because of these changes in the external and internal environment of the superintendent and, in fact, the entire school organization and because

---


superintendent succession remains a critical problem to the organization, a replication of some of the key portions of Carlson's studies was undertaken to explore the differences in perceptions of key educational issues by career-bound and place-bound superintendents.

The worth of this study is further supported by Charters, who bemoans the fact that so little replication is done in educational research.¹⁶ Educators are so uninclined to build on each other's works that he expresses concern that there is a potential to fail to scratch the surface on the detail of someone else's study. The solution he proposes would certainly make him a unique doctoral advisor.

I am not sure to what degree the unfortunate injunction on doctoral candidates to produce an "original contribution" is responsible for our inclination to avoid the work of our colleagues, but I have nearly reached the point of insisting on replication in the doctoral thesis. It certainly would be "original" at this juncture.¹⁷


¹⁷Ibid.
Hillestad also supports the idea of replication as an appropriate research venture.¹⁸ She argues that it is enough for a problem to possess a "degree of originality."

Many studies need to be redone, but not in exactly the same way the first investigations were done. A restudy of a problem may be done to remedy any weaknesses in research procedures used by a previous investigator. New and better measuring instruments may be available that were not in existence at the time of the original study. Some of the variables used by others may not have been carefully enough controlled so their findings are contradictory. The analysis of data may not have been appropriate for the design of the study to answer the questions posed by the investigator.

The "degree of originality" used in this study was a different methodology than Carlson's original works and an attempt to better operationally define the variables, career-bound and place-bound superintendents.

This study replicates Carlson's works in sufficient detail to determine if differences between place-bound and career-bound superintendents still exist today. For if they do, those boards of education employing superintendents and those colleges and universities training

¹⁸Mildred Hillestad, Research: Process and Product, p. 3.

¹⁹Ibid.
them need to be reminded of these differences and how they may impact on the school organization.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The previous discussion suggests that the differences between career-bound and place-bound superintendents are supported in theory by the literature and by several studies, all of which are somewhat dated. The superintendency has experienced considerable change in the last decade. Cuban attributes this to a continuous shifting in the environment in which schools exist, especially the subjective, public view of schools. Old belief systems have come under attack and the idea of education as the "great equalizer" is increasingly questioned. Superintendents must face unfamiliar demands, expectations, and groups. Therefore, a determination should be made as to whether these changes have intensified the dichotomy in career path that Carlson and others have postulated.

This determination was made through a survey of superintendents in America.

20 Larry Cuban, Urban School Chiefs Under Fire, p. 168.
Research Assumptions

1. That relevant data can be collected through the use of a survey instrument to replicate adequately Carlson's studies which used mainly the interview technique.

2. Employing the proper chief administrative officer remains a crucial decision in the educational organization.

3. Not all of Carlson's hypotheses can or should be replicated in this study. Proof or disproof of some of his hypotheses can suggest areas of further investigation.

Propositions and Hypotheses to be Replicated

Carlson's data support a fairly large number of hypotheses. The research method used in this study permits the re-testing of several of Carlson's hypotheses which have been grouped under two more generalized propositions.

Proposition 1 - There will be significant differences in the demographic data of place-bound superintendents as compared to career-bound superintendents.

This proposition was supported by the notion that the place-bound superintendent simply waits around in his home school district until the superintendency is finally his. The career-bound superintendent, on the other hand, does not wait, but seeks a superintendency wherever it is to be found. The following hypotheses follow from this
proposition. All were verified in Carlson's studies and were re-tested in this study.

Hypothesis 1a - Career-bound superintendents obtain their first superintendency at a younger age than place-bound superintendents.

Carlson found in a sample of 185 Oregon and Massachusetts superintendents that the mean age on assuming the first superintendency was 35.7 for career-bound and 44.3 for place-bound.21 (Question number 27a in the survey instrument was used to retest this hypothesis. This question asked the respondent to give his age at the time of his first superintendency.)

Hypothesis 1b - When asked to state the age at which they decided to aspire to the superintendency, career-bound superintendents give a lower age than place-bound superintendents.

Carlson reported that in a sample of 102 Massachusetts superintendents, the mean age for career-bound superintendents at the time this decision was made was 29, and the mean age for place-bound superintendents was 37. Similarly, in a sample of 83 Oregon superintendents, the mean age was 30 for career-bound and 36 for place-bound superintendents.22 (Question number 37 on

21 Carlson, School Superintendents: Careers and Performance, op. cit., p. 51.
22 Ibid., p. 50.
the survey instrument asked "At what age did you first decide that you wanted to become a school superintendent?)

Hypothesis 1c - Career-bound superintendents obtain a greater amount of formal education than place-bound superintendents.

Using a sample of 719 school superintendents, Carlson found that about 11 percent of the place-bound superintendents and about 25 percent of the career-bound superintendents obtain either an Ed.D or Ph.D. Using this criterion as the determinant of formal education obtained by the two types of superintendents yields a chi-square of 18.5, significant at the .001 level of confidence.23 (Question number 83, which asked the highest degree earned, was used to re-test the hypothesis.)

Hypothesis 1d - Salaries of career-bound superintendents will be higher than those of place-bound superintendents.

Carlson reported that: "Beginning outsiders command from $1,000 to $5,000 more a year than beginning insiders. Further, the insider never catches up with the outsider. The difference holds regardless of time in office."24

23 Ibid., p. 52
24 Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change, op. cit., p. 19.
(Question 26d through 32d in the survey instrument collected the salary data necessary to re-test this hypothesis.) A second general proposition is suggested by Carlson.

**Proposition 2** - The expectations of and for career-bound superintendents will be significantly different from those of and for place-bound superintendents.

This proposition is suggested by Carlson's discussion of the employing board's attitudes when seeking a new superintendent. When a board is unhappy with the performance of the school system, they hire a career-bound superintendent; they go outside the district for new blood. A happy board that wishes to maintain the status quo can feel comfortable selecting a place-bound leader. "School boards, then, hope for a *creative* performance from a career-bound superintendent, but are happy with a *stabilizing* performance from a place-bound man."^{25}

The following hypothesis constructed from this second proposition was re-tested in this study.

**Hypothesis 2a** - Career-bound superintendents will more often receive mandates from their employing board than will place-bound superintendents.

---

Carlson used superintendent perceptions of the reasons they were appointed to office to test this hypothesis. A mandate was defined as a feeling that either "improvement was desired" or "action was desired" by the employing board, as opposed to the reason "personal characteristics." Assuming this definition, among those responding, 44 career-bound men reported receiving a mandate while 16 did not; 10 place-bound men reported a mandate response and 22 did not. Using this distribution, a chi-square test yields a value of 13.6, significant at the .001 level of confidence.26 (Question 39 of the survey instrument was: "What is your perception of the most important reason you were employed by your present board of education? (Select only one).

1. My personal characteristics/qualifications
2. The board/community wanted some specific programmatic or curricular improvements made in the school district.
3. The board/community was looking for a person to solve some specific problems (i.e. closing schools, RIFing, desegregation, etc.)
4. The board/community wished to maintain the status quo.
5. Other (Specify): ____________________"

Responses 2 and 3 were considered in the mandate category, responses 1 and 4 were not. Respondents who answer "other" were not included in this analysis.

26 Ibid.
Hypothesis 2b - Career-bound superintendents will attend more professional meetings than place-bound superintendents.

Carlson reported that in a group of Allegheny County superintendents, career-bound men, on the average, attended 50 percent more meetings than did place-bound men. The difference in the distribution of meetings attended between the two groups yielded a Mann-Whitney U with a value of 1.97, which is significant at the .05 level of confidence.  

(Question 44 on the questionnaire asked the respondent how many professional meetings attended in the last twelve months.)

New Proposition and Hypotheses to be Tested

Carlson pointed out the functional significance of rule-making for a successor. Place-bound superintendents concentrated on publicizing and reinforcing old rules and assessing the extent to which such rules were taken into account. He also pointed out that career-bound men are more involved in the interaction with staff and more receptive to change.  

All of this would lead one to

27 Ibid., p. 72
28 Ibid.
suppose that the career-bound superintendent would view educational issues differently than a place-bound superintendent.

This is contradicted by March and March who argue that most of the time superintendents are not only indistinguishable from each other, but also indistinguishable from the pool of potential superintendents. Further support for this argument is offered by Wolf who administered the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to career-bound and place-bound Iowa superintendents and found no significant difference in their Initiating Structure scores, Consideration scores, or total LBDQ scores.

It is with these conflicting findings in mind that the following proposition was formulated.

Proposition 3 - Significant differences may exist in the way career-bound superintendents perceive key educational issues than the way place-bound superintendents perceive these issues.


The following two competing hypotheses follow from the above proposition.

**Hypothesis 3a** - When asked to rate the importance of a list of key educational issues, no significant difference will be found between the ratings of career-bound superintendents and those of place-bound superintendents.

**Hypothesis 3b** - When asked to rate the importance of a list of key educational issues, significant differences will be found between the ratings of career-bound and those of place-bound superintendents.

When the data from this study were analyzed, only one of the two competing hypotheses was proven correct. (Section IV of the questionnaire was used to test these hypotheses. The respondent was asked to use a four-point scale to rate the degree of importance of 35 issues and challenges facing the superintendent today.)

Another hypothesis was suggested by combining the career-bound and place-bound dichotomy of Carlson with the notion of career sponsorship studied by one of his advisees, Robert Rose. Rose states: "The career progress of most if not all superintendents is related in some degree to the support of activities of a sponsor or
This study tested the following hypothesis concerning the sponsorship, or mentoring phenomenon.

**Hypothesis 4** — Career-bound superintendents will indicate that they have had mentors (sponsors) more often than will place-bound superintendents.

(Question number 42 in the survey instrument asked the respondent if he has ever had a mentor.)

**Operational Definitions**

1. **Career-bound Superintendents** — a superintendent who has served as the chief administrative officer in two or more school districts.

2. **Extreme Career-Bound Superintendents** — a superintendent who has served as the chief administrative officer in three or more school districts.

3. **Place-Bound Superintendents** — a school superintendent who has been appointed to the superintendency from a position inside the employing school district.

---


32 This definition is intended to be an improvement over Carlson's definition: a school superintendent who has been appointed to the superintendency from a position outside the employing school district. A superintendent who makes a move to another district is certainly not place-bound.

33 Suggested by Gouldner's classification of "extreme cosmopolitans" and "extreme locals".

34 While this definition conforms to Carlson's original definition, a problem does exist. A career-bound person could be employed as an administrative assistant for a short period of time for the express purpose of learning the ropes before stepping into the top job. When he was promoted, he would bear the misnomer of place-bound. An attempt will be made to purify the sample of this study to avoid this problem.
4. **Extreme Place-Bound Superintendent** - a school superintendent who has spent his entire career in only one school district.

**Description of Survey Instrument**

This author has been privileged to be a member of the advisory panel who helped develop the survey instrument that was used in this decade's comprehensive study of the American school superintendent. Dr. Luvern L. Cunningham, who was selected to undertake this project by the American Association of School Administrators, has been sensitive to the importance of replicating Carlson's work from its beginnings. The entire questionnaire used in the AASA study is enclosed as Appendix I of this proposal. Access to the raw data from this survey has been provided by Dr. Cunningham and indirectly by AASA.

The questionnaire was reviewed by two panels of distinguished educators, an ad hoc panel of Ohio administrators and Ohio State University educational administration faculty members, and the standing Committee for the Advancement of School Administration of AASA.

The survey instrument was mailed to a random sample of public school superintendents and was returned in the same manner. It is estimated that it took each respondent about fifty minutes to complete the questionnaire.
Description of the Sample

A stratified selected sample of American superintendents was used. The selection of the sample was determined with the help of the Educational Research Association, Washington D.C., and the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration of AASA. Details of the size of the sample and its breakdown by enrollment strata are given in Chapter 3.

In addition to the data obtained from the questionnaire, a follow-up telephone interview was conducted with six career-bound superintendents and six place-bound superintendents selected at random from the survey respondents. The purpose of these interviews was to enrich the data from the questionnaire. The interviews were conducted after the survey data had been analyzed and the interview protocol was developed to help formulate rationale for the conclusions reached by this study.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR ANALYZING THE DATA

Before dealing specifically with the techniques that were used to analyze the data, it should be mentioned, again, that this study used raw data generated for the current National Study of the American School Superintendent conducted under the direction of Dr. Luvern L.
Cunningham for the American Association of School Administrators and supported by the Spencer Foundation. This author was permitted to include certain questions in the survey instrument to facilitate the collection of data for this study, but in the main, the survey instrument was designed to provide new data for a soon-to-be published report on the American School Superintendent, similar to the report published ten years ago by AASA. This study did not use the data in the same manner as will the published report.

Data from the questionnaire was key-punched for computer processing. A separate program was written for the processing of the specific data for this study. Mean values were calculated for the variables of age, salary, and number of professional meetings attended for career-bound and place-bound superintendents. Modal values and frequency distributions were calculated for the other nominal data called for in the research hypotheses. Frequency distributions were run so that subtle differences in the data could be observed. In some cases, the stratification of the sample was preserved in order to permit comparisons between districts of different sizes. Since sufficient numbers of extreme place-bound and extreme career-bound superintendents were identified, these
categories were also compared on each research hypothesis. Data is displayed in appropriate tables and charts in Chapter 4.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Material for Carlson's original study was gathered in four ways: by case study in four school systems with new superintendents, by interviews with superintendents and school board members, by secondary analysis of various documents. This study used two techniques to gather data: a survey instrument with mainly closed-ended questions and a follow-up telephone interview with a very small sample size. Therefore, while the sample size for the study is larger than any used by Carlson, the open-endedness required to test some of his hypotheses was severely limited. For example, Carlson found that place-bound superintendents concentrate on old rules, while career-bound superintendents tend to develop larger numbers of new rules. To retest this hypothesis, a more open-ended

---

35 Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change, op. cit., p. 83.

36 Carlson, School Superintendents: Careers and Performance, op. cit., p. 95.
research method would be required. For this kind of reason, not all the hypotheses of Carlson's studies were replicated.

Another limitation results from the small number of interviews that were conducted. Because only twelve interviews were done, no generalizations were made based on the interviews alone. The interviews were made to provide a frame of reference for the remainder of the data gathered from the questionnaires.

It is hoped that, should disparities be found between the findings of this study and those earlier studies upon which it was modeled, that this would open other lines of inquiry for further researchers.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

For the Academic Field of Study

This study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on the superintendent, particularly in the area of superintendent succession. This is an area of study that was explored in some detail by Richard Carlson and others, but has lain dormant for nearly two decades. With the rapid changes taking place in the profession of the
superintendent and in education in general, the topic was worthy of re-investigation.

Furthermore, this study can serve as an example of how secondary analysis of data from one research effort can lead to contributions in an area with a substantially different focus. While AASA major studies have provided comprehensive updates on the status of the school superintendent, the reports of the studies have not attempted to determine relationships between the variables investigated. This study has.

For the Practitioner

Boards of education who employ superintendents as well as consultants who assist them in this task are very often faced with the choice of whether to promote from the inside or employ from the outside. This study has produced some findings that could impact upon this crucial decision. Superintendents themselves may find help as well in planning their careers.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The study is organized into five main chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introductory overview and conceptual design for attacking the problem. Chapter 2
is a review of the relevant literature. Chapter 3 outlines the methods and procedures for the collection of data, including a copy of the research instrument.

In Chapter 4, the findings are reported and the results are analyzed. The final chapter is devoted to arriving at conclusions and making recommendations based on the results.
Chapter II

A REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

While a great deal has been written about the superintendent and his role since the establishment of the first superintendency in Buffalo, New York, in 1837, empirical research on the career origins of the superintendent is limited in scope. An examination of such sources as the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), the Education Index, and Dissertation Abstract for the past several years yields a paucity of research and writing directly related to the career origin or the career path of the school superintendent. The key figure that appears in the limited research is Richard O. Carlson whose studies will be replicated to some degree in this study. The limitations of other research to support his findings serves to emphasize the significance and importance of this effort.

The review of the literature that follows is intended to be a representative overview of the literature which bears some direct relationship to this
study, it is by no means exhaustive. A conscious attempt has been made to focus this review on literature that deals specifically with the career origin or career path of the superintendent.

The first topic area to be covered in this chapter is the general literature on the career of the school superintendent; including the history of the school superintendency, profile studies of the superintendent, a look at the individual who is the superintendent, and some examples of other research methods used to study the chief school officer. In the latter section of the chapter the literature dealing specifically with career origin of the school superintendent is reviewed.

The Literature on the Career of the
School Superintendent

The career origin as part of the entire career of any single superintendent is somehow linked to all other superintendents that have gone before. Therefore, the history of the school superintendent becomes important to this study.

As the school organization became more complex, growing beyond the one-room school house, the need to
centralize the management function was felt. The superintendency of schools was created to fill this need. As indicated by Campbell and McPhee,

During our early history school management was a function performed by lay citizens. However, with the growth of cities and the merger of school districts within cities, the problems of school administration became too demanding for part-time, lay school board members. This led to the creation of the office of superintendent of schools.

While there is some discrepancy as to the place and time of the first superintendency, most authorities list Buffalo, New York, in 1837, as having the first city school superintendent. From this significant date, until the end of the nineteenth century considerable evolution took place in the role which the chief school administrator occupied. By the beginning of the twentieth century, school administration had become an identifiable profession.

One of the clearest expositions of this view was Cubberley's *Public School Administration* (1916).

vivid language the old-style ward boards and the large center school committees that perpetually meddled in the everyday administrative affairs of the schools, treating the early superintendents as clerks. He applauded the changes at the turn of the century which reduced the size of city school boards and introduced a new norm of board behavior, namely that the lay members should restrict themselves to "legislative functions" and turn the actual running of the schools over experts whom they employed as superintendents.

Thus was born the policy-administration dichotomy.

The next phase that the history of the superintendent went through was brought about by adapting the principals of scientific management, business principles, and similar concepts borrowed without much careful thought from the private sector of the economy. The classic description of this phase is found in Callahan's important study Education and the Cult of Efficiency, where he challenges the use of the scientific management principles and calls this period "an American tragedy." Callahan maintained that schoolmen emulated business to save their own skins.

