THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS IN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN REGION 20 ESC

A Record of Study

by

PETER JOHN RUNNING

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

December 2004

Major Subject: Educational Administration

THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS IN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN REGION 20 ESC

A Record of Study

by

PETER JOHN RUNNING

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved as to style and content by:

_____	_____
John Hoyle (Chair of Committee)	Robert Slater (Member)
_____	_____
Stephen Stark (Member)	Ronald Zellner (Member)
_____	
Jim Scheurich (Head of Department)	

December 2004

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

The Role of the Superintendent as Perceived by School Administrators
and School Board Presidents in Texas Public Schools
in Region 20 ESC. (December 2004)
Peter John Running, B.S., University of Michigan;
M.Ed., Texas A&M University
Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. John Hoyle

This study examined the role of the superintendent as it is perceived by school administrators and school board presidents. The study was limited to public schools in Texas located within Region 20 ESC. Responses to a Likert-type instrument were solicited from school board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators (n=163).

The questionnaire generated data regarding perceptions toward the role of the superintendent in nine different domains containing 38 different criteria. Results from an ANOVA showed no significant difference at the alpha level of .05. Sidak post-hoc tests were run as well, but because the ANOVA did not reveal any significant difference, the post-hoc data was not presented.

The primary conclusion drawn from this study was that the perceived conflict in the literature that exists between boards and superintendents that is prevalent enough to cause a superintendent to leave a district, was not brought to light in this study. Board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators all appear to have

the same perceptions regarding the role of the superintendent. This questionnaire did not reveal the source of conflict. However, the data revealed that board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators see the superintendent's role in the same way. The findings from this research may indicate that as a result of extensive board training, there may be improved respect and communication between the board, superintendents, and other school administrators.

Recommendations include, among others:

1. Research into the development of an instrument that examines a more reflective relationship between the board and superintendent dealing with the aspects of personality, character, prejudices and attitudes.

2. Through the legal process, to increase the length of a term for board members from the current three-year term to at least five years.

3. Through the legal process, modify the Open Meetings Act to allow boards the freedom to conduct self-evaluations and "board performance" issues behind closed doors. This would eliminate the perception of the board "airing dirty laundry" in public.

DEDICATION

This record of study is dedicated to my parents, Thomas and Dorothy Running. My father taught me the meaning of a strong work ethic, dedication and what the strength of conviction can do. My mother taught me the meaning of unconditional love for family, perseverance and what a strong heart can do. Dad, although you were called home in May of 1995, I know you are with me. Mom, I am eternally grateful for all you have done for me!

I am a strong and peaceful man who is willing to totally yield to the Will of God, trusting I will continue to live in His Grace!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am much indebted to the following individuals for creating a stimulating arena for personal, professional and academic growth. A special thanks to Dr. John Hoyle for serving as my committee chair and for his great patience and understanding throughout this entire process. His leadership and guidance were exemplary, and I am forever indebted. I am also forever indebted to the EHRD staff, particularly Joyce Nelson and Clarice Fulton for their unending willingness to go the extra mile time and time again. A special thanks goes to Bill Ashworth for his help and encouragement throughout my entire course of study.

I would also like to extend a very special thanks to my committee members for their help, understanding and for pushing me to have a respect for knowledge by providing challenging and stimulating discussions and for raising the bar of expectations. My committee members include Dr. Stephen Stark, Dr. Robert Slater and Dr. Ron Zellner. I could not have reached this goal if it were not for the collective encouragement of the entire committee.

I am indebted to my mother and to Bill and Carol McCagherty for their support. I was blessed to have the support of my sister Marg and her family and my brother Ed and his family.

Lastly, I want to recognize my family. To Sterling, D.D. and Gerald, I have been blessed by each of you. In your own special ways, you have all taught me what it takes to be a step-father, and I'm proud to call you my sons. You are all fine men

with tremendous hearts, and I love you all. To my daughter Katie, you have always been in my thoughts and in my heart. I continue to hope and pray….!

Finally, to Jamie thank you for your love, support, gentle prodding and for living a life that shows me daily that anything is possible with God in my corner and in the center of my life. Most of all, thank you for agreeing to be my life long partner. If it were not for you, it would have been even more difficult to realize this accomplishment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk*, there has been a great emphasis on improving the effectiveness of schools and improving student performance. In studies by Hoyle, Ealy, Hogan and Skrla, (2000) and Hoyle, Hogan, Skrla and Ealy (2001) it was discovered that increased performance by students resulted from an increase of economic and political attention given to the evaluation of superintendents and the demand for greater accountability. Public school boards and superintendents are responsible for educating over 53 million students (Goodman and Zimmerman, p.3) in over 15,000 school districts nationwide. In Texas alone, according to the 2001 – 2002 Texas Education Agency's statistics, there are 1,042 districts and almost 4 million students to be educated. Goodman and Zimmerman (2000), explain that "superintendent leadership" and "teamwork" were crucial factors affecting success of students. Therefore the perception of what the role of the superintendent is must be decided upon and agreed upon by the team members in order to have a smooth running district. This will facilitate teachers and students being successful. If the perception of what the role of the superintendent is not agreed upon, there is turmoil and discourse. Cashburn (1975) states that if the perception of the role of the superintendent is not similar to that of the board, then the mutual

---

The style and format of this study follow that of the *Journal of Educational Research.*

expectation of an effective school district is compromised and many times to the point of being counter productive. The effectiveness of the team depends on how well each member understands his or her role. The board members must understand that their role is to select and work with a superintendent to make policy. The role of the superintendent is to work with the board to enforce policies and act as the chief executive officer for the district. Public school superintendents must know and be able to perform a great number of tasks (Cunningham, 1999). Due to the increase of accountability and student success, superintendents find themselves in a role that is defined very differently than even a decade ago. Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) state, "several profound shifts in American life and culture have compelled schools, and their leaders, to rethink some of our basic premises of public education…" (p.7). These shifts of increased accountability, the diversity of students, and school funding have placed a great amount of pressure and increased the importance of the effectiveness of the working relationship between the board and the superintendent. This working relationship must then be rooted with a clear understanding of what the role of the superintendent is to be.

Statement of the Problem

There is a growing problem in that the numbers of vacant superintendent positions are on the rise. Many superintendents are currently retiring each year. Hoyle et al.(2001) provides alarming statistics that by 2005, 51% of new superintendents will leave the profession and that 80% of practicing superintendents

will be eligible to retire due to age. With this indication of an upcoming high turnover rate, evidence suggests that if superintendents are to be successful, the superintendent and board must be a unified team with clear goals and expectation for the school district. The role of the superintendent / board team is to have documented clearly defined objectives for improving student performance and being educational leaders for the community. (Goodman and Zimmerman, 1997). Also, there is a pattern of superintendents moving from job to job. There is common knowledge that conflict between the school boards and superintendents is one of the major reasons for the retiring and the job switching. Research is limited on solving governance problems that can cause superintendents to be terminated or leave on their own.

Purpose of the Study

The basis of this investigation is to extend research conducted by Casburn (1975) who examined the role of the superintendent as perceived by superintendents, school administrators, and presidents of the boards of education with specific emphasis on governance issues.

The primary purpose of this investigation is to evaluate the role expectation of the superintendent to see if conflict is reflected in the responses of board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC. A second purpose of this study is to determine if a congruence of perception about the role expectation of the superintendent exists between the president of the board of education and other school administrators. A third purpose of this study is to

determine if a congruence of perception about the role expectation of the superintendent exits between the superintendent and other school administrators.

The Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire (Fast, 1968) was the instrument used to measure the differences in perceptions on the role of the superintendent between superintendents, other school administrators and presidents of the boards of education.

Research Questions

The research questions posed are as follows:

1. Is there conflict reflected in the responses regarding role expectations of the superintendent as perceived by school board presidents, superintendents, and other school administrators from Texas public school districts in Region 20 ESC?
2. Are there differences in the perceptions of the role expectation of superintendents between the president of the board of education and superintendents in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?
3. Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between presidents of the board of education and other school administrators in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC.
4. Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between superintendents and other school administrators in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC.

Significance of the Study

The future of public school systems depends to a great extent on the leadership competencies; the knowledge, proficiencies, and skills of school superintendents. Even if the competencies are performed well, if the role of the superintendent is not mutually agreed upon by the board and the superintendent, then the perceived effectiveness of the superintendent is compromised. When board members and superintendents are unclear about who is responsible for which duties, conflict, inefficiency, and frustration are inevitable (Goodman and Zimmerman, 2000). These authors further state that there must be "an atmosphere of cooperation and mutual support" to have an effective leadership team and have an atmosphere that fosters a unity of purpose, a clear mission and a sense of responsibility for action to achieve both long and short term visions (p. 13).

The intent of this study is to provide information regarding the importance of the perception of the role of the superintendent and the effect on board – superintendent relations. Results of this study may provide a forum for suggestions as to how to improve relationships and be able to decrease the chances for a negative perception which will allow superintendents to do the job they have been hired to do – lead school districts.

Operational Definitions

The following definitions will be pertinent to this study:

Superintendent: The superintendent is defined as the chief executive officer (CEO), chief financial officer, (CFO) who is appointed by the board of trustees and given power, both legal and administrative, to administer the day-to-day operations of the school district in which he or she was appointed. The superintendent is superodinate to the professional and non-professional staff but subordinate to the board of trustees.

School Board President: The school board president is defined as the duly elected officer to preside over the board, its actions, to represent the board as a whole when a quorum of the board is not present or required, and as spokesperson or representative for ceremonial purposes.

School Board: The body of duly elected individuals to oversee the discharge of authority necessary to operate a school district. The "school board" is also referred to as the "board of trustees".

School Administrators: This is defined as the administrative positions that include superintendent, deputy superintendent, associate superintendent, assistant superintendent and area superintendent. These positions are limited to the position immediately subordinate to the superintendent and include only central office positions.