---


39 Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency.
"Vulnerable to attack from the public and especially from their employers - the local school boards - superintendents adopted the lingo and practices of those with high status in the society - businessmen - and betrayed their earlier tradition of educational administrator as scholar-statesmen." Remnants of the over emphasis of scientific management doctrine remained until the end of World War II.

Overlapping the second phase was a third phase that emphasized human relations. The democratic approach, or the human relations movement became a major theme between the years of 1930 and 1950. The development of this theme may have been born out of the public's disenchantment with business leadership as the Great Depression took its toll. The training of school superintendents during these decades emphasized human relations skills.

An alternative interpretation of the history of the superintendency in the century before 1950 is offered by Tyack and Cummings who base their central argument on the following statements:

1. There have been significant changes in the external governance and internal organization of school systems; these alterations did much to transform the job of school superintendent.

2. The personal and social characteristic of superintendents have been relatively uniform, so far as we can determine, over the last hundred years and have probably been crucial determinants in the selection and performance of superintendents.

3. In comparison with political and organizational context and general social characteristics, formal training in educational administration has had marginal impact on the character of educational leadership.

The emphasis on the political and organizational contexts of the superintendency makes their view of the history of the position different than most others.

A fourth phase in the development of the superintendency began with the decade of the fifties. "The period opened as World War II ended. The national organizations of school administrators and the Kellogg Foundation combined with many universities to inaugurate an extensive examination of the superintendency and other administrative posts. The Russian 'Sputnik', huge government grants, the teacher organization movements, the civil rights movement, and an intense public interest in

\[\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 50\]
education all combined to create a new setting for education."\(^4\)\(^2\) Educational Administration: The Developing Decades\(^4\)\(^3\) is an entire volume devoted to this transitional period which continues to some extent today. As Goldhammer concludes:

Established to give some independent professional thought, judgment, and action to the overall needs of the schools, the superintendency is now greatly circumscribed by the forces internal and external to the schools. Designed as a position of educational leadership, it is now more significantly marked as a position of coordination and orchestration rather than one of independent leadership, although some new opportunities have yet to be fully explored or exploited. Regardless of its problems, the superintendency will persist.

Another way to examine the history of the school superintendent during the twentieth century is to review the data contained in the five profile studies of the superintendent conducted by the American Association of

\(^4\)\(^2\) Daniel E. Griffiths, The School Superintendent, pp. 22-3
\(^4\)\(^3\) Cunningham et. al., op. cit.
School Administrators. These studies, conducted each decade since 1923 with the exception of 1940-41 when World War II interfered with the research, contain statistical information that paints a unique portrait of the development and growth of this profession. (This study uses the raw data that will be presented in the 1981-82 study of the superintendent.) The aggregate information contained in these research efforts has been mainly untapped in terms of what it tells about the changes, over time, in the superintendency. Some examples of the information available in these studies are:

No single field can be cited as a breeding ground for school superintendents... The stereotype of the superintendent as a physical education undergraduate was discredited completely in prior studies as well.

In general, the superintendent of 1969-70 was more likely than his predecessors to have classroom teaching experience... The percentage

having teaching experience was 73.4 percent in 1921-22, rising to 88.1 percent in 1958-59 and 95.6 percent in 1969-70.

The 1958-59 AASA study of the superintendency challenged the commonly held notion that superintendents as a whole were a highly mobile group who changed positions frequently. The data collected in 1969-70 substantiated the findings of this earlier study and support the conclusion that the vast majority of superintendents confine their experience as chief administrators to two school districts.

Even the change in the name of the organization responsible for publishing the studies from the National Education Association, Department of Superintendence to the American Association of School Administrators has historical significance to the superintendent as well as to his professional association.

Other profiles of the superintendent have been formulated from questionnaire research. Stearns replicated the 1970 American Association of School Administrators study on a stratified random sample of Ohio superintendents. The findings on the Ohio superintendents were then compared to the AASA findings on superintendents nationwide ten years earlier. Among her

---

46 Knezevich, _op. cit._, pp. 25, 27, 39-40.

findings, she noted that "Ohio superintendents, contrary to many beliefs, do have first-hand knowledge of elementary or middle school classrooms, and in this respect they differ from their counterparts of ten years ago. The subjects taught by most Ohio superintendents in their first full-time educational position were basically courses within the elementary education field."\textsuperscript{48} She also found a decrease in the percentage of earned doctorates among Ohio superintendents when compared to the nationwide sample of the previous decade. A decrease in the length of the work week was also reported.

When asked to comment on their careers, most Ohio superintendents said they would, if given the choice, select the superintendency again. Superintendents ten years ago also selected the superintendency a second time, but by a wider margin than Ohio superintendents today. Ohio superintendents seem to be satisfied with their career choice, but they exhibited less enthusiasm for the superintendency than did superintendents ten years ago.\textsuperscript{49}

The professional association of the superintendent at the state level, as well as at the national level, also has a keen interest in a profile of its membership.

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., pp. 5-6.
\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., p. 8.
As an example, the Buckeye Association of School Administrators, the Ohio affiliate of AASA, annually surveys its members and reports the results to these superintendents.\textsuperscript{50} Besides demographic data on the superintendent, these reports concentrate heavily on comparing salaries and fringe benefits.

Another method to learn about the superintendency is to take a close look at the human being who fills that position. Two works are classics in this endeavor. The first is Frank E. Spaulding’s autobiography.\textsuperscript{15} The second is Cuban’s biographical study of three large city superintendents.\textsuperscript{52}

Spaulding’s autobiography is unique, in that almost nothing in the work deals with his tenure as a school superintendent. The entire volume presents a sensitive look at how the educational philosophy of a true giant in the profession was nurtured. In his words, "My philosophy began to take shape not later than ten by the kitchen clock, in the morning of the 30th day of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50}"1981 Profile of the BASA Member," Buckeye Association of School Administrators, 1981.
\item \textsuperscript{51}Frank E. Spaulding, One School Administrators Philosophy: Its Development.
\item \textsuperscript{52}Cuban, \textit{op. cit.}\
\end{itemize}
November 1866. At least that is the time when visible environment began to act on me. I do not clearly remember, but I think it a safe assumption that I began promptly to react on that environment, both visibly and audibly.  

The book then traces the first twenty years of Spaulding's life; from his early years in Dublin, New Hampshire, through his post doctoral studies at Clark University following the earning of his Ph.D. at Leipzig, Germany. The book is Spaulding's personal account of what led him to become a successful school superintendent in five cities ranging in population from eight thousand to eight hundred thousand (definitely a career-bound superintendent) where he constantly made practical applications of the philosophic concepts he describes.

Cuban's study of three successful large city superintendents grew out of his belief that an effective superintendent can make a qualitative difference in urban education. He picked three chief school officers who were both respected by their colleagues and also

were under tremendous pressure on their jobs. Chicago's Benjamin C. Willis was facing both a desegregation controversy and the furor over an independent evaluation. In Washington D.C., Carl Hansen also faced desegregation and federally funded efforts to change the public schools. Harold Spears, the superintendent of San Francisco was faced with a curricular fracas triggered by Sputnik and, in common with the others, a concerted drive to desegregate his schools. Cuban examines each superintendent and his situation separately and then compares and contrasts the three men, the three political contexts, school organization, and pressure groups that surround them. (Of particular interest to this study is the fact that all three of these men were career-bound.)

In attempting to draw conclusions from his study of these three superintendents, Cuban says:

A superintendent, then, is not likely to be a man for all seasons. Respected professionals to friends and stubborn autocrats to critics, Carl Hansen, Benjamin Willis, and Harold Spears could not easily adjust to the radical changes which confronted them - although there were differences in adjustment among the three. The times, the local political context, and the dominant conception of leadership may well determine
whether a schoolman can do an effective job or not. There are fall, summer, spring, and winter superintendents - but none for all seasons.\(^5^4\)

Where Cuban used a biographical approach to study and report on three successful superintendents, other scholars have sought to find the attributes of the successful chief school administrator using other research methodology.

Wilson used a jury method to identify successful superintendents and then interviewed these men to find out if there are identifiable special characteristics and talents common to successful school superintendents.\(^5^5\) His jury, whose task it was to identify the sample, was the key to his research. He used a twelve member panel which included seven professors of educational administration and five other individuals whose administrative jobs brought them into constant association with most superintendents in the state he chose to use as his universe. The ratings of this panel produced

\(^{5^4}\) Cuban, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

"most successful" superintendents who were then the subject of the research effort.

Using the results of the interviews of these 16 superintendents, Wilson built a profile of a most successful superintendent. The profile includes some demographic descriptors like, "He is male, Anglo-Saxon, protestant, usually Republican, and of upper middle age. . . . His salary is $2,900 higher than his colleagues who head school districts of similar size. . . . He is married and has three children."\(^{56}\) In terms of his career origin, the successful superintendent was career-bound, but not extremely career-bound. Some of the major descriptors that Wilson found were that the successful superintendent is:

- a human relations expert
- a highly moral person with "inordinate integrity"
- a regular voter but not deeply involved in partisan politics
- self confident and a risk taker

\(^{56}\)Ibid., p. 31.
- may be identified as a "liberal conservative"
  - slightly to the left.\textsuperscript{57}

Based on his research, Wilson also offered some tips to the "Aspiring Successful Superintendent" including advice on where to seek an advanced degree; how to deal with boards of education, students, staff, and community; and the career path that is most appropriate.

In a sequel to his work on the "successful" superintendent, Wilson examined another group of superintendents whose contracts were either not renewed by their board of education, or who experienced enough pressure from their boards that they retired, left the superintendency all together, or resigned to seek a different locale from which to work. Wilson called this sample, the "untracked" superintendent.\textsuperscript{58} The ten superintendents in this sample were selected after reviewing forty cases of superintendent turnover. Wilson was fairly certain that these persons, who he then studied, were pressured into leaving their jobs. As in his

\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., pp. 32-33.

\textsuperscript{58}Robert E. Wilson, "The Untracked School Superintendent. . . And Why," The Administrator, IX (Number 2, 1980).
previous work, Wilson then developed a profile of the untracked superintendent. In his conclusions, Wilson found:

1. There is very little difference in the background of the untracked superintendents and the most successful superintendents.

2. There is minimal difference in the personal characteristics between the untracked superintendents and the most successful superintendents.

3. The type of community in which a superintendent is serving does make some difference in the prospects for his success.

4. Regular and formal evaluation of the superintendent's performance by the board is a crucial factor in avoiding untracking.

5. There is no common pattern to the reasons for untracking a superintendent.

6. Becoming untracked may distract a superintendent from his career path, but does not deter him or her from pursuing success as a school administrator, including the superintendency.

Wilson does link the two studies by providing another set of recommendations to "Aspiring Successful Superintendents" based on the studies of the two categories of superintendents.

Typical of the other literature that offers advice on what makes a successful superintendent is that

59 Ibid., p. 29.
offered by Zorn who remarks, tongue-in-cheek: "The traits of a good superintendent can be described as one possessing: the courage of a lion, the eyes of an eagle, the cunningness of a fox, the swiftness of a gazelle, the stomach of a goat, the wisdom of an owl, the hide of an elephant, the loyalty of a Saint Bernard, and the nine lives of a cat." Unfortunately, the serious treatment of the issue is every bit as useless.

A variation on the idea of using a specific sample of superintendents was applied by Harris who interviewed all the superintendents in the state of Ohio who had twenty-five years or more of service in the chief administrator post. The study focused on the changing role of the superintendent over a quarter-century period. Harris found that significant changes did take place including a shift from the superintendent as a specialist to a coordinator of specialists, an increase in shared governance, an increasing concern over inter-organizational contact, and an increase in external pressure on the superintendent and the school system.

---


61 Harris, op. cit.
Pitner used anthropological methodology in studying the superintendents. She used observation and recording of descriptive data, structured interview guides, and a review of written records as she shadowed three suburban school superintendents in order to learn what their day-to-day jobs were like. She found that the superintendents' world is centered on verbal communications and that his activities are generally brief and fragmented. Time is an enemy of the chief school administrator and much of it is spent acquiring information, according to this study. "Much of the activity of superintendents is mundane (inconsequential) never approaching the lofty ideals of leadership. They spend a considerable portion of their time talking with insiders about minor things, making trivial decisions, holding meetings on unimportant agendas, and responding to the little irritants in organizational life." On a more positive note, superintendents in this study were

---


63 Ibid., p. 169.
found to be able to reduce uncertainty for organiza-
tional members and to assist them in making an often-
times irrational system appear to have some rationality.
Pitner did not attempt to evaluate the three superin-
tendents that she observed however, the success and path
of their careers is certainly affected by the day-to-day
operations that she captured in her study.

While Pitner studied the superintendents as an
anthropologist might, Ogawa chose to use a sociologist's
framework. He describes the occupational "ethos" of the
superintendent in much the same way that Daniel Lortie
described the ethos of the classroom teacher in his
book. In defining his terms, Ogawa states,

... ethos might be defined as a culturally
standardized system of emotions which give
meaning to things, a meaning which serves as a
basis for action and which is derived by indi-
viduals from social interactions in relation to
things. Transposing this definition of ethos to
an occupational context, occupational ethos
might be defined as: An occupationally
standardized system of emotions which give mean-
ing to things based upon social interactions in
relation to those things, a meaning which serves
as a basis for occupation member's action.

64 Daniel Lortie, School Teacher: A Sociological
Study.

65 Rodney Takashi Ogawa, "A Descriptive Investiga-
tion of the Occupational Ethos of School Superinten-
dents" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State
University, 1979), p. 8.
He examined two factors in order to describe the occupational ethos of the American school superintendent, the structures which develop and sustain the occupation and superintendents' descriptions of their work in order to determine the meanings and sentiments of their work. Under the factor of structure Ogawa studied recruitment, the socialization process of becoming a superintendent, the reward structure of the occupation, typical tasks of the position, and the evaluation component of the job. Under the second factor, Ogawa found "...that superintendents attach meanings and sentiments to: (1) the total social system of which a school system is a part, as their work arena, (2) uncertainty and its management, (3) organizational movement, and (4) the structural aspects of a school system."

His intense study of the twenty school superintendents led Ogawa to finally describe their ethos as follows:

Thus, four basic elements of the occupational ethos of school superintendents are: (1) concern for the total social system of which school systems are a part, (2) the accommodation of uncertainty, (3) an emphasis on movement, and (4) attention to structure."

66 Ibid., p. 281.
67 Ibid., p. 282.
The final part of this section will deal with the notion of sponsorship or mentoring. The career path of a school superintendent may be affected by others, either inside the profession or very close to it. Two studies, one by Tieman and one by Rose, attempted to determine how important the mentoring or sponsorship phenomenon is in the career of a school superintendent.

Tieman focused his study on the use of consultants who help boards of education recruit and select superintendents. His population included the public school systems of Ohio and Illinois in the 1966-67 school year. Out of 239 cases of superintendent turnover, Tieman found that consultants were used 52 times, a percentage of 22.1. He determined that "Narrative comments from the consultants and board members about the consultantship revealed that board members saw great value in the consultants as a public relations device and as a means for developing a working relationship with the university community. The consultants felt that a major

---

outcome of their influence would be the ultimate selection of better superintendents. . ."69

The implications for the career of the superintendents wishing to be selected is that the most common role of the consultant, according to Tieman, was to recommend applicants for final interviews. Therefore, a board of education normally saw only five candidates out of the entire pool of applicants. The consultant, then, could be a block in the path of a career-bound superintendent or could be a scapegoat in denying the promotion of a place-bound superintendent. Tieman does, however, indicate that this problem is resolved by the agreement between the board of education and the consultant as to the desired qualifications of the candidates.

Rose's study expands on the use of consultants to what he calls "sponsorship."70

Sponsorship refers to the active intervention of established persons associated with or members of the educational administration profession in the career lines of selected individuals who aspire to be or are public school superintendents. Such intervention is designed to enhance the career progress of the selected

69Ibid., pp. 171-2.
70Rose, op. cit.
individuals as they pursue a career in the public school superintendency. A synonym for sponsor would be mentor.

Rose gathered the data for his research in interview sessions with established members of the educational administration profession identified as knowledgeable about the sponsorship of public school superintendents and with public school superintendents identified as recipients of career support through sponsorship. He found that the career progress of most of the superintendents in his study was related in some degree to the support of a sponsor or sponsors. These sponsors were identified as established members of the profession who were usually professors in administrative training programs and "who take an active interest in the future of newcomers to the profession and who consider assisting talented newcomers in their career progress a professional obligation." 72

Rose found that the informants in his study were generally favorable to the sponsorship notion. They felt that the sponsorship of superintendents was both

71 Ibid., p. 6.
72 Ibid., p. 121.
positive and beneficial to all parts of the public school system. Rose does, however, raise the concern over the "inner fraternity" or "old-boy network" that has more negative connotations. To this idea he replies, "The data in this study are not sufficient to establish categorically the existence of such an organization in educational administration. However, there is some evidence suggesting that such an organization or organizations may be a reality."\textsuperscript{73}

This portion of the review of the literature has examined writings that treat the general topic of the career of the school superintendent. Researchers and scholars have looked at the chief school officer through the eyes of a historian, an anthropologist, a sociologist, a statistician, and a biographer. The focus of this chapter will now sharpen to look at the literature dealing specifically with the career origin of the school superintendent.

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., p. 130
The Literature on Career Origin

When a vacancy occurs in a key organizational position, those responsible for selecting a successor often must make a decision sometime during the selection process whether to fill that position by promotion from within the organization or by selection of someone from outside. Looking at the other perspective, two courses of action are open to the person striving to advance in his career: one is to wait until the opportunity comes to him, and the other is to chase the position across organizational boundaries.

Many different terms have been applied to the two categories of career origin. Hughes wrote of the "itinerant" and the "home guard" in the medical field.\textsuperscript{74} Gouldner identified differences in attitudes between "cosmopolitan" and "local" roles.\textsuperscript{75} And as previously mentioned, Carlson has done extensive research on "career-bound" and "place-bound" superintendents.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{74}Hughes, \textit{op. cit.} p. 21-5.
\textsuperscript{75}Gouldner, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 281-306; and pp. 444-80.
\textsuperscript{76}Carlson, \textit{School Superintendents: Careers and Performance}, \textit{op. cit.}
It is apparent that despite the use of a variety of labels, career origin may be viewed as a dichotomous variable; the "insider" and the "outsider."

Gouldner, in his pioneering writing about the latent social roles among the faculty of a small college, coined the terms "locals" and "cosmopolitans." The terms were defined as follows: locals are "those high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation"; cosmopolitans are "those low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an outer group orientation."\(^{77}\)

Sergiovanni and Carver use Gouldner's terms in an educational setting to describe school employees.

In educational terms, three variables are used to distinguish between individuals with one orientation or the other: (1) loyalty to the school, (2) commitment to one's specialization or to one's professional skills, and (3) reference group orientation. Cosmopolitans are described as low in loyalty to the employing school, high on commitment to specialized professional skills, and likely to identify with an outside reference group. Locals, on the

\(^{77}\)Gouldner, \textit{loc. cit.}
other hand, are those high in loyalty to the employing school, low in commitment to specialized professional skills, and likely to identify with an inner reference group.78 These authors point to the dangers of being too rigorous with the categorization. Their caution is worth repeating because it certainly applies to this study.

Stereotyping, then, is not unlike an ideal framework and suffers from some of its faults—that is, although a general class of phenomena is described, the framework fails to describe any one specific case. However, while we recognize the risks of stereotyping (including the dangers of inaccuracy, prejudice, disapproval, and the like) we will trust in the intelligence of the reader as we indulge in some stereotyping which is useful in explaining behavior.

Finally, Sergiovanni and Carver provide a rationale for the importance of using the dichotomy. They postulate that a school would have problems if it was staffed entirely with people who were either all locals or all cosmopolitans. They feel that the local orientation provides the cement that holds together the foundation of the school enterprise, while the cosmopolitan orientation offers the school the needed transfusion which keeps it up-to-date on educational change. "Those who seek administrative effectiveness will need to

79 Ibid.
concern themselves with a proper balance between the
two by providing sufficient opportunity for expressing
both these orientations as well as meaningful rewards
for expression of each."80

Richard O. Carlson, in one of his series of studies
on career patterns of school superintendents, studied
the commitments of Oregon superintendents to advanced
preparation for their position, a factor that related to
the commitment to specialized role skills studied by
Gouldner.81 He found that career-bound superintendents
(cosmopolitans) tended to hold higher degrees than place-
bound superintendents. In another study, he showed that
these career-bound school heads tended to pursue their
degrees at more prestigious graduate schools, and to
complete their advanced formal education at a younger
age than place-bound men (locals).82

80 Ibid., p. 96.
81 Richard O. Carlson, "Career and Place Bound
School Superintendents: Some Sociological Differences.
A Project Report." (Eugene: Center for the Advanced
Study of Educational Administration, Oregon University,
82 Carlson, School Superintendents: Careers and Per-
formance, op. cit., pp. 51-3.
Carlson also studied the reference-group orientations of career-bound and place-bound superintendents. Place-bound superintendents showed similar characteristics to Gouldner's locals while career-bound superintendents showed no distinct inner or outer reference groups.

A comparison of Carlson's and Gouldner's work shows striking similarities between locals and place-bound superintendents, and between cosmopolitans and career-bound superintendents. These similarities lead to the conclusion that career-bound and place-bound superintendents (outsiders and insiders) differ according to the cosmopolitan-local dichotomy.

Another way to view the dichotomy is to use a model developed by Tausky and Dubin called the Career Anchorages model. A rising executive who is motivated to seek the top, and who will not be satisfied until he reaches it, is said to be upward-anchored. The downward-anchored superintendent, on the other hand, although he may have reached the same organizational


84 Wolf, op. cit., p. 65.

level as his counterpart, is said to be motivated only by a desire to go as far as luck and his abilities will take him. He judges his success in terms of how far he has come, not how far he must go.

One of Carlson's advisers, Robert Rose, attempted to relate the anchorage points to the career-bound, place-bound dichotomy and failed to find a significant relationship. The study did find, however, that 75 percent of the superintendents who were studied were downward anchored. 86

Carlson also looked at personal history as one possible variable to explain the differences between insiders and outsiders. On the assumption that career-bound and place-bound superintendents might have had differences in their personal background that would help account for attitudinal and personality differences, he investigated a sample of 83 Oregon superintendents. 87 Data was collected about the number of times each subjects' family had moved during childhood, the number of high schools and college activities


participated in, and the number of organizational memberships held. Career-bound superintendents surpassed place-bound superintendents in number of moves, activities, and memberships. The differences were significant at the .05 level of significance.

In the same study, Carlson collected data about certain psychological differences between the two career orientations. Measurements were made of attitudes toward retirement, inferiority feelings felt in childhood, vocational interests, values, scores on the California Psychological Inventory, and attitudes toward self as measured by the Adjective Check List. Only the measures of childhood inferiority feelings and the results of the Adjective Check List showed any significant results. Place-bound superintendents reported significantly more feelings of inferiority in childhood than career-bound superintendents. On the Adjective Check List, career-bound superintendents reported themselves as being confident, spontaneous, optimistic, suggestible, idealistic, wise, poised, and progressive more often, to a significant degree, than

---
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those superintendents in the place-bound sample. These place-bound administrators described themselves as silent significantly more often than the career-bound sample.

Beyond these attitudinal, psychological, and personal differences, the conditions of employment differ for insiders and outsiders. One of the chief differences is the expectation that the employing board has for the superintendent.

When school board members are dissatisfied with the performance of the school system, they hire a career-bound superintendent; they go outside the district for new leadership. The conditions of employment, in part, indicate that school board members will be satisfied if the place-bound man maintains the status quo, but they expect and are only satisfied with a career-bound man when changes are made. School boards, then, hope for a creative performance from a career-bound man, but are happy with a stabilizing performance from a place-bound man.

Carlson also performed secondary analysis of data from two superintendent studies, one in Massachusetts and one in Illinois. Both studies showed that career-bound superintendents more frequently than place-bound superintendents receive a mandate from the employing board.

---
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school board. In other words, career-bound superintendents more often perceive that their employment is based on the fact that the board of education wants some improvements made or some specific action taken for which they are qualified. Place-bound superintendents have the idea that they are employed to maintain the status quo or that their personal characteristics got them hired.

Going outside the district for new leadership can have an effect on the board's satisfaction with the superintendent. Outsiders may have an advantage over insiders in board satisfaction from the moment of hiring. In a study of hiring practices in New York State, the only significant variable affecting school board's satisfaction with their new superintendents was the geographical area covered in the search for them. The authors concluded that it "virtually constitutes an axiom -- the wider the geographic selection base, the better the chance of making a good selection." One is reminded of the old saying that

90Ibid., pp. 82-3.
92Ibid., p. 33.
experts always come from at least 50 miles away. Unfortunately, the investigators found, only 25 percent of the school boards had searched outside the state, and more than half had confined their search to a specific region of the state.

Jones postulates another reason why boards look outside for a new chief administrator. In his article dealing with the vanishing SUPERintendent he describes several kinds of "Kryptonite" that can harm a SUPERintendent.

It is probable that even SUPERintendents overlook instances of administrative inefficiency from time to time because their longtime cronies might get burned by any top-down action to clean it up.

It is this latter type of Kryptonite, this unwillingness on the part of many great leaders to clean their own houses, that prompts many school boards to look outside their school systems for SUPERintendents. Sometimes this works, and a SUPERintendent in one city is able to SUPERintend in another.

In addition to differences in the reasons for hiring insiders and outsiders, the terms of their employ-

---
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ment were shown to differ. Carlson's research has shown that career- and place-bound superintendents tended to differ in starting salaries. "Regarding salary paid, it is clear that career-bound superintendents are the favored type." Career-bound superintendents command from $1,000 to $5,000 more a year than place-bound superintendents when beginning salaries are compared and place-bound superintendents do not catch up.

Carlson, in the same research, reported that place-bound men have longer tenure and that career-bound men have higher levels of prestige among fellow superintendents.

Given that the literature seems to support the notion that there are both personality and job expectation differences between insiders and outsiders, it could be hypothesized that performance on the job also varies along the same dichotomy. The literature seems to support this speculation.

Carlson found that although all new superintendents tend to be preoccupied with rules, their preoccupation

---
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varies along career-bound, place-bound lines. Place-bound superintendents were found to concentrate on old rules; publicizing and reinforcing them. On the other hand, career-bound superintendents devoted most of their rule-making activity to filling the gaps between the old rules or replacing them.

In analyzing secondary data from Deprin, Carlson found that both types of successors develop new rules, but career-bound men do so more frequently. "In a sample of five of each kind of superintendent, the career-bound men exhibited a mean of about 45 rules in the first two years of office and the place-bound men exhibited a mean of about 29 rules over the same period of time." 99

While both types of successors use rules, they differ in the type of rules made and the functional significance of the rule.

For the stranger, the outsider, rules serve to establish his identity, and to compensate for his lack of influence in the informal organization. For the insider, the rules he makes or enforces have the function of serving notice on the other staff members that he is now the man in charge. Rules may also be relied upon by the insider to overcome doubts about the legitimacy

---
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of his promotion, especially among his rivals for the position.

The different purposes served by rules as well as the type of rules made may have an effect on the organizational climate of the school district. Hall studied the variables of climate, length of tenure, and successor origin and came up with the following conclusions paraphrased as follows. 101

(1) Career-bound superintendents of short tenure tended to have schools with more open climates.

(2) Place-bound superintendents of short tenure tended to have schools with more closed climates.

(3) Career-bound superintendents of short tenure and place-bound men of long tenure were both viewed as being more sympathetic, thoughtful, and considerate.

(4) Career-bound superintendents, when compared to place-bound leaders, had programs and schools

100 Wolf, op. cit., p. 76.

viewed by their staffs as more adaptable, dynamic, individualistic and imaginative.

(5) Schools headed by place-bound chief executives were viewed as more stable, thorough, basic, reliable, disciplined, conservative, and conventional, whereas schools with a career-bound superintendent were viewed as more adaptable and forward looking.

(6) Long tenure superintendents were viewed as more cautious; staffs viewed short tenure superintendents as more imaginative.

Insiders and outsiders have also been found to adopt educational innovations at different rates. In one study, career-bound superintendents were found to have adopted innovations in math curriculum at a significantly faster rate than their place-bound counterparts. The research reported:

Modern math was first accepted by a career-bound superintendent, and over one-fifth of the career-bound men adopted the innovation before it was adopted by a place-bound superintendent. By 1960 about one-half of the career-bound superintendents had adopted modern math compared to 20 per cent of the place-bound sample.

\[102\] Carlson, School Superintendents: Careers and Performance, op. cit., p. 129.
In the same study, superintendents were asked about five other educational innovations: language labs, team teaching, programmed instruction, foreign language instruction in the elementary grades, and accelerated programs in secondary education. In all cases, career-bound superintendents had a significantly higher rate of adopting the innovation.103 A study by Reynolds of school systems in Illinois and Missouri comes to the same conclusion. "The mean innovativeness ratio for the 45 place-bound men was .0896 and was .1283 for the 49 career-bound men. The difference in the innovativeness scores produced an F-ratio of 18.15, significant at the .01 level on a one-tail test."104

The review of the literature on executive origin to this point shows that the insider - outsider dichotomy may be viewed as a useful conceptual tool for understanding observed differences in role incumbents. There is, however, a modest amount of literature that indicates that this tool may not be as valuable as the literature

103 Ibid., pp. 130-1.
presented up to this point seems to imply. This conflicting literature will be reviewed next.

Leland Wolf did a study of Iowa public school superintendents.¹⁰⁵ Five variables were analyzed in the study. They were years in present position, age at first superintendency, Structure score, Consideration score, and total Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire score. The latter three variables were determined from the LBDQ.¹⁰⁶ Some of his conclusions support the idea of a career origin dichotomy and agree with earlier research. Other of his conclusions find no significant differences between the successor types. His conclusions are paraphrased as follows:

¹⁰⁵Wolf, op. cit.

¹⁰⁶The LBDQ, an instrument developed for The Ohio State Leadership Studies measures two aspects of a leaders behavior, called Initiating Structure and Consideration. Initiating Structure refers to the actions of the leader in delineating the relationship between accomplished tasks. Consideration behaviors are those directed toward warmth, respect, and mutual understanding between the leader and his subordinates. Effective leaders were found in the literature to score high on both dimensions. The instrument is designed to be used by subordinates to rate the frequency with which their leaders engage in the behaviors described in the questionnaire.
(1) Place-bound superintendents wait longer for promotion than career-bound men, and stay longer in their superintendencies.

(2) No significant difference was found in sub-test and total test scores of the LBDQ between successor types.

(3) Length of time in office adversely affects administrative subordinates' perceptions of their superintendents' leader behavior, especially Structure.

(4) Age at first superintendency has no appreciable relationship to leader behavior scores.

(5) The frequency of occurrence of place-boundedness is directly related to school district sizes; the larger the school district the greater percentage of superintendents who were place-bound.

(6) The high school principalship is the main route to the superintendency for place-bound men, career-bound men move to the superintendency from the high school principalship about half the time.

(7) The smallest schools may serve as the training ground for career-bound superintendents.
Wolf had reasoned that, "if career- and place-bound superintendents were found to differ from each other in leader behaviors, the results of this study would be of interest to all concerned with educational leadership and would serve as useful input for their decisions." He did not, however, find any significant difference.

A second study that appears to refute the importance given to the successor dichotomy is a longitudinal study of Wisconsin superintendents by March and March. They studied the careers of the school leaders in their sample from 1940 through 1972, and examined the extent to which statistical characteristics of that system were consistent with a statistical model that assumes both individuals and jobs to be indistinguishable and careers at that level to be essentially random. Apparently reacting to the large amount of literature on the subject of careers in educational administration during the late 60's and early 70's, they said in the introduction to their study:

108 March and March, op. cit.,
Much of the literature on careers in educational administration, like the literature on careers in other managing fields, seeks to explain variations in career and chronologies as necessary consequences of personal, temporal, or organizational factors. Individuals with long careers are characteristically described as having properties that produce long careers; organizations with high turnover are characteristically described as having properties that produce high turnover. The events of some time periods are seen as conducive to long careers, other times to short ones. The result is that there is considerable lore and some data about what kind of administrators succeed - have long careers - when, and what kinds of districts are attractive - have low turnover - to whom.\textsuperscript{109}

It was, however, March and March's contention that this was not the case, that variations in careers and chronologies are "chance fluctuations in a probabilistically invariant world."\textsuperscript{110}

The results of their study indicate that the sample that they studied; Wisconsin school districts, superintendents, and superintendencies; was nearly, but not entirely random. The deviations from randomness appeared to be due primarily to the differences among the job settings (school districts), rather than to differences among individuals. The results, then, were consistent with the original speculation that most superintendents

\textsuperscript{109}Ibid., p. 378.
\textsuperscript{110}Ibid.
are indistinguishable from one another in their behaviors, performances, abilities and values. These results prompted the authors to remark:

The fact that careers are almost random does not make performance in those careers socially irrelevant, any more than the fact that a group of light bulbs are indistinguishable in their illumination or life expectancy makes the light they give unwanted. Nor does it indicate that efforts to improve the training and selection of educational administrators are useless. The normative lesson is much narrower. It is that the same behaviors, abilities, and values that produce successful careers at the top will, on the average, produce unsuccessful ones also; that little can be learned about how to administer schools by studying successful high-level administrators that could not be learned by studying unsuccessful ones; and that the stories we tell each other about success and failure in top management . . . are in large part fictions intended to reassure us about justice and encourage the young.  

The studies and literature reviewed in this section have dealt with the dichotomy of career origin; whether called insider, local, or place-bound, as opposed to outsider, cosmopolitan, or career-bound; and the usefulness of this dichotomy to explore differences in the man who holds the top administrative position in the school organization. Many studies have found this a valuable construct. On the other hand, two studies do indicate

that questions may exist in the weight of importance given to the idea of successor origin.

Another fact about the literature reviewed here is that it centers around the time period of one decade, the sixties. There was an apparent interest in the topic of career origin at that time, probably stimulated by the studies of Richard O. Carlson. Then the interest diminished.

Both of these factors, the inconsistencies in research interpretations and the necessity to update the research surrounding the issue, provide rationale for the current study.

**Summary**

The first section of this chapter deals with the general elements that impact upon the career of the superintendent. The rich history of profession of the school superintendent has certainly affected each person who has entered this career. Profile studies provide a quantitative picture of the development of the profession over the last sixty years while portraits of its greatest heroes, like Spaulding, Willis, Hansen, and Spears fill in the qualitative side. Composites of successful superintendents and those who are "untracked"
also help determine the career path of a chief school executive.

The use of varied research methods helps to gain an insight into the superintendency as demonstrated by Pitner and Ogawa who used the anthropological and sociological approaches respectively.

And, finally, the career of the superintendent may be affected by those significant others that are referred to as mentors or sponsors.

The main literature upon which this study is based is that dealing with the career origin of an executive. Two points of origin were discerned for executives appointed to office. Those appointed from within the organization were considered "insiders"; those elected from outside the formal organization were thought of as "outsiders." The insider – outsider dichotomy was found in several studies of executive succession, although different terms were applied to the categories. Insiders have been variously termed as home guard, locals, and place-bound; whereas outsiders have been tagged as itinerants, cosmopolitans, and career-bound.

Most of the studies reviewed in the second part of this chapter showed that the insider – outsider classification was useful in explaining differences in the
personalities, job expectations, and performance of successors. Two studies, however, somewhat refuted the importance of the concept. Many of the studies were the work of one man, Richard O. Carlson, whose thinking has greatly influenced this study.

It is upon this scholarly foundation that this current study is built.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This chapter will detail the methods used to collect and process the data that are reported in Chapter 4. Because this study uses data from a comprehensive study of the American public school superintendent, the methodology of this study and of that larger effort are the same in many respects. Since the author of this study was involved in the major study from its beginings, it seems appropriate to report on the methodology of the major study in this work.

SURVEY DATA COLLECTION

As mentioned in Chapter 2, The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and its parent organization have sponsored major studies of the superintendent in each decade since the 1920's, with the exception of the World War II decade of the 1940's. The major study from which the secondary analysis of data was obtained for this research effort was undertaken in order to develop a comprehensive and reliable assessment of the American public school superintendent in a similar manner to the five earlier studies. In order to
accomplish this task, AASA sent out a Request for Proposals in late 1980. The Spencer Foundation agreed to provide funding for the project and Luvern L. Cunningham, Novice G. Fawcett, Professor of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University was appointed as principal researcher. The present writer was invited to assist in the project with a research team composed of two other Ohio State University Faculty members and three other graduate students. The project officially began in July, 1981.

From this point on, the study progressed through the six "Stages of the Survey Process" as identified by Weisberg and Bowen. These stages of survey design and data collection are: "Statement of study objectives, Preparation of study design, Sampling—choosing people to be interviewed, Questionnaire construction and pretesting, Interviewing, and Coding—categorizing the responses." Each stage will be explained in terms of the AASA study.

The first two stages, statement of study objectives and preparation of study design, were greatly influenced
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by the historical background of the study. The objective of the study was to provide an update on the characteristics of the superintendent and his role as chief public school administrator at the beginning of a new decade. The study design had previously used mail questionnaires and because of the desire to gather a considerable amount of data from superintendents all over the United States in the most economical manner, the study design was not changed.

The universe for the sample was 15,217 American public school superintendents. The size of the sample was recommended by the Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C. and the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration of AASA. Table I shows the size of the universe and the size of the sample. It should be noted that the sample was derived from a universe of all public school systems, and was not restricted to those belonging to AASA or any other professional association. The sample was stratified into five major categories, four of which are appropriate for this study:

Group A - superintendents employed in school districts with pupil enrollments of 25,000 or more.
Group B - superintendents serving in school districts with pupil enrollments ranging from 3,000 to 24,999

Group C - superintendents employed in districts with pupil enrollments ranging from 300 to 2,999

Group D - superintendents in districts with fewer than 300 pupils

Group E, consisting of chief school administrators of intermediate school districts including county school districts, joint vocational schools, educational service units and similar districts known by a wide variety of titles, were sampled, but not used in this study.

The five major strata were sub-divided to provide the opportunity for even more detailed analysis of data according to district size. Table I shows these subdivisions.

Considerable time and effort was spent on the fourth stage, questionnaire construction and pretesting.

The framework for the new questionnaire was the instrument used in the 1969-70 study. The primary focus was on maintaining comparability with that and earlier studies while accommodating new questions of both contemporary value and those of interest to the members of the research team. Two committees, one ad hoc and one, The Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (C.A.S.A.), reviewed and pretested the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Enrollment Classification</th>
<th>Number in Universe</th>
<th>Percent of Total Superintendents</th>
<th>Number Sampled</th>
<th>Percent Sampled in Each Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: 25,000 or more enrolled</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1: 100,000 or more enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2: 50,000 to 99,999 pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3: 25,000 to 49,999 pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: 3,000 to 24,999 pupils</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1: 10,000 to 24,999 pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2: 5,000 to 9,999 pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3: 3,000 to 4,994 pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C: 300 to 2,999 pupils</td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1: 1,000 to 2,999 pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2: 300 to 999 pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D: less than 300 enrolled</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>14,260</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
questionnaire at various stages in its development and provided valuable assistance and advice. The final product of this stage is presented in Appendix A of this study.

The next stage, the actual collection of the responses, was accomplished via the mails. Responses were received from almost one in every ten superintendents in America. The response rates for the various strata are shown in Table II. Groups A, B, and C all had very high response rates of approximately 60 percent. Group D's rate was lower, but still at the acceptable level of 40 percent. These response rates are significantly higher than the 15 or 20 percent return rates normally expected in questionnaire research. These favorable return rates can very likely be explained by Selltiz, who said:

There are many factors that influence the percentage of returns to a questionnaire. Among the most important are: (1) the sponsorship of the questionnaire; (2) the attractiveness of the questionnaire format; (3) the length of the questionnaire; (4) the nature of the accompanying letter requesting cooperation; (5) the ease of filling out the questionnaire and mailing it back; (6) the nature of the people to whom the questionnaire is sent.114

### Table 2
RESPONSE RATES OF SUPERINTENDENTS SAMPLED IN 1981-82
AASA STUDY BY ENROLLMENT STRATA

| Pupil Enrollment Classification | Number Sampled | Number Returning Questionnaires | Percent Returning Questionnaires |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------
| Group A: 25,000 or more enrolled | 189 | 113 | 59.8% |
| A-1: 100,000 or more enrolled | | | |
| A-2: 50,000 to 99,999 pupils | | | |
| A-3: 25,000 to 49,999 pupils | | | |
| Group B: 3,000 to 24,999 pupils | 698 | 403 | 57.7% |
| B-1: 10,000 to 24,999 pupils | | | |
| B-2: 5,000 to 9,999 pupils | | | |
| B-3: 3,000 to 4,999 pupils | | | |
| Group C: 300 to 2,999 pupils | 892 | 593 | 66.5% |
| C-1: 1,000 to 2,999 pupils | | | |
| C-2: 300 to 999 pupils | | | |
| Group D: less than 300 enrolled | 563 | 230 | 40.6% |
| Totals: | 2,342 | 1339 | 57.1% |
The AASA questionnaire, while of such length that it took nearly an hour to complete, was professionally prepared and was endorsed by AASA, a widely respected professional association. A return, postage-paid, envelope was included with the questionnaire. In addition, the superintendents who took the time to respond, behaved in a manner that demonstrates a certain commitment to their profession.

The final stage, coding and categorizing the responses was accomplished with the help of the Polimetrics Laboratory, a research support group located in the Department of Political Science of The Ohio State University. This organization provided both technical assistance with the questionnaire format and also the data processing expertise necessary to organize the massive amounts of data generated from the survey.

PROCESSING OF SURVEY DATA

The 1339 questionnaires that were returned were checked and the data was professionally key-punched onto computer cards. Funds for this and the other data processing functions were provided as part of the Spencer Foundation grant to carry out the AASA study.
The language used for the statistical analyses was the "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (SPSS). SPSS is a "packaged program" specifically designed to compute those statistics typically used by social scientists. A "packaged program" is essentially a prepared program that will perform a specific set of operations, usually under the control of a simplified "language" or set of instructions. Most of the computer commands for the SPSS program are in standard English language, so the program is relatively easy for a novice to learn.

The SPSS program was ideally suited to answer the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Several of the hypotheses to be tested required the relatively basic statistics of median and mean to provide the measure of comparison between career origin types. These hypotheses were:

Career-bound superintendents obtain their first superintendency at a younger age than place-bound superintendents.

When asked to state the age at which they decided to aspire to the superintendency, career-bound superintendents give a lower age than place-bound superintendents.

Salaries of career-bound superintendents will be higher than those of place-bound superintendents.

---

Norman H. Nie, et al., *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. 
Other of the hypotheses were tested using cross-tabulations to show correlations between variables. In these cases, with data in the form of frequencies, the chi square statistic was used. Examples of these hypotheses were:

Career-bound superintendents obtain a greater amount of formal education than place-bound superintendents.

Career-bound superintendents will more often receive mandates from their employing boards than will place-bound superintendents.

Career-bound superintendents will indicate that they have mentors (sponsors) more often than will place-bound superintendents.

The research question that examined whether career-bound and place-bound superintendents differ on the way they rank-order educational issues was answered using frequency data and rank-difference correlation.

The SPSS program has the flexibility to provide the relatively simple statistical data required in this study, as well as statistical information that is much more complex.

The large amount of data is stored on magnetic disks. Access to the data was made through the use of the computer facilities at The Ohio State University.

The actual data processing for this study was the relatively simple matter of defining and entering the
appropriate variable labels; career-bound, place-bound, extreme career-bound, and extreme place-bound; and ordering the necessary cross tabulations to control for the variable of school district enrollment.

Most of the statistics reported in the next chapter were generated by the SPSS program. As an example, the "Frequencies" subprogram of SPSS will calculate any or all of eleven statistics including mean, standard deviation, variance, kurtosis, mode, and others. Only a few of the statistics were calculated manually.

INTERVIEW DATA COLLECTION

One factor missing in questionnaire research is knowledge about the frame of reference of the respondent. To compensate for this methodological weakness, short telephone interviews were held with six career-bound and six place-bound superintendents randomly selected from the respondents to the survey instrument. The researcher acknowledges the fact that a sample size of only twelve is far too small to use to make any generalizations, but the results of the interviews will help to explain the conclusions reached in the statistical analysis of the questionnaire data and also point to some lines of further inquiry.
In all cases, the calls were made to the superintendent at his place of work during the regular working day. The interviews were tape recorded when interviewee agreed to this practice. A copy of the interview protocol is included as Appendix B of this report.

The results of the interviews are interspersed in the next chapter where appropriate.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The data collected as described in Chapter 3 provide a wealth of information on the American public school superintendent. Much of the data will be analyzed and reported in a final report prepared by the research team that conducted the AASA study under the leadership of Luvern L. Cunningham, Novice G. Fawcett, Professor of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University. The data that has been analyzed along the career-bound/place-bound dichotomy will be presented in this chapter which will be organized in terms of the hypotheses established in Chapter 1. Before treating these hypotheses, data on the numbers of career-bound and place-bound superintendents identified in the sample will be reported.

DISTRIBUTION OF CAREER- AND PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS

Table 3 shows how career- and place-bound superintendents were distributed across the enrollment categories established for the AASA study. These data are reported using the operational definitions of this study as set forth in Chapter 1.
TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF CAREER-AND PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS USING NEW OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Career-Bound</th>
<th>Place-Bound</th>
<th>Undefined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number &amp; %</td>
<td>Number &amp; %</td>
<td>Number &amp; %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>52 46.0</td>
<td>49 43.4</td>
<td>12 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>170 38.7</td>
<td>166 37.8</td>
<td>103 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>219 40.9</td>
<td>222 41.4</td>
<td>95 17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>68 26.7</td>
<td>13 5.1</td>
<td>174 68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>509 37.9</td>
<td>449 33.4</td>
<td>385 28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Enrollment category limits are shown in Chapter 3.

b. These superintendents do not clearly fall into either category so defined in Chapter 1.

Table 3 shows that the frequency of occurrence of place-bound superintendencies is not a function of school district size except in the smallest districts. In the three largest categories, there is about an equal chance for superintendents to be career-bound as there is to be place-bound. In the smallest enrollment category, however, the incidence of place-boundedness is considerably less. This fact can be explained when the relative size of the administrative staffs in these
smaller districts are considered. In the larger districts, the probability of finding a suitable candidate for a vacant superintendency would logically be greater where the size of the administrative staff is larger. In the small school districts, it is likely that persons having the required certificate or levels of preparation for the superintendency are relatively few. In addition, grooming of candidates for the superintendency, in the sense of promoting them through the chairs, is far more likely to occur in larger districts.

The superintendents labeled as undefined in Table 3 are those superintendents who were employed from outside their present districts, but have served in only one superintendency. These superintendents would have been classified as career-bound by Carlson, but have not been defined as such in this study. The assumption was made that, if a continuum of career origin type is postulated, these undefined superintendents would fall towards the middle or neutral point on the continuum. In order to emphasize the differences between place- and career-bound superintendents, this group was not considered in the comparisons that follow in the remainder of this chapter. The largest group of these undefined or neutral superintendents hold superintendencies in small
school districts as might be expected. These small districts, as was indicated earlier, do not have the reservoir of talent necessary to promote a large number of place-bound superintendents, neither do they appear to be prestigious enough to attract the career-bound superintendent.

It is important to note at this point, that while changes in the method of defining career-bound and place-bound superintendents were made in this study from Carlson's original works, the findings relating place-boundness to district size are consistent with his.

A second frequency distribution of career-bound and place-bound superintendents was made using the operational definitions originally established by Carlson. A question on the survey instrument asked "Were you appointed or elected to your present superintendency from inside the same district or from outside the district?" The responses to this question were cross tabulated with the enrollment strata used in this study. The results of this analysis is shown in Table 4.

Consistent with Carlson's earlier findings, the table indicates the tendency for larger school systems to promote to the superintendency from within. When Carlson did a secondary analysis of the raw data from
the 1960 AASA study, he found that about 35 percent of the superintendents were place-bound and about 65 percent were career-bound. The present study, using the Carlson method of defining the variables, found an overall increase in place-boundedness to 39 percent. A z-test was used to test the significance of this difference and a value of 1.83 was found, yielding a confidence level of .05. Comparisons could not be made by specific enrollment strata because different enrollment categories were used in the 1960 study.
What is interesting to note is that Carlson predicted that promotion from within would increase during times of scarcity of money. With the problem of finances ranking as the number one concern of all superintendents surveyed in 1981, his prediction appears to have come true. Carlson's rationale for this prediction was based on three reasons: (1) promotion from within does not put the district's financial plight in the hands of a stranger, (2) promotion from within leaves a position vacant in the district, a position that can be eliminated, and (3) as will be shown later, place-bound superintendents work for less money than their career-bound peers.

A fourth reason for an increase in the frequency of place-bound superintendents may have even a greater effect in the future. Two career families are increasing in all sectors of society as women gain access to more and more professional opportunities in employment. Will a superintendent be anchored to one place because of the career of his/her spouse? Data to answer this question are not available from this study, but questions to determine the answer to this question may need to be considered for the AASA study at the end of the present decade.
Two other categories of superintendents were defined for this study, extreme career-bound and extreme place-bound. These categories are subsets of the career- and place-bound categories respectively.

The results shown in Table 3 and Table 5 seem to be consistent with common sense notions about career origin. First, the largest districts have the highest occurrence of both the extreme place-bound and extreme career-bound superintendent. A large school district may be the ultimate goal of an upward mobile superintendent and he may have to pursue this goal through a series of smaller districts, thus making the largest district the end-point in the career of an extreme career-bound superintendent. On the other hand, the large school district also contains the greatest reservoir of administrative talent, as mentioned earlier, and therefore a person could move through an internal set of ranks to gain the experience necessary to act as the chief executive officer of a large school district. Small school districts, for the opposite reasons, have the smallest frequencies of these extreme career origin types. Overall, there are nearly twice as many extreme career-bound superintendents as extreme place-bound superintendents, indicating that career mobility and turnover
TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF EXTREME CAREER- AND EXTREME PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS BY ENROLLMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Extreme Career-Bound Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Extreme Place-Bound Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are important factors to study when viewing the profession of the American public school superintendent.

COMPARISONS OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON CAREER- AND PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS

Carlson found in his studies that career-bound administrators get their first superintendencies at younger ages than place-bound administrators. The present study, using slightly different definitions to emphasize the differences in career origin types, found similar results.

116 Carlson, School Superintendents: Careers and Performance, p. 51.
The data in Table 6 clearly show that both the mean and median ages for place-bound superintendents obtaining their first superintendency were greater than career-bound superintendents. It is even more significant to note that extreme career-bound superintendents moved even more quickly, on the average of two years faster, into their first superintendency. Conversely, extreme place-bound superintendents waited even longer than place-bound superintendents for their first chief administrative job. This is the first of several results that support the notion that a career origin continuum may be a useful way of looking at successor types.

TABLE 6
MEAN AND MEDIAN AGE AT WHICH CAREER ORIGIN TYPES OBTAINED THEIR FIRST SUPERINTENDENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER ORIGIN TYPE</th>
<th>MEAN AGE</th>
<th>MEDIAN AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career-Bound</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Bound</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Career-Bound</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Place-Bound</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on these results, the hypothesis that career-bound superintendents obtain their first superintendency at a younger age than place-bound superintendents is supported. It is also shown by the data in Table 6 that the responses of the extreme career-origin types do demonstrate that they may be even more polarized on the ends of a continuum of career origin. The notion that an extreme place-bound superintendent waits around in one school district until the superintendency is finally his appears to be consistent with the data presented. In one of the interviews conducted to enrich the data from the questionnaire, a place-bound superintendent was asked his perception of why the board of education selected him as superintendent. His reply was, "I was patient enough to wait until the board was ready to have me administer the schools."

Carlson also found that when asked to state the age at which they decided to aspire to the superintendency, career-bound superintendents give a lower age than place-bound superintendents. He supported this hypothesis using samples of both Massachusetts and Oregon superintendents. 117 The data from the most recent

117 Ibid., p. 50.
TABLE 7
MEAN/MEDIAN AGE AT WHICH DECISION WAS MADE TO BECOME SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT BY CAREER ORIGIN TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Origin Type</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career-Bound</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Bound</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Career-Bound</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Place-Bound</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that, on the average, a career-bound superintendent has made the decision about his career goals at the age of 30. A place-bound superintendent takes six years longer to make this choice. Again, the extremes serve to emphasize this point even more. An extreme career-bound superintendent, one who has held three or more superintendencies, makes the commitment to his career path at age 28, while those who stay in only one school district, the extreme place-bound superintendents, do not decide to seek the top post until age 37. As the labels imply, the place-bound administrator, for whatever reasons, is more interested in staying in one location than in chasing the top administrative post...
from district to district. He remains with a lower position in the chain of command until much later in life. In contrast, the career-bound superintendent sets his sights high at a relatively early age and is willing to uproot himself and move to a new location to accomplish his career goals.

These first two hypotheses, both supported by the data from this study, can be taken together to suggest a profile of the commitment of the two types of superintendents. The career-bound superintendent decides early in his career, often before the age of 30, to seek the chief executive post. He is willing to move across school district lines to gain the superintendency and his aspirations are realized in five to six years. Carlson found similar results and argued that these early commitments have higher professional value to the individual. A place-bound superintendent, on the other hand, appears to have less commitment to the profession of the superintendent, or develops the commitment later in life. The place-bound superintendent makes his decision to seek the top administrative post in his mid-thirties, possibly simultaneously with the knowledge that the superintendency will soon be open in his home district. The data in Tables 6 and 7 support this
notion. The place-bound superintendent decides to become a superintendent at the average age of 36 and is promoted to the post only one year later.

For a variety of reasons, the insider does not want to move from his present location. The interviews gave some indications as to the main factor that anchors a superintendent to one location. Not surprisingly, that factor was family. Three of the place-bound superintendents, when asked their future career plans, indicated they would like to stay where they were until their children finished school.

Thus, it appears that a career-bound superintendent has the strongest commitment to the superintendency as a profession, and as a result is able to gain access to his/her first superintendency at an earlier age, making his potential career as a chief school administrator, a more lengthy one. The place-bound superintendent may be characterized as a dedicated public school employee who, because of long and hard work and a general pattern of successes is finally rewarded with the chief administrative position in his home school district.

Carlson found that a relationship also existed between formal education and career origin type. He used the percentage of Ph.D.'s or Ed.D.'s held by superin-
tendents as his way of measuring this variable. In his studies, he found that only 11 percent of place-bound superintendents had these terminal degrees as compared to 25 percent of the career-bound men. The 1981 AASA study found, in general, that superintendents are earning doctorates in greater numbers than in the past decades. Analysis of the data along the place/career-bound dichotomy again reveals that the hypothesis (career-bound superintendents obtain a greater amount of formal education than their place-bound peers) is supported.

Table 8 includes data used to support this hypothesis. The data from the extreme career origin types are also shown in the table but do not serve to point out any significant differences in formal education for these extremes.

The data show that one in every four place-bound superintendents holds a doctorate degree, while one out of every two career-bound superintendents have this level of formal preparation. The chi-square values displayed in Table 8 show that the differences in educational preparation, as measured by the completion of the doctorate degree, are significant at well beyond the

118 Ibid., p. 52.
### TABLE 8
PERCENTAGES OF THOSE SUPERINTENDENTS HAVING DOCTORATE DEGREES AND FORMAL HOURS BEYOND THE DOCTORATE BY CAREER ORIGIN TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Origin Type</th>
<th>Percent with Earned Doctorate</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career-Bound</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Bound</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Career-Bound</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>59.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Place-Bound</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.001 level of confidence. The differences are equivalent between the career- and place-bound superintendents and the extreme career-origin types. It is likely that a Ph.D. or Ed.D. is viewed by many career-bound superintendents as an important prerequisite for the upward career path that they have chosen. Given also the fact that over a third of all respondents to this study have a doctorate or beyond, compared with 15.4 percent a decade ago, the pressure for a career-bound superintendent to further his education will likely continue to increase in the years ahead.
Building on the profiles of the career- and place-bound superintendents begun earlier in the chapter, the factor of professional preparation can now be added. The fact that career-bound superintendents do acquire more formal education than their place-bound counterparts lends credence to the assumption that career-bound leaders have a higher commitment to the profession of the superintendency than do place-bound leaders. Career-bounders recognize that advanced levels of formal education are important both for access to the jobs they seek and also to provide the skills and theories necessary for success in the demanding and complex roles that they will fill. Place-bounders view their formal preparation in terms of their present assignments, not concerned about future career changes either inside or outside their present organizational boundaries.

The final hypothesis to be examined in this section pertains to salaries. Carlson found that salaries of career-bound superintendents were higher than those of place-bound superintendents.\textsuperscript{119} The salary data from this study supports this hypothesis in all enrollment categories. These salary data are displayed in Table 9.

\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., p. 87.
TABLE 9

SALARY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CAREER- AND PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Mean Salary for Career-Bound Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean Salary for Place-Bound Superintendents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$51,808</td>
<td>$47,245</td>
<td>$4,563</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>40,512</td>
<td>38,536</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>30,877</td>
<td>29,365</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25,441</td>
<td>23,172</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding salary paid, it remains clear that career-bound superintendents are the favored type. In this study they are shown to be paid anywhere from 1,500 to 4,500 dollars more than place-bound superintendents in similar size school districts. The differential ranged from five to almost ten percent with career-bound superintendents in the largest and smallest enrollment strata getting the greatest salary advantages. In general, boards of education compensate the outsider at a higher level than his peer who rises from the inside. Whether boards do this to help reimburse for relocation expenses or because outsiders demand or expect these higher salaries, has not been determined in this study.

It could be speculated that higher salaries are the chief extrinsic motivator for career-bound
superintendents, but when the six career-bound and six place-bound interviewees were asked, "Was an increase in salary a primary consideration in accepting this superintendency?," all six place-bound superintendents answered no and five out of the six career-bound superintendents also gave a negative response. The interviewees did provide enough information to speculate that the career-bound superintendent has a strong drive to achieve prestige. He views prestige in job factors that go beyond the salary he earns. Prestige factors include the size of the organization he administers, the quality of the school system he leads, and the "perks" and salary associated with his position. One career-bound interviewee said, "I plan to remain in this district two more years, then move to a city district of 10,000 pupils for five years, and then to a large city."

Another outsider pointed out how high the students in his district scored on achievement tests when compared to the other districts in his locale. Place-bound superintendents do not seem to have this prestige drive and are more often heard to say things like, "This is a nice place to raise a family."

Table 10 shows salary data for the extreme career- and extreme place-bound superintendents.
The patterns of salary differentials for the extreme career origin types are different than those found between career- and place-bound superintendents. Superintendents who make several career moves gain rather large salary advantages in districts with enrollments in the 3,000 to 25,000 range. It may be that the greatest variation of school district types (i.e. rural, suburban, small urban) occur in this enrollment stratum and the typical path of the extreme career-bound superintendent is from a rural district to a suburban district to a small city district obtaining large salary increases as he moves. Extreme career-bound superintendents maintain a fairly large salary differential in the largest districts, but lose any advantage at all as

**TABLE 10**

**SALARY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXTREME CAREER- AND PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS BY ENROLLMENT CATEGORIES IN DOLLARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Mean Salary for Extreme Career-Bound Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean Salary for Extreme Place-Bound Superintendents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>52,679</td>
<td>48,789</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>42,301</td>
<td>37,050</td>
<td>5,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28,633</td>
<td>28,283</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>24,795</td>
<td>24,615</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they move from one small district to another. Some of the extreme career-bound superintendents who make lateral moves in small districts or from larger to small districts may not be moving of their own choice. These forced moves may decrease their bargaining power for higher salaries.

COMPARISONS OF EXPECTATIONS OF AND FOR CAREER- AND PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS

Each board of education has a certain set of expectations when it employs a new superintendent. A board that has been generally happy with the performance of the most recent superintendent tends to be content with an administrator from the inside to maintain the status quo. On the other hand, a board which was unhappy with the most recent superintendent, a board that is facing a situation of crisis in the district, or a board that is continually interested in change in the district will tend to look outside the district for the new superintendent. Paraphrasing Carlson's hypothesis, career-bound superintendents will more often receive mandates from their employing boards than will place-bound superintendents. Career-bound superintendents will perceive that they have a specific mission to accomplish.

120 Ibid., pp. 75-77.
in their new districts more often than place-bound superintendents.

The survey instrument included the question:
What is your perception of the most important reason you were employed by your present board of education? (Select only one)
1. My personal characteristics/qualifications
2. The board/community wanted some specific programmatic or curricular improvements made in the district
3. The board/community was looking for a person to solve some specific problems (i.e. closing schools, RIFing, desegregation, etc.)
4. The board/community wished to maintain the status quo
5. Other

Responses 2 and 3 were combined to form the mandate category, superintendents answering with these responses perceived they had a mission to make certain improvements or solve certain problems. Responses 1 and 4 were grouped together to form the non-mandate category, superintendents selecting these answers believed they were hired because they had the necessary personal qualifications or because the board was happy with the way things were going and did not want someone to rock the boat.
The responses, as grouped above, were then analyzed along the career-origin dichotomy and the results were presented in Table 11. Carlson had found, in looking at data from Massachusetts superintendents, that career-bound superintendents more frequently than place-bound superintendents received a mandate from the employing school board. This finding is also supported by the data below.

As shown in Table 11, one third of the career-bound superintendents felt they received a mandate from their employing boards, while only one-fifth of the place-bound superintendents responded in the same way. The extreme career-bound superintendents show even further polarization in this comparison, with forty percent indicating they received a mandate when they were employed as compared to only twenty percent of the extreme place-bound superintendents. The hypothesis concerning the relationship between career-origin type and reasons for employment is supported at the .001 level of confidence when comparing both the career- and place-bound superintendents and also the extreme career- and

\[1^{21}\text{Ibid., p. 83.}\]
TABLE 11
PERCEPTIONS OF REASONS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY CAREER ORIGIN TYPE IN PERCENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Employment</th>
<th>Career Origin Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career-Bound</td>
<td>Place-Bound</td>
<td>Extreme Career-Bound</td>
<td>Extreme Place-Bound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>32.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>40.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Mandate</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The chi-square value calculated when comparing career-bound and place-bound superintendents was 20.78, which is significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

<sup>b</sup>The chi-square value calculated when comparing extreme career-bound and extreme place-bound superintendents was 28.65, which is significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

The interviews provided some insight into what superintendents saw as the reasons for which they were employed. The responses to the question, "What is your perception as to why the board of education selected you as the superintendent?," ranged from the tongue-in-cheek
answer of one career-bound superintendent, "I'm a hell of a superintendent!," to the place-bounder who gave one hundred percent credit to the fact that his predecessor groomed him for the job. Examples of the kinds of mandates cited were: "clean house . . . establish better discipline," "develop a strong inservice program . . . lead the district to financial stability", and "pass a levy." Examples of the non-mandate answers were: "I hit it off well with the board during the interview.", "the board wanted youth, vitality, and a good track record," and "because the board knew me and they would not be dealing with an unknown quantity.

Using the results of the last two research questions, the profiles of the two career-origin types can be developed further. The outsider values prestige, especially in terms of the job he holds. His career path is designed to increase his prestige and salary is only one of several ways that this prestige is measured. The outsider perceives that his employing board has a mission for him to accomplish, that he has been given a mandate for action when he was employed. The insider is without high prestige motivation. He is simply in the right place at the right time. The board of education
will pay him less than a person from outside, and that is fine with him because the promotion is his reward. The insider does not perceive that he has a mission to accomplish in the district. His rise to power was an indication of his acceptance of established interests and loyalties, and his continued success will be based on his willingness to support and enhance those interests. He will not "rock the boat."

The final hypothesis of Carlson to be re-examined is that career-bound superintendents will attend more professional meetings than place-bound superintendents. The rationale behind this hypothesis is that career-bound superintendents are more active in the search for information than their place-bound counterparts. It could also be the fact that contacts related to career changes can be made and maintained by attendance at meetings of this type. In any case, Carlson found that career-bound superintendents in Allegheny County, on the average, attended 50 per cent more meetings than did their place-bound peers.\textsuperscript{122}

The data below do not indicate the strong relationship that Carlson found between the career origin

\textsuperscript{122}Ibid., p. 72.
type and the number of professional meetings attended. The data are shown in Table 12. Part of the problem of analyzing these data is the way the response categories were originally established in the survey instrument. Respondents were limited to the categories: "NONE, 1-2, 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9 or more," when asked how many meetings they attended in the last twelve months. Of those answering the question, 58.4 percent indicated "9 or more". Thus, there is little discrimination available in the data when the results are analyzed by career-origin type.

The data in Table 12 does show that a slightly higher percentage of career-bound superintendents attended nine or more professional meetings than place-bound superintendents. The same difference is found between extreme career-bound superintendents and extreme place-bound superintendents. The differences in the number of professional meetings attended between career origin types, however, is not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence as Table 12 indicates. Therefore, the hypothesis that career-bound superintendents attend more professional meetings than place-bound superintendents is rejected.
TABLE 12

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS ATTENDED IN LAST
TWELVE MONTHS BY CAREER ORIGIN TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Meetings Attended</th>
<th>Percent of Career Origin Type Making Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career-Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or more</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The chi-square value calculated when comparing career-bound and place-bound superintendents was 1.796 which is significant at only the .20 level of confidence.

<sup>b</sup> The chi-square value calculated when comparing extreme career-bound and extreme place-bound superintendents was 2.311, which is significant at only the .20 level of confidence.

COMPARISONS OF THE RANKINGS OF KEY EDUCATIONAL ISSUES
BY CAREER- AND PLACE-BOUND SUPERINTENDENTS

One of the key parts of the present study is to determine if career-bound superintendents have a different perception of key educational issues than do
place-bound superintendents. Superintendents were asked to rank 35 educational issues as being of great significance, significant, of limited significance, or of little or no significance. Eighteen of these issues were carried over from the AASA study conducted ten years ago and the remaining seventeen were added by the research team which helped conduct the current study. The issues were then ranked by adding the percentages of those who rated an issue "of great significance" and those who rated the issue "significant." For example, 66.6 percent of the superintendents responding rated the issue "Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlay" as "of great significance" while 27.1 percent rated the same issue as "significant." These two percentages were added to produce a ranking score of 93.7. This was by far the highest ranking score obtained and therefore financing schools became the issue deemed most important to all superintendents and to superintendents in all career origin groups. The same procedure was used to determine rankings for the four career origin classifications; career-bound, place-bound, extreme career-bound, and extreme place-bound. A complete list of the 35 issues,
TABLE 13

COMPARATIVE RANKINGS OF THE TOP TEN EDUCATIONAL ISSUES BY CAREER ORIGIN TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Issue</th>
<th>Comparative Rankings (Raw Ranking Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlay.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(94.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and goal setting.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(81.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing educational outcomes.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(77.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Administrator Evaluation.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(76.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator-board relations.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(74.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/ Credibility.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(74.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education/ Public Law 94-142</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(71.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining timely and accurate information for decision making.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(69.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues such as negotiations, strikes, sanctions and/or forms of teacher militancy.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(69.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the purpose of discussion in this section, the top ten issues according to ranking scores will be compared. These most significant educational issues are shown in Table 13 along with the rankings and raw scores calculated for the four career originroups.

Spearman's rank-difference correlation method was used to determine statistically if there was any significant difference between the rankings of these important issues by career-bound and place-bound superintendents. A rho coefficient of .868 was calculated which shows high correlation (significant at the .01 level) between the rankings of the first two columns in Table 16. Therefore, no significant difference was found statistically between the comparative rankings of career- and place-bound superintendents. The same statistical test
was used on the rankings of the extreme career origin types and a rho coefficient of .545 was calculated. This indicates a weaker correlation between these two groups, significant at only the .10 level of confidence. Therefore, a weak significant difference was found between the comparative rankings of the extreme career-bound and extreme place-bound superintendents.

Even though the statistical analysis indicates only subtle differences in the rankings by career origin type, an attempt will be made to explain some of them. First, the differences between career- and place-bound superintendent rankings will be examined. As a guideline, differences in rankings of two or more levels will be considered meaningful and an explanation will be postulated.

Staff and administrator evaluation was ranked two levels higher by career-bound superintendents than place-bound superintendents. This could be explained by the fact that place-bound superintendents were members of the group to be evaluated prior to being moved up to the evaluator role. They may find it more difficult to evaluate their former peers and therefore play down the importance of evaluation. Career-bound superintendents, on the other hand, are entering a new situation where
they may need to establish their control. A method of asserting this control could be through evaluation. Two career-bound superintendents that were interviewed made it very clear that when dealing with second level administrators, they had the right and responsibility to evaluate and their evaluations were not subject to review by the board of education. "The board evaluates me and I am responsible for the evaluation of all other staff. If the board doesn't like it that way, they can tell me, and I'll move on," was the response from one of these outsiders. This idea is supported by Carlson in his discussion on rules and policies. Boards of education employing career-bound superintendents may also have given them a mandate to clean house, thus elevating the importance of evaluation.

The career origin dichotomy clearly explains the difference in rankings given to administrator-board relations. Career-bound superintendents rank this issue three levels higher than place-bound superintendents. A place-bound superintendent is known to the board prior to his promotion to the chief executive position. If he

123 Ibid., pp. 89-105.
didn't have good relations established with the board, he wouldn't have been given the job in the first place. The outsider, however, must work hard at building the mutual trust necessary between a board and superintendent. This was strongly supported in the interviews. When both career-origin types were asked their perceptions as to the main problems faced by a superintendent employed from the outside, one unanimous response was "getting to know the board of education."

Place-bound superintendents gave a higher ranking to the issue involving special education and Public Law 94-142, the Federal legislation creating educational equity for handicapped students. This might be explained by the fact that place-bound superintendents had previously served lower on the organizational chart where problems like this were dealt with. It could also be that place-bound superintendents are more student-orientated or student-centered, an issue that will be mentioned again later in this section.

Turning attention now to the two columns on the right-hand side of Table 13, explanations will be offered for the differences of two or more ranking levels between extreme career-bound and extreme place-bound superintendents. The small differences in rankings
between planning and goal setting and assessing educational outcomes between career- and place-bound superintendents have increased for the extreme types. Planning and goal setting are more important to extreme career-bound superintendents and assessing educational outcomes are more important to extreme place-bound superintendents. Since it has already been shown that career-bound superintendents are more likely to receive mandates from their boards, the goal setting process for that extreme outsider may be a requirement to fulfill this mandate. The place-bound leader is more often employed in situations where the status is to be preserved, and therefore new goals and planning for change are of lesser importance. The information gathered from the interviews tended to support this notion. When the question was asked, "Have you made any major policy changes in your district since you became superintendent?," the list generated by the place-bound superintendents was considerably shorter than the list generated by the career-bound superintendents. In fact, one place-bound superintendent with five years of tenure answered with a simple no to the question.

The difference in ranking of the assessing educational outcome issue may again provide a hint that
place-bound superintendents are more student-centered. It may also be an indication that place-bound superintendents are more interested in product rather than in process or that career-bound superintendents are more concerned with process than they are with outcomes. In any case, these variations suggest further study to indicate if these proposed explanations are sound.

The differences in the rankings of staff and administrator evaluation, administrator board relations, and special education have already been explained earlier in this section. The difference in the ranking of the issue "obtaining timely and accurate information for decision making" between the extreme career origin types is the only ranking difference that does not agree with Carlson's earlier studies. He found evidence to support the idea that career-bound superintendents would place a greater emphasis on the need for information.124 In this study, extreme place-bound superintendents ranked this issue two levels higher than the extreme career-bound sample. It could be that the complexity of the school organization and its relationship with a turbulent environment has become a more important factor for insiders during the last two decades. It may be that

124 Ibid., pp. 71-73.
extreme place-bound superintendents, wishing to remain in their "places", now put a premium on the gathering of information so that the decisions they make will not force them out of the location they hold so dear. Extreme career-bound superintendents may be greater risk-takers, more willing to fly by the seat of their pants, and therefore are less likely to feel as strong a need for information as their insider counterparts.

The issue of teacher militance ranked four levels higher for extreme career-bound superintendents than for the extreme place-bound sample. The superintendents who have spent their entire careers in one district may feel they have developed an allegiance with their staffs and may be more likely to view them as "on the same team" rather than in opposing camps.

The final issue in the top ten of perceived importance where a significant difference in ranking is noted between the extreme career origin types is the issue of the greater visibility of the superintendent. The extreme career-bound type, who is characterized as a career climber, would seem likely to be less concerned about being visible than his opposite number from the inside. The data supports this notion. In many cases, this extreme outsider may actually thrive on visibility.
The extreme place-bound superintendent, conversely, may wish to remain a low key administrator lest he be shot out of his place-bound saddle and forced to move on. This rationale may explain why extreme place-bound superintendents ranked this issue six places higher than the extreme career-bound types.

Before considering one final issue that emerged when analyzing this data on educational issues, a caution is appropriate. The differences noted in this section are subtle. There was a great deal of consistency in the ranking of educational issues by the four career origin groups. The explanations offered represent explanations that are consistent with the intuitive differences between insiders and outsiders, but at best they represent hypotheses that are available for further testing.

When all thirty-five issues were compared, the same general consistency was noted in the lower twenty-five as in the top ten, with the one exception of the issue "student activism". All superintendents completing the study gave that issue a ranking score of only 6.4. This same issue received ranking scores of 5.6, 7.5, and 5.0 by the career-bound, place-bound, and extreme place-bound groups respectively. This made it the least
important issue of two groups and second from the bottom in the other. The extreme career-bound superintendents, however, gave this issue a ranking score of 45.6 and ranked it twenty-second. This discrepancy calls for an explanation. Two other hints were offered earlier that career-bound superintendents (and to a greater degree, extreme career-bound superintendents) were not as student centered as their place-bound peers. This hypothesis may well be supported by the discrepancy in the ranking of the student activism issue. Could it be that the extreme career-bound superintendent has been so busy chasing his career from district to district that he has failed to notice, as the other groups have, that student activism is no longer the problem it was in the late 60's and early 70's? Could it be that this very mobile career origin type is looking outside of the organization so much that he has lost touch with the students in his schools? These questions cannot be answered by the data in the AASA study, but they suggest a line of further inquiry, a line of inquiry which was pursued during the interviews with the six career-bound and six place-bound superintendents. The question was asked, "How often do you deal with issues directly involving a student or students in your district?" Three
out of the six place-bound superintendents answered "often" or "frequently" and they felt the frequency of this involvement was due to the fact that they had held previous positions in the district they were closer to the students. Only one career-bound superintendent answered that he had frequent contacts with students and he indicated that his was by design. He made a conscious effort to make student contacts. The data from the questionnaire combined with that from the interviews is still not conclusive, but does seem to indicate that further study of the relationship between student-superintendent involvement and career origin type may be appropriate.

This section of Chapter 4 has dealt with the competing hypotheses that either there would be a significant difference in the ranking of educational issues by career origin types or there would be no differences. The data show that subtle but not statistically significant differences do exist.

Returning to the profiles of the career origin types, these educational issue rankings help to further complete the description. The career-bound superintendent emphasizes formal evaluation of his subordinates and works extremely hard on developing good relations
with his board of education. These are parts of the socialization process of the outsider trying to gain security in a new setting. Planning and goal-setting are important to the career-bounder as he attempts to complete the mandates he has been given by his employing board. He is not, however, interested in assessing the outcomes of his actions. He is more interested in moving on to begin another project. The career-bound superintendent is a risk-taker who loves being visible, almost daring people to challenge him. He has a tendency to "fly by the seat of his pants" and does so with minimum regard for research or other information.

In contrast, the place-bound superintendent has been completely socialized by the present school organization. He has made friends at other levels in the organization and therefore is reluctant to emphasize formal evaluation procedures or create new rules. He knows the board of education through previous successes in his former position, so he does not need to make a conscious effort to improve superintendent-board relations. The place-bounder is cautious. He wants as much information and research as possible and wants to assess the outcomes of the projects undertaken in the district. He may be more student-centered than his career-bound peer.
A final hypothesis was proposed in Chapter 1 dealing with mentors. It was speculated that career-bound superintendents would indicate that they have mentors more often than would place-bound superintendents. The data from the 1981 AASA study did not support this hypothesis. Nor did the data show any significant difference between extreme career-bound superintendents and extreme place-bound superintendents. The data on mentoring is shown in Table 14.

The chi-square tests done on the mentoring data did not provide levels of confidence below .05.

While the data in Table 11 does indicate that three out of every five superintendents have, or had, a mentor, no relationship exists between career origin type and mentoring or sponsorship. Part of the problem could be in a lack of a standardized definition for the term mentor. The other factor could be that insiders as well as outsiders rely on the advice of those certain people in their lives to help them in their careers. The help may be equally as important in moving through the ranks in one district as it is in moving between
TABLE 14
PERCENT OF SUPERINTENDENTS WHO DID OR DID NOT HAVE MENTORS BY CAREER ORIGIN TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have or Had a Mentor?</th>
<th>Place-Bound</th>
<th>Career Bound</th>
<th>Type Career Bound</th>
<th>Extreme Place Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.4a</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>59.5b</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The chi-square value calculated when comparing career-bound and place-bound superintendents was 1.063 which is significant at only the .30 level of confidence.

\(^b\) The chi-square value calculated when comparing extreme career-bound and extreme place-bound superintendents was 1.653 which is significant at only the .20 level of confidence.

districts. The mentoring phenomenon is one aspect of educational administration that appears ripe for further empirical study, especially in light of how often its use is reported in this study.

ADDITIONAL INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Some of the information gained from the twelve superintendent interviews has already been reported in earlier sections of this chapter. There were, however, interview questions that were not directly related to
the hypotheses under study in this research effort. The results of these questions will be reported in this section. Again, it is important to realize that the sample size for the interviews was intentionally small and no generalization will be made from these results.

It has already been reported that both career origin types of superintendents had similar perceptions as to the main problems faced by a superintendent employed from outside the district. These problems were those of a socializing nature, getting to know the board, getting to know the community, learning the local power structure, developing mutual trust, and developing a support group. Both career-origin types were also asked their perceptions of the problems faced by an insider assuming the chief administrative position. Again, there was a great deal of similarity between their responses. Many of the responses dealt with the fact that an insider's past is known. One career-bound superintendent phrased it, "Everyone knows your warts," and another said "You've collected a lot of barnacles on your boat." "People know your weaknesses and forget your strengths," was the response of a place-bound superintendent.
Another set of problems defined by superintendents in both groups were those resulting from role conflict. One superintendent referred to it as the "good ol' Al syndrome." He used the example of good ol' Al who, when he was a principal, would have a beer with the coaches and chide them that they could have negotiated fifty dollars more at the bargaining table if they would have just hung on a little longer. Now as superintendent, the coaches wonder why the beer drinking has stopped. A former high school principal who was promoted to the superintendency said he was always being accused of favoritism towards the high school staff. In a similar vein, several superintendents felt they would be "used by their former peers."

It was this notion of role conflict that prompted the question, "If a second level administrator in your district was in conflict with the board of education, what would you do?" It was speculated that place-bound superintendents would side with the administrator because of previous peer relationships, while the career-bound superintendent would support the board. The results of the interview showed little difference in the kinds of answers given by the two career origin types.
In most cases, the superintendent said he would act as a mediator and his ultimate resolution strategy was situational.

Carlson, in his book, included a chapter entitled "The Successor's Successor" in which he speculated that "two place-bound superintendents in a row might be too many." He found that it was very unlikely that a school board would hire a superintendent from inside when the predecessor was also of the place-bound type. The questionnaire data did not include any information on successor patterns, but the interviewees were asked, "As far back as you can remember, were your predecessors hired from outside or inside?" Of the 38 instances of succession reported by the twelve superintendents, only three cases were reported where a school board employed two insiders in a row. In addition, only one of the place-bound superintendents interviewed had a predecessor who was also place-bound.

A final, and very important fact, came from the interview question, "What are your plans for the future, in terms of your career in the superintendency?" Two of

the career-bound superintendents gave answers that seemed to be place-bound in nature. They indicated their plans were to stay in the district until their children grew up or until they (the superintendents) reached retirement age. One of the place-bound interviewees, with a short tenure as superintendent, responded that he was almost ready to move on to a district of five thousand pupils and then in four or five more years to a larger city district, a response that certainly sounded career-bound. He would have been a career-bound superintendent had he not been at the right place at the right time in his present district, and it was clear that he soon would be a career-bound superintendent. These facts raise questions about the permanence of the career origin labels. It appears that a person can be placed on a career origin continuum for the purpose of current analysis, but that time and situation may alter that position. Additional study will need to be done to demonstrate what effect this shifting has on the career origin research of which this study is a part.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1982 AASA study of the American public school superintendent found that, when compared with data of a decade earlier, there is now a slightly higher turnover rate in the superintendency and a reduction in the average period of service in the position of school superintendent. School organizations are faced with the problem of replacing their chief executive officer more frequently than in the recent past. When a vacancy occurs in a key organizational position, like that of a superintendent of schools, those charged with the selection of a successor must make a decision some time in the selection process, whether to fill the position by promotion from within the organization or by the selection of someone from the outside. These two successor types of school superintendents were the subject of this study.

These types of superintendents have been identified in the literature. Career-bound superintendents were designated as those who were elected from outside the districts they presently serve. Those who were promoted
to the superintendency from within their present school district were called **place-bound**.

Place-bound superintendents have been described as those who valued place above career; who would prefer to wait for promotion within their schools rather than actively seeking a superintendency elsewhere. Career-bound superintendents, on the other hand, were believed to value career above place; to actively chase a superintendency across district lines.

Place-bound superintendents were found in the literature to differ from the career-bound in many respects. Differences between the two types were found to exist in reference group orientation, number and content of rules made, salary levels, desire for information, and several other areas. Richard O. Carlson was the chief researcher on this topic and his works in the 1950's and 1960's became the foundation for the present research effort.

This study was conducted to partially replicate Carlson's studies, retesting several of his hypotheses using a national sample of school superintendents. This study was also conducted to determine whether career orientation (i.e. either career- or place-bound)
effected the way school superintendents viewed key educational issues.

It was reasoned that, if career- and place-bound superintendents were found to differ from each other on their perceptions of key educational issues, the results of this study would be of interest to those concerned with educational leadership, and would add important new knowledge to the study of the public school superintendency. These differences could indicate a possible relationship between career development patterns and an individual's value system. A relationship that would be worthy of further study since it might help explain how career patterns effect the formation of a superintendent's perceptual framework or vice versa.

Three general propositions were explored in this study. They were:

There will be significant differences in the demographic data of place-bound superintendents as compared to career-bound superintendents.

The expectations of and for career-bound superintendents will be significantly different from those of and for place-bound superintendents.

Significant differences may exist in the way career-bound superintendents perceive key educational issues from the way place-bound superintendents perceive these issues.

The hypotheses that followed from these propositions, and were tested in this study, will be enumerated in the following section.
Some changes were made in the operational definitions originally used by Carlson. Two new career origin types were defined that represented further refinements in classifying the successor types. The operational definitions used were:

Career-Bound Superintendents - a superintendent who has served as the chief administrative officer in two or more school districts.

Extreme Career-Bound Superintendents - a superintendent who has served as the chief administrative officer in three or more school districts.

Place-bound Superintendent - a school superintendent who has been appointed to the superintendency from a position inside the employing school district.

Extreme Place-Bound - a school superintendent who has spent his entire career in only one school district.

Data used for this study came from the 1981 American Association of School Administrators study of the superintendent, conducted by a research team at The Ohio State University headed by Luvern L. Cunningham. The present researcher of this study was fortunate to have been involved with the AASA study from its beginning and assisted in the design of the questionnaire that was mailed to the stratified selected sample of American school superintendents.

The data from the survey instrument were key punched onto computer cards and is now stored on magnetic discs in the SPSS program format. The computer
in the SPSS program format. The computer facilities at The Ohio State University were used to generate the frequency distribution and statistical analysis necessary to test the hypotheses.

Telephone interviews were conducted with six place-bound superintendents and six career-bound superintendents who were randomly selected from the questionnaire respondents. The results of these interviews were used to help enrich and explain the statistical data generated from the questionnaire.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Distribution of Career- and Place-Bound Superintendents

1. The national distribution of career- and place-bound superintendents shows an approximately equal percentage of these types in the three largest enrollment strata using the revised operational definitions of this study. In the three strata of school districts that have enrollments of over three hundred pupils, 40 to 45 percent of the superintendents are career-bound and the same percentages are found for place-bound superintendents. The nation's smallest schools, however, have a very small percentage of place-bound superintendents
(5.1%). Respondents employed from outside the district into their first superintendency were classified as neutral or undefined. Two thirds of the superintendents in the smallest enrollment stratum were in this category.

Using Carlson's dichotomous definitions of career- and place-bound superintendents, a small but significant increase in the overall frequency of place-bound superintendents was found when compared to his data of two decades ago. The overall frequency of place-bound superintendents was 35 percent in 1960. It is now 39 percent.

2. Extreme career-bound and extreme place-bound superintendents are most likely to be found in the nation's largest school districts. In the largest enrollment stratum 24.8 percent of the superintendents were identified as extreme career-bound and 16.8 percent were identified as extreme place-bound. In the smallest enrollment stratum, only 14.7 percent were of the extreme career-bound type and 5.1 were extreme place-bound men and women.

Comparisons of Demographic Data on Career- and Place-Bound Superintendents

1. The hypothesis that career-bound superintendents obtain their first superintendency at a younger age than
place-bound superintendents was supported across all enrollment categories. Both the mean and median ages for place-bound superintendents obtaining their first superintendency were greater than career-bound types. Place-bound superintendents took, on the average, two years longer to move into their first chief administrative post.

2. Extreme career-bound superintendents and extreme place-bound superintendents showed even a greater age differential in obtaining their first superintendency in most of the enrollment categories. For example, in the largest enrollment stratum, the extreme career-bound superintendent obtained his first superintendency at the average age of 34, while his extreme place-bound peer had to wait around until the average age of 43 before becoming a superintendent.

3. The hypothesis that career-bound administrators decide to pursue the superintendency at a younger age than place-bound superintendents is supported by this study. Career-bounders decided they wanted to seek the chief administrative post at the average age of 30. Place-bounders do not make this decision until age 36, almost simultaneously with being promoted into their first superintendency.
4. Extreme career-bound superintendents made their decisions on seeking the chief administrative post two years earlier than the career-bound sample. The superintendents who remained in one district, the extreme place-bound group, took until the average age of 37 to make the decision to seek the top post.

5. The hypothesis that career-bound superintendents obtain a greater amount of formal education than place-bound superintendents was supported. The attainment of a Ph.D., Ed.D. or hours beyond these degrees was used as the way to measure the level of formal training. Almost one of every two career-bound superintendents have this high level of education as compared to one in four of the place-bound type. The distribution of these terminal degrees among the extreme career- and extreme place-bound sample was equivalent.

6. The hypothesis that salaries of career-bound superintendents will be higher than those of place-bound superintendents was supported. In this study, career-bound superintendents earned on the average from 1500 to 4500 dollars more than place-bound superintendents in districts of similar enrollment.

7. The salary differential for the extreme career types is from 4000 to 5000 dollars in the larger enroll-
ment districts, in favor of the outside. The difference shrinks to less than 500 dollars in the two smaller enrollment strata.

8. The hypothesis that career-bound superintendents will more often receive mandates from their employing boards than will place-bound superintendents was supported. One third of the career-bound superintendents surveyed felt they received mandates from the boards of education that hired them, while only one fifth of the place-bound superintendents responded in the same way. Even a higher frequency, 40 percent, of the extreme career-bound superintendents perceived they had a mandate for action when employed.

9. The hypothesis that career-bound superintendents will attend more professional meetings than place-bound superintendents was not supported. A slightly higher percentage of career-bound superintendents indicated they attended nine or more professional meetings in the last twelve months than those categorized as place-bound, but the differences were not significant. The same findings were noted for the extreme career origin types.

10. Subtle differences were found between the way the career origin types ranked educational issues. These differences were explained by applying the basic
characteristics of the successor categories. The differences in rankings that were considered important were:

a. Career-bound superintendents ranked the issue of staff and administrator evaluation higher than place-bound superintendents.

b. Career-bound superintendents ranked the issue of administrator-board relations higher than place-bound superintendents.

c. Extreme career-bound superintendents gave planning and goal-setting a higher rank than extreme place-bound superintendents.

d. Extreme career-bound superintendents ranked the issue of teacher militancy higher than extreme place-bound superintendents.

e. Place-bound superintendents gave a higher ranking to the issue involving Public Law 94-142.

f. Extreme place-bound superintendents rated the importance of assessing educational outcomes higher than the extreme career-bound superintendents.

g. Extreme place-bound superintendents ranked the issue of the importance of timely and accurate information higher than the extreme career-bound sample.

h. The extreme place-bound superintendents ranked the
greater visibility of the superintendent as a more important issue than those classified as extreme career-bound.

i. Three of the career origin types ranked student activism as an issue of little or no importance, extreme career-bound superintendents, in contrast, gave this issue a much higher ranking.

11. The hypothesis that career-bound superintendents will have mentors more often than place-bound superintendents is not supported by data collected for this study.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Five out of the six hypotheses that were re-tested from Carlson's earlier works on career-bound and place-bound superintendents were supported. They were:

Career-bound superintendents obtain their first superintendency at a younger age than place-bound superintendents.

When asked to state the age at which they decide to aspire to the superintendency, career-bound superintendents give a lower age than place-bound superintendents.

Career-bound superintendents obtain a greater amount of formal education than place-bound superintendents.

Salaries of career-bound superintendents will be higher than those of place-bound superintendents.
Career-bound superintendents will more often receive mandates from their employing boards than will place-bound superintendents.

The one Carlson hypothesis not supported was, "Career-bound superintendents will attend more professional meetings than place-bound superintendents."

Even though slight changes were made in the operational definitions of these career origin types, it remains clear that the insider/outside differences that were uncovered by Richard O. Carlson remain to some degree in today's public school superintendents.

2. In several cases the differences between career- and place-bound superintendents were increased between the extreme career- and extreme place-bound superintendent as defined in this study. Therefore, it may be more helpful to view all four career origin types as points along a continuum rather than as four separate categories. Figure 1 represents this idea.

---

**Figure 1**

Career Origin Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extreme</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career-Bound</td>
<td>Bound</td>
<td>Bound</td>
<td>Place-Bound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Where a superintendent falls on the Career Origin Continuum affects his perception of educational issues. These differences were shown to be subtle in this study, but present, nonetheless. The career origin profiles that follow generalize these differences.

4. Mentors or sponsors are important to all superintendents, no matter where they fall on the Career Origin Continuum.

5. A significantly smaller frequency of place-bound superintendents is found in the nation's smallest schools.

6. Some of the data seems to suggest that career-bound superintendents, and to a greater degree, extreme career-bound superintendents are less student-centered than their place-bound peers.

7. It appears that a person can be placed on a career origin continuum for the purpose of current analysis, but that time and situation may alter that position.

CAREER ORIGIN PROFILES

The hard data from the study were used to test several research questions. Using the answers to these
research questions and the softer data from the inter-
views of the twelve superintendents, profiles emerged
for the superintendents who fall at opposite ends of the
career origin continuum. These profiles may well be the
most important findings of this study for not only do
they lend credence to the earlier work of Richard O.
Carlson, but they also should be of interest to aspiring
superintendents, those boards of education faced with
the decision to hire from inside or outside, and those
people charged with the responsibility of the formal
preparation of the American school superintendent. Here
are the summaries of those profiles:

The Career-Bound Superintendent is strongly com-
mitted to the superintendency as a profession. She/he
makes the decision to strive for the highest public
school administrative post early in his career and his
efforts are soon rewarded if he is willing to move from
one district to another. She/he is well prepared to
assume the superintendency as evidenced by high levels
of formal education. Career-bound superintendents seek
prestige from their jobs. They not only move across
district lines to find their first superintendency, but
they move again and again to what they perceive as more
prestigious school districts. They measure prestige not
by salary alone, but also by the size and quality of the school districts they administer. They do earn higher salaries than their place-bound peers. Outsiders feel they have a mandate to perform some kind of change in their new districts. They emphasize planning, goal setting, board-superintendent relations, and subordinate evaluations as they become socialized into their superintendencies. They thrive on visibility, are risk-takers, and tend to enjoy the role of change agent while not paying particular attention to the outcomes of the changes they bring about. As new superintendents, the major problem they face is learning their new surroundings and developing the necessary trust between themselves and the other members of the organization with whom they must work.

The Place-Bound Superintendent has a strong commitment to education as a profession, but not necessarily to the superintendency. She/he does not make the decision to pursue the top administrative post until later in his career, often when the superintendency happens to open up in his home district. His levels of formal preparation are lower than his career-bound peers. These insiders do not seek high levels of prestige from their jobs and when they are rewarded for
previous hard work in their districts by promotion to
the superintendency, large salary increases are not
included. Insiders are not change agents. They grow up
in one system and continue to nurture it. Visibility is
a problem for them and they demand information before
making decisions. Insiders assess the outcomes of the
projects they administer. As new superintendents,
place-bounders face the problem of living down their
past mistakes, which people inside and outside of the
organization seem to find easier to remember than their
past successes. Insiders may be more student-centered
than those hired from outside.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Further study should be done on the issue of
whether superintendents on the career-bound end of the
career origin continuum are less student centered than
their place-bound peers. Further study, perhaps using a
more rigorous interview schedule, should be done to look
in more depth at the ways educational issues are per-
ceived by the different career origin types. The rela-
tionship between issue perception and career origin
pattern should be studied with alternative research tech-
niques (i.e. multiple regression analysis).
2. Most of the research on career-origin types has been done using the perspective of the chief administrator. A study should be done that asks the employing body, the board of education, what their perceptions are in regard to hiring an insider or outsider.

3. Superintendents in training programs should be made aware of the research on career origin so that they may use this information in planning their careers in light of their own self-assessment.

4. Boards of education and consultants who assist boards in the selection of a new superintendent should become familiar with the research on career successor types so that this information can be used in developing selection criteria.

5. Superintendency preparation programs and in-service education programs should incorporate findings of this study. Specific implications for superintendents include:

   a. Superintendents who wish to move quickly into the chief administrative post should plan to relocate to get this opportunity.

   b. Superintendents who find salary a prime motivator should plan on making several moves across school district lines during their careers.
c. School administrators who become attached to a particular location will have to be patient in their wait for the superintendency and should realize that they may sacrifice higher salaries as a result of their desire to remain in one place.

6. Studies of chief executive officers in other professions should be undertaken to determine if similar career origin characteristics are found to be general or unique to the superintendency.

7. Studies should be conducted to determine the effect of other variables influencing career origin patterns. For example, what is the effect of two-career families on the frequency of place-boundedness in the field of educational administration as well as other professions.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER
September 11, 1981

Dear Superintendent:

It is important for institutions and their leadership to periodically analyze themselves through survey procedures and to utilize the data gathered for constructive purposes. AASA has a history of sponsoring such research each decade since 1950; earlier research was conducted through the Department of Superintendence in 1923 and 1933.

Professor Luvern Cunningham, The Ohio State University, with assistance from a panel of school superintendents and under the auspices of the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, is the principal researcher for the 1981 study of the American School Superintendent. The final report will be made public in early 1982.

Your support is most necessary to obtain data that only you can provide. The scope of this study goes far beyond earlier studies and will result, we believe, in a most significant piece of research. As one member of a national sample of educational leaders, your cooperation will go far to enhance the validity of this study.

You are asked to complete the enclosed copy of the questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided at the earliest possible time. Please feel free to make a photo copy of the questionnaire for your files.

In appreciation for this professional courtesy, we remain

Cordially yours,

Paul Salmon, Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

Richard A. Boyd, Chairman
Committee for the Advancement of School Administration

(703) 525-0100
1801 North Moore Street • Arlington, Virginia 22209
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209
NATIONAL STUDY OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT
SUPPORTED BY THE SPENCER FOUNDATION

Note: Your participation in this study is an extraordinary service to your profession that goes beyond normal expectations. The depth and breadth of this research project is significantly greater than typical status reports.

Without your help, the project will fail. Please feel free to use administrative assistance in completing the demographic data.

This questionnaire was developed with the assistance and advice of the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, AASA.

Directions

1/1:4 Your questionnaire is identified by a code number to simplify recordkeeping and follow-up procedures. In reporting the results, no individual identity will be divulged. Only group statistical responses will be cited. Respondent confidentiality is assured.

Attempt to answer every question and, please, make every answer a sincere one. In the event none of the alternatives provided for a question correspond exactly to your position or opinion, you are asked to select that alternative which comes closest to the answer you would like to give.

Circle the number of the proper alternative using either a pen or pencil. If you change a response please be sure that the change is legible and clear in order to facilitate data processing.

Place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and mail it. Your cooperation and assistance in this significant study is greatly appreciated.

1. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

2.1. What is your sex? 1. Male 2. Female

2.2. What is your age? __________ years old.

2.3. Which of the following categories best describes the type of community in which you spent most of your life prior to your college years?

1. Rural 2. Town or small city 3. Large urban center or city

3. Which of the following categories best describes the size of the community in which you spent most of your life prior to your college years?

1. Under 2,500 in population 2. 2,500 to 5,999 in population 3. 10,000 to 29,999 in population 4. 100,000 or more in population

4. Politically, do you consider yourself to be a(an): 1. Independent 2. Republican 3. Democrat 4. Other (Specify):
8. Were one or both of your parents active in the PTA/PTO?
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
   3. Don't recall

9. How does your present standard of living compare to that of your parents when they were your age?
   1. The same as your parents  
   2. Lower than your parents  
   3. Higher than your parents

10. Which category best describes the educational level of your father? (Select only one)
   1. Did not complete elementary school  
   2. Completed elementary school  
   3. Graduated from high school  
   4. Some college  
   5. Graduated from college  
   6. Graduate or professional school  
   7. Technical or trade school  
   8. Don't know

11. Which category best describes the educational level of your mother? (Select only one)
   1. Did not complete elementary school  
   2. Completed elementary school  
   3. Graduated from high school  
   4. Some college  
   5. Graduated from college  
   6. Graduate or professional school  
   7. Technical or trade school  
   8. Don't know

12. In general, do you believe that the children of today's superintendents will enjoy, as adults, a standard of living:
   1. Equal to your standard of living  
   2. Better than your standard of living  
   3. Lower than your standard of living  
   4. Don't know

### 11. CAREER DATA/PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

13. At what age were you employed in your first full-time position in public education? __________ years old.

14. In what type of school was your first full-time position in public education?
   1. Elementary school  
   2. Junior high/medium school  
   3. High school  
   4. College/university  
   5. Vocational/technical school

15. What subject(s) did you teach in your first full-time teaching position in public education? (Circle as many as apply).
   1. Elementary  
   2. Science  
   3. Mathematics  
   4. Social Science  
   5. English, Drama or Journalism  
   6. Health, physical education  
   7. Business education  
   8. Art  
   9. Music  
   10. Foreign Language  
   11. Special education  
   12. Counseling and guidance  
   13. Driver education  
   14. Vocational/technical  
   15. Industrial arts

16. What extracurricular activities were you responsible for in your first full-time position in education? (Circle as many as apply).
   1. Coaching athletics  
   2. Dramatics  
   3. Class advisor  
   4. School newspaper or annual  
   5. Music group outside of school day

17. How many years of classroom teaching experience have you had? Do not include years as full-time administrator or supervisor. __________ years.

18. At what age were you appointed to your first school administrative or supervisory position other than the superintendency? __________ years old.

19. What was the nature of your first administrative or supervisory position other than the superintendency? (Select only one)
   1. Assistant principal  
   2. Principal  
   3. Supervisor  
   4. Director  
   5. Assistant Superintendent  
   6. State Department of Education  
   7. Other (Specify):
20. How many public school superintendencies have you held including your present one? 

21. How many years have you served (in total) as a superintendent including 1981-82 

22. In how many states have you served as a public school superintendent? 

23. Were you elected or appointed to your present superintendency?
   1. Elected
   2. Appointed

24. Were you appointed or elected to your present superintendency from:
   1. Inside the same district
   2. Outside the district

25. How many years in length is the full term of your present Contract or Letter of Appointment with your school board? 

26. In the chart below, provide the following information for each superintendency you have held: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>A. Age</th>
<th>B. Tenure</th>
<th>C. Enrollment</th>
<th>D. Salary (In thousands)</th>
<th>E. State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Superintendency</td>
<td>(Include 1981-82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Superintency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Superintency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Superintency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. In which of the following types of positions have you had a full year or more of experience? (Place a check in the appropriate blanks).

- Elementary teacher
- High school asst.'s principal
- Elementary asst.'s principal
- High school principal
- Elementary principal
- Supervisor or consultant
- Jr. HIgh/middle sch. teacher
- Director
- Jnr. High/middle sch. asst.'s principal
- Asst.'s,assoc. superintendent
- Jr. High Asst.'s principal
- High school teacher
- Other (Specify) 

28. Which of the following combinations of educational experience best describe your career pattern prior to the superintendency? (Select only one). 

- Teacher only
- Principal only
- Central office only
- Teacher and principal
35. Have you spent your entire educational career in one school district?
   1. Yes  
   2. No

36. In what positions were you employed outside of public education for a period of one year or more since graduation from college? (Check those positions that apply).
   a. __________ No non-educational employment  
   b. __________ Military  
   c. __________ Business  
   d. __________ Non-public education  
   e. __________ Other (Specify): __________________________

37. At what age did you first decide that you wanted to become a school superintendent? ________ years old.

38. How long did it take you to obtain your first superintendency once you were certified and actively sought such a position?
   1. Less than 1 year  
   2. 1 year  
   3. 2 years  
   4. 3 years  
   5. 4 years  
   6. 5 or more years

39. What is your perception of the most important reason you were employed by your present board of education? (Select only one).
   1. My personal characteristics/qualifications  
   2. The board/community wanted some specific programmatic or curricular improvements made in the school district.  
   3. The board/community was looking for a person to solve some specific problems (i.e., closing schools, RIFing, desegregation, etc.)  
   4. The board/community wished to maintain the status quo.  
   5. Other (Specify): __________________________

40. Do you consider yourself to be a mentor?
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
   3. Uncertain, don't know

41. Do others come to you for career advice on a regular basis?
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
   3. Uncertain, don't know

42. Do you, or did you ever, have a mentor?
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
   3. Uncertain, don't know

43. The following data will be useful in determining the work load of the superintendent of schools. Please fill in the missing blanks.

   95/3:20-21
   a. __________ What in your estimation is the number of hours that you devote to the superintendency during a typical week?
   96/3:22
   b. __________ About how many evenings in a typical week do you obligate to do work related to the superintendency?
   97/3:23
   c. __________ About how many Saturdays in a typical month are devoted (whether for one hour or all day) to work related to the superintendency?
   98/3:24
   d. __________ About how many Sundays in a typical month are devoted (whether for one hour or all day) to work related to the superintendency?
   99/3:25
   e. __________ What time in the morning does your typical work day start?
   100/3:26
   f. __________ What time does your typical work day end?

44. How many professional meetings did you attend in the past twelve months?
   1. None  
   2. 1-2  
   3. 3-4  
   4. 5-6  
   5. 7-8  
   6. 9 or more  
   7. Don't know

45. Has the 'Old Boy/Girl Network' been effective in advancing your career?
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
   3. Don't know

46. Have you utilized the 'Old Boy/Girl Network' in employing other administrators?
   1. Yes  
   2. No
47. In your opinion, to what extent are discriminatory hiring and promotional practices a problem in limiting administrative career opportunities for women?
1. Major problem 2. Minor problem 3. Little or no problem

48. In your opinion, to what extent are discriminatory hiring and promotional practices a problem in limiting administrative career opportunities for minorities other than women?
1. Major problem 2. Minor problem 3. Little or no problem

49. Do you actively encourage/recruit women to enter administration?
1. Yes 2. No

50. Do you actively encourage/recruit minorities to enter administration?
1. Yes 2. No

51. From your perspective, which of the following factors most inhibit your effectiveness as superintendent? (Select no more than two)
01. Lack of time
02. Too much added responsibility
03. Inadequate financing of schools
04. Too many insignificant demands upon superintendent
05. Limits on personal or professional capabilities
06. Too many controls placed on superintendent
07. Inexperienced, unqualified, or ill-prepared staff members
08. Difficulty in relations with school board members
09. District too small
10. Not enough administrative staff members
11. Racial/Ethnic problems
12. Drug Problems
13. Clerical Staff
14. Philosophical differences with board/community
15. Collective Bargaining
16. None
17. Other (specify): ______________________
18. No opinion

52. During what period of service as a superintendent do you believe you were/will be most effective?
1. Early years
2. Middle years
3. Recent years
4. Years that lie ahead
5. Don't know

53. What, in your opinion, is the status/prestige of the position of the superintendent as educational or community leader in your school district? (Select only one).
1. Decreasing in importance and influence
2. Remaining about the same as it was 10 years ago
3. Increasing in importance and influence
4. Don't know

54. If you had to do it all over again, would you choose a career as/in: (Select only one).
1. School superintendent
2. Another educational administration or supervisory position
3. Classroom teacher
4. Guidance counselor
5. College professor
6. A position outside the field of education
7. Other (specify): ______________________
8. Don't know

55. If you have held more than one superintendency, please list below the reasons you left your last superintendency.

56. Please check the professional organizations in which you are an active member in good standing: (Check all that apply)
A. ASCA
B. AEA
C. WASC
D. State Professional Association(s)
E. ASCD
## SCHOOL BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT/COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS (from the perspective of your present position)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130/3:54 What is the average length of service of your present board members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131/3:55 Are board members appointed or elected?</td>
<td>1. Appointed  2. Elected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132/3:57-58 How many members of each sex serve on your board?</td>
<td>a. _______ Males  b. _______ Females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133/3:60 How many current board members belong to each of the following ethnic groups? (Fill in the blanks with the appropriate number).</td>
<td>a. _______ White (non-Hispanic)  b. _______ Black (non-Hispanic)  c. _______ Chicano/Hispanic  d. _______ Native American  e. _______ Asian/Pacific Islander  f. _______ Other (Specify): ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134/3:62 In your opinion, is community participation in school district decision making:</td>
<td>1. More important in 1981 than in 1971  2. Less important in 1981 than in 1971  3. About the same  4. Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135/3:69 Does your board view citizen participation:</td>
<td>1. Favorably  2. Unfavorably  3. Take it or leave it  4. Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136/3:70 In your opinion, what is occurring in regard to the desire of parents and/or community members to participate in the decision making process?</td>
<td>1. Parents/community are becoming more willing to participate  2. Parents/community are becoming less willing to participate  3. Parent/community willingness to participate remains about the same as it has been over the past few years  4. Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137/3:71 What do you see occurring in regard to the desire of students to participate in the decision making process?</td>
<td>1. Students are becoming more willing to participate  2. Students are becoming less willing to participate  3. Student willingness to participate remains about the same as it has been over the past few years  4. Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
68. Check below the areas in which you involve parents or other citizens in a planning-advisory capacity in your school district.

- 6/E: Objectives and priorities for the school
- 6/G: Program changes and new programs being considered
- 6/H: Student activities
- 6/I: Student behavior, rights and responsibilities
- 6/J: Finance and budget
- 6/K: Evaluation of programs
- 6/L: Evaluation of personnel
- 6/M: General administration
- 6/N: Fund raising
- 6/O: Other (specify)

69. How often does your board evaluate your job performance? (Select only one).

1. Annually
2. Semi-annually
3. At contract renewal time only
4. Don't know

70. What kind of procedure does your board use for evaluating your job performance? (Select only one).

1. Formal
2. Informal
3. Both of these
4. Don't know

71. If you are not formally evaluated, do you see a need to develop a formal procedure? (Select only one).

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

72. If you are not formally evaluated, does your board of education see a need to develop a formal procedure? (Select only one).

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

73. In your opinion, which of the following are reasons for your board evaluating you? (Select the two most important).

1. To provide periodic and systematic accountability
2. To establish evidence for dismissal
3. To identify areas needing improvement
4. To point out strengths
5. To document general dissatisfaction with your performance
6. To help you establish relevant performance goals
7. To assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards
8. To comply with board policy
9. To determine qualifications for permanent status
10. To determine salary for the following year
11. Other (Specify)
12. Don't know
13. Question does not apply

74. For each of the following criteria please indicate the degree to which each criterion is a factor in your evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not a Factor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155/4:24</td>
<td>a. General effectiveness of your performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:25</td>
<td>b. Your personal characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:26</td>
<td>c. Educational leadership and knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:27</td>
<td>d. Management functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:28</td>
<td>e. Recruitment, employment and supervision of personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:29</td>
<td>f. Budget development and implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:30</td>
<td>g. Board/superintendent relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:31</td>
<td>h. Staff/superintendent relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:32</td>
<td>i. Student/superintendent relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155/4:33</td>
<td>j. Community/superintendent relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75. Which of the following methods are used in your evaluation by the board? (Select the two most important.)

01. Discussion at executive meeting of Board members only
02. Discussion at a meeting of the Board and the superintendent
03. Rating forms used individually and/or collectively
04. Written evaluation presented to the superintendent
05. Criteria for the appraisal developed in advance by the Board
06. Criteria previously agreed to by the Board and the superintendent
07. The superintendent is rated on each criterion
08. Board consults others before completion of its evaluation
09. Observation and association of Board and the superintendent at meetings, other times
10. Assessment of the superintendent's written reports
11. Evaluation against goals and objectives for past year
12. Comparison with other districts
13. The superintendent has the opportunity to respond to Board evaluation
14. The superintendent has the opportunity to measure the performance of the Board
15. Other [Specify]: ________________________
16. Don't know
17. Question does not apply

76. From your point of view, which of the following are your board's primary expectations of you as a superintendent? (Select only two.)

1. Skill in human relations
2. Knowledge of finance
3. Internal management
4. P.R. - Community relations
5. Curriculum development
6. Planning
7. Other [Specify]: ________________________
8. Don't know

77. Do you have a formal job description?

1. Yes
2. No

78. If you have a formal job description, are you evaluated against the criteria in the description?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Does not apply

79. As superintendent, what do you see as the most difficult problem your board members face as board members? (List only one.)

80. Listed below are some individuals/groups which may be sources of information to school board members for decision making purposes. From your perspective how much weight do board members give information from each of these groups? (List only one.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very great weight</th>
<th>Considerable weight</th>
<th>Some little weight</th>
<th>No weight</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District superintendent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Central office staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teacher organizations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Parents</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Special interest groups in the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Local power structure in the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. School board organizations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. Issues and Challenges Facing the Superintendent Today

#### A1. Degree of Importance:
Please rate each of the following issues and challenges facing the superintendent today on your school district on the following scale: 1 = Great Importance, 2 = Significant Importance, 3 = Limited Importance, or 4 = Not Important. (Circle appropriate response.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues/Challenges</th>
<th>Pre-service</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration, or segregation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Issues such as negotiations, strikes, sanctions and/or forms of teacher militancy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student activism.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decentralization of large districts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consolidation of small districts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Changing priorities in curriculum such as &quot;Back to the Basics,&quot; black studies courses in sex education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Demands for new ways of teaching or operating the educational program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlay.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assessing educational outcomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Growing pressure for public support of non-public schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Declining federal involvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Caliber of persons assigned to or removed from local boards of education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Caliber of responsibilities assigned to or removed from local boards of education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rapidly decreasing/increasing enrollments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A2. Pre-service/In-service:
Please indicate whether the issues listed, 1) should be included in pre-service education programs only, 2) should be handled through in-service education only, 3) both, or 4) should not be included in either. (Circle appropriate response.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Pre-service</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

251/5:50-51 83. What is the highest earned degree you hold? (Select only one)

- 01. Less than BA
- 02. Bachelor's Degree
- 03. Master's degree in Education
- 04. Master's degree not in Education
- 05. Master's degree plus some work for a doctoral degree
- 06. Master's degree plus all course work for a doctoral degree
- 07. Specialist degree
- 08. Doctor of Education or Philosophy
- 09. Doctor of Philosophy
- 10. Additional work beyond the doctorate
- 11. Doctoral degree
- 12. Some other degree (Specify): 

252/5:52-53 84. In which of the following areas did you major as an undergraduate? If you majored in more than one, choose the one with the most hours. (Select only one)

- 01. Agriculture
- 02. Business
- 03. Education (other than phys. ed.)
- 04. Fine arts
- 05. Humanities (e.g., literature, languages, etc.)
- 06. Mathematics
- 07. Physical Education
- 08. Physical or Biological sciences
- 09. Social sciences (e.g., sociology, history, etc.)
- 10. Other (Specify): 

253/5:54-55 85.-87. What was your major field of study for each of your graduate degrees? Certificates? Choose only one per program and write the appropriate number from the list below in the corresponding blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95.</th>
<th>86.</th>
<th>87.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Sixth Year or Specialist</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

254/5:56-57

255/5:58-60 88.-90. Please provide the following information only for graduate programs of study completed in educational administration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>88.</th>
<th>89.</th>
<th>90.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Sixth Year or Specialist</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 256/5:60-61 | 257/5:62-63 | 258/5:64 |
| a. Age at the start of degree study | b. Age at completion of degree study | c. Did you receive a fellowship or assistantship? |
| 260/5:68 | e. Who provided the fellowship/assistantship (university, federal, private, etc.) | |
| 261/5:69 | f. Did you receive sabbatical leave or other financial support from your district? | 1. Yes 2. No 1. Yes 2. No 1. Yes 2. No |
| 263/5:71 | h. Did you have to seek a loan to complete your study? | 1. Yes 2. No 1. Yes 2. No 1. Yes 2. No |
| 264/5:72-76 | i. If yes, how much did you borrow for such purposes? | |
| 265/5:75-76 | j. Years of administrative experience when degree was received | |
| 266/5:77 | k. Indicate number of semesters or quarters spent in full-time study | 2** | 3* | 4* |
10. What weakness do you see in your graduate study program? (Select only one)

1. Low quality of professors
2. Poor library or other facilities
3. Poor or irrelevant course offerings in general
4. Shortcomings in, or lack of specific classes
5. Poor quality of specific educational administration courses
6. Lack of support from other depts.
7. Other:

8. Educational Administration Courses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance Systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Business Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aspects of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Plant Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School Principalship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Educational Foundations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Growth and Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (Adolescent &amp; Other)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Curriculum, Instruction & Supervision
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and/or Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Experience</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Surveys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Visits &amp; Observations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Science Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Science Course</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer-assisted Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia, including TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP&amp;O or Program Budgeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humanities and Fine Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities and Fine Arts</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Science and Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science and Mathematics</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Highly Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. SELF-FULFILLMENT

97. Which issue listed on pages 9 and 10 (questions 81 and 82) would cause you to leave the superintendency if the issue intensifies further in your school district? (Write the appropriate number from the list of issues/challenges).

98. What are your future plans in the superintendency? Please circle the one which reflects your thinking today.

O1. I definitely will continue in a superintendency whether in this district or another until the normal retirement age.
O2. I will probably continue in a superintendency until I can qualify for minimum state retirement benefits.
O3. I will probably leave when I find a desirable position in a university.
O4. I will probably leave when I find a desirable position outside of education.
O5. This is an impossible position and I want to get out of the superintendency as soon as possible.
O6. I will remain until a position outside the superintendency opens which allows me to make a greater contribution to education.
O7. I expect to leave the superintendency for another position temporarily but I will eventually return to a superintendency position.
O8. Other, please specify ____________________________

99. Don't know
99. How much self-fulfillment (that is, the feeling of being able to use one's unique capabilities, or realizing one's potential) does your position as superintendent provide?

1. None
2. Little
3. Moderate
4. Considerable

100. The superintendency is often described as a stressful occupation. Do you, as superintendent, feel:

1. No stress
2. Little stress
3. Some stress
4. Considerable stress
5. Very great stress

101. Listed below are a number of things which sometimes trouble superintendents. To what extent does each of the following occur in your situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I am concerned about what an individual or group may do if I make a decision contrary to their wishes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I find myself being concerned whether I have made the right decision on a matter with which I have just dealt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I am concerned about relating to, and being supported by, the local power structure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am concerned about a lack of control over events which occur that affect the schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I am concerned about how to deal with nonproductive and/or uncooperative staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I am concerned about gaining community support for school district programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I am kept awake at night thinking about tasks undone or problems unresolved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I am concerned about my relations with the teachers union/assoc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I am concerned about the impression I will make when attending meetings of various community groups in my role as superintendent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. I find myself being concerned about financial matters and levy issues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. I feel nervous when planning or participating in school board meetings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIII. School District Data

#### 341/7/48-49

**103. What grade levels are included in your district?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. K or 1-2</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. K or 1-3</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. K or 1-6</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vocational/technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**107. Other (Specify):**

#### 343/7/50

**109. Does your school district provide pre-kindergarten education?**

1. Yes
2. No

#### 344/7/51-52

**105. How many students were enrolled in your district as of September, 1981?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 100,000 or more</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1,000 to 2,999</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 300 to 999</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 345/7/53-54

**106. How does the present enrollment compare with that of 1970?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase of 225 or more</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase of 10 to 224</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase of 5 to 19</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase of less than 5</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. Decrease of 225 or more**

#### 346/7/55-56

**107. In which geographical region is your school district located?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New England</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Midwest</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Southeast</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 347/7/57-58

**108. What is the total population (all ages) of your school district?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 200,000 and over</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 100,000 to 249,999</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 50,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Less than 50,000</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**109. Which of the following categories best describes your school district?**

1. Major urban center (school district contains a central city of 200,000 or more population)
2. City district (school district contains a central city of 50,000 to 200,000 population)
3. Suburban (school district does not contain a central city of 50,000 or more but is located within a county or contiguous counties adjacent to be socially and economically integrated with the central city)
4. Non-urban/suburban (all school districts not identified in 1, 2 or 3).
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110. How many central office administrators are there in your district? Do not count yourself. If none, enter a zero.

111. How many of these central office administrators are female? Do not count yourself. If none, enter a zero.

112. How many of these central office administrators belong to each of the following ethnic groups? (Fill in the blanks with the appropriate numbers.)
   a. White (non-Hispanic)  
   b. Black (non-Hispanic)  
   c. Chicano/Hispanic  
   d. Asian/Pacific Islander  
   e. Native American  
   f. Other (Specify): 

113. How many staff members report to you directly?

114. Of the subordinate administrative service areas available to you in your district, which one do you rely on most heavily? (List only one).

115. In projecting the administrative needs of your district, what types of specialists do you believe will be needed in your district, that you do not now have, to keep pace with educational needs over the next several years? (Select no more than three.)
   a. Curriculum and Instructional  
   b. Public Relations  
   c. Research and development  
   d. Government relations  
   e. Board attorney  
   f. More general administrators  
   g. More classified personnel  
   h. More elementary specialists  
   i. More secondary specialists  
   j. More high school specialists  
   k. More junior high specialists  
   l. More elementary specialists  
   m. More specialists  
   n. More business management  
   o. More staff development  
   p. More business managers  
   q. More business managers

116. Who serves as the chief negotiator for your district?
   1. Superintendent  
   2. Professional negotiator from inside  
   3. Professional negotiator from outside  
   4. Board attorney  
   5. Board attorney  
   6. Board attorney  
   7. Board attorney  
   8. Board attorney  

117. How many strikes have you experienced during your career as superintendent?

Thank you most sincerely for your cooperation and patience in completing this questionnaire.

Please return in the envelope provided as soon as possible to:

Dr. Luverna L. Cunningham
Ohio State University
120 W. 1873rd Ave
Columbus, Ohio 43212
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APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

I.D.# ________________

Good morning/afternoon. My name is Clayton Dusek. I am a Ph.D. student at The Ohio State University, and I am attempting to collect some data for my dissertation on the school superintendent. I would like to ask you a few questions and the entire interview will take no longer than ten minutes. Your responses will be completely confidential.

(1) Would you be willing to help with my research and give me about ten minutes of your time?
Yes _____ No _____
Call back: date _______ time _______

(2) Thank you for agreeing to help. May I tape record the interview?
Yes _____ No _____

(3) Were you employed in your present position from inside the same school district or were you employed from outside?
Career-bound _____ Place-bound _____

(4) How long have you been in your present superintendency?
________ years

The focus of my study is the comparison of superintendents who were promoted from within a district to those employed from outside.

(5) What are your perceptions of the main problems faced by a superintendent hired from outside?
(6) What are your perceptions of the main problems faced by a superintendent promoted from within?

(7) If a second level administrator in your district was in conflict with the board of education, what would you do?

(8) Have you made any major policy changes in your district since you became superintendent? If so, could you describe them?

(9) As far back as you can remember, were your predecessors hired from outside or inside?

__________________________ most immediate predecessor

__________________________

__________________________

(10) What are your plans for the future, in terms of your career in the superintendency?

(11) What is your perception as to why the board of education selected you as the superintendent?

(12) How often do you deal with issues directly involving a student or students in your district?
(13) Was an increase in salary a primary consideration in accepting this superintendency?

  yes  no

Thank you for the valuable information you have given me. I appreciate your help.
TABLE 15
COMPARATIVE RANKINGS OF 1981 AASA SURVEY EDUCATIONAL ISSUES BY CAREER ORIGIN TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Issue</th>
<th>Comparative Rankings (Raw Ranking Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration, or segregation.</td>
<td>30 (27.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues such as negotiations, strikes, sanctions and/or forms of teacher militancy.</td>
<td>9 (68.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activism.</td>
<td>35 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization of school districts.</td>
<td>34 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of small districts.</td>
<td>31 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing priorities in curriculum such as &quot;Back to the Basics,&quot; black studies courses or sex education.</td>
<td>20 (50.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for new ways of teaching or operating the educational program.</td>
<td>23 (47.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlay.</td>
<td>1 (94.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Issue</th>
<th>Career Bound</th>
<th>Place Bound</th>
<th>Extreme Career Bound</th>
<th>Extreme Place Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing educational outcomes.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(77.0)</td>
<td>(81.0)</td>
<td>(75.3)</td>
<td>(74.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing pressure for public support of non-public schools.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40.1)</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
<td>(42.6)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining federal involvement.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.5)</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td>(36.7)</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliber of responsibilities assigned to or removed from local boards of education.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46.2)</td>
<td>(42.2)</td>
<td>(42.9)</td>
<td>(41.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapidly decreasing/increasing enrollments.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62.8)</td>
<td>(64.5)</td>
<td>(65.1)</td>
<td>(68.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater visibility of the superintendent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62.4)</td>
<td>(60.6)</td>
<td>(58.3)</td>
<td>(65.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing attacks on the superintendent.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32.9)</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td>(30.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of drugs and alcohol in the schools.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56.2)</td>
<td>(56.2)</td>
<td>(59.1)</td>
<td>(57.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in values and behavioral norms.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51.9)</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td>(53.1)</td>
<td>(55.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education/Public Law 94-142.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71.5)</td>
<td>(79.1)</td>
<td>(74.9)</td>
<td>(79.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/Credibility.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74.9)</td>
<td>(78.9)</td>
<td>(76.3)</td>
<td>(78.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Issue</td>
<td>Career Bound</td>
<td>Place Bound</td>
<td>Extreme Career Bound</td>
<td>Extreme Place Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement in school district decision making.</td>
<td>14 (57.8)</td>
<td>18 (55.0)</td>
<td>17 (57.4)</td>
<td>16 (57.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIFing.</td>
<td>21 (49.2)</td>
<td>26 (41.0)</td>
<td>23 (45.1)</td>
<td>26 (37.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action Programs/Title IX.</td>
<td>32 (22.0)</td>
<td>32 (24.2)</td>
<td>33 (24.1)</td>
<td>32 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline.</td>
<td>18 (55.0)</td>
<td>14 (56.7)</td>
<td>13 (59.1)</td>
<td>19 (53.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and goal setting.</td>
<td>2 (81.2)</td>
<td>3 (79.6)</td>
<td>2 (79.3)</td>
<td>5 (76.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator-board relations.</td>
<td>5 (74.9)</td>
<td>8 (72.0)</td>
<td>6 (75.0)</td>
<td>8 (68.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and funding instructional programs for new aliens.</td>
<td>33 (16.2)</td>
<td>33 (18.1)</td>
<td>34 (16.2)</td>
<td>33 (21.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recruiting/selection.</td>
<td>15 (56.7)</td>
<td>21 (48.3)</td>
<td>15 (58.5)</td>
<td>23 (43.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal time management.</td>
<td>12 (60.0)</td>
<td>11 (61.3)</td>
<td>11 (60.3)</td>
<td>12 (63.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent apathy and irresponsibility about their own children—including child abuse.</td>
<td>13 (58.4)</td>
<td>17 (56.0)</td>
<td>14 (58.9)</td>
<td>14 (59.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 15 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Issue</th>
<th>Career Bound</th>
<th>Place Bound</th>
<th>Extreme Career Bound</th>
<th>Extreme Place Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student rights in terms of due process requirements and court imposed procedures.</td>
<td>25 (42.5)</td>
<td>24 (41.5)</td>
<td>26 (40.7)</td>
<td>28 (34.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with state and federal record keeping requirements.</td>
<td>16 (56.6)</td>
<td>13 (59.6)</td>
<td>18 (54.4)</td>
<td>11 (65.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining timely and accurate information for decision making.</td>
<td>8 (69.2)</td>
<td>7 (72.6)</td>
<td>8 (70.0)</td>
<td>6 (74.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier-free facilities for handicapped students.</td>
<td>29 (28.9)</td>
<td>28 (33.4)</td>
<td>30 (34.5)</td>
<td>27 (35.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and administrator evaluation.</td>
<td>4 (76.4)</td>
<td>6 (73.7)</td>
<td>3 (76.4)</td>
<td>7 (72.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliber of persons assigned to or removed from local boards of education.</td>
<td>22 (48.6)</td>
<td>22 (43.4)</td>
<td>21 (47.8)</td>
<td>22 (44.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a \] Raw ranking scores were calculated by adding the percentages of each career origin type who rated the issue either "of great significance" or "significant."
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