Central Office: This is defined as administrative positions that are not found at the campus level. Central office positions are superordinate to the administrative positions at the campus level.

Region 20 Education Service Center (ESC): One of 20 non-regulatory agencies within Texas that assist school districts and charter schools in improving student performance and increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of school operations. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) defines the geographical borders that each of the regional service centers encompasses. Region 20 ESC is located in San Antonio.

Role: Robert Owens (1987) defines "role" as a "psychological concept dealing with behavior enactment arising from interaction with other human beings". Owens also states that this interaction includes the expectation that the individual will exhibit some "idiosyncratic personality in role behavior" (p.62).

Role Expectation: Robert Owens (1987) defines "role expectation" as the expectation that one person has of the role behavior of another" (p.62).

Perception: *Webster's Dictionary II* (1984) defines perception as "the act, process, or faculty of perceiving" and as "insight, intuition, or knowledge gained by perceiving".

Assumptions

1. Administrators will understand the purpose of the instrument and answer it honestly and to the best of their ability.
2. The researcher will be impartial in collecting and analyzing the questionnaire data.
3. The interpretation of the data will accurately reflect that which is intended.
4. The individual who returned the survey is the individual who completed the survey.
5. The instrument used in this study accurately measured the responses rendered by the selected population.
6. The perceived role of a superintendent by school board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators are accurately reflected by the instrument.

Limitations

1. Findings from this study may not be generalized to any other group than the Texas public school districts in Region 20 ESC.
2. Only the 163 identified 2001 – 2002 board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators in Region 20 ESC public schools will be surveyed.
3. Objectivity of the responses to the survey instrument may be affected due to the fact that a self-report was used. Asking presidents of boards and school administrators to assess the superintendent and themselves may reflect personal biases.

4. Due to a low percentage rate of return, generalizations my be skewed and not representative of the population

Contents of the Record of Study

The dissertation will be divided into five major units or chapters. Chapter I contains an introduction, a statement of the problem, a need for the study, specific objectives, assumptions and limitations, and a definition of terms. Chapter II will contain a review of the literature. The methodology and procedures will be found in Chapter III, and Chapter IV will contain the analysis and comparisons of the data collected in the study. Chapter V will contain the researcher's conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For the past two decades and certainly since the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* where it was pointed out that "The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded…by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and as a people" (London, 1992), educators and non-educators alike have put a tremendous emphasis on improving schools and increasing student performance. In the March 2003 issue of *Fiscal Notes* disseminated by the office of the Comptroller of the State of Texas Carol Keeton Strayhorn, a list of "10 principles for Texas in the 21st Century" appears. The third principle listed is to "raise the bar on student performance". A great deal of pressure has been put on administrators, teachers and students. Richard Riley (1998) stated it this way: "And this I know for sure-we are in a new time with new challenges-and none is more important than this: never has this nation been confronted with the task of teaching so much to so many while reaching for new high standards-that is the state of American education and America's first challenge" (p.2). This pressure has been exerted in the form of standardized tests and which results have been monitored and graded by the Texas Education Agency. These have taken the form of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills or the TAAS test and for the first time in 2003, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills or the TAKS test. The grading system that school districts find themselves in the center of is controversial to say the least. There have been accusations in different forms of testing biases ranging from the racial aspect to trying to play "got you" or testing what

the student does not know. At the center of this is the CEO of the district, the superintendent. The superintendent finds himself being pulled in many different directions and as Hoyle (2002) stated in his Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum sponsored presentation entitled *Superintendents for Texas School Districts: Solving the Crisis in Executive Leadership*, "increased scrutiny by the state legislature, media, business and special interest groups have made school improvement and higher student achievement a top priority" (p.7). Hoyle goes on to say that as CEO's, superintendents find themselves involved in political work (Hoyle, 2002). Peggy Ondorvich (1997) stated from her superintendent position perspective that "with the proliferation of single-issue school board members and private agendas, dealing effectively with conflict has never been a more crucial skill for the superintendent. Today, superintendents find themselves in a role defined quite differently than that of even a decade ago. As Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) state in the AASA publication *The Study of the American School Superintendency 2000*, "several profound shifts in American life and culture have compelled schools, and their leaders, to rethink some of our basic premises of public education… that the rapid increase in both number and diversity of students … demands new skills of teachers and administrators. …Add to this mix the …commitment to high standards and accountability, the stress in the superintendency becomes clear" (p.7). Glass, Bjork and Brunner (2000) states, "Whenever significant changes are made in how schools are organized and students are taught, the position of the superintendent is affected, and sometimes changed. The men and women who hold these key leadership positions are vitally important to the future success of American public schools.

Their leadership will significantly shape and mold the schools of the next century…" (Glass, p.1). Research indicates that there are differing opinions as to how to "fix" the problems facing public education whether on a notional or state level. Individuals such as Alfie Kohn (1991) and Richard Elmore (1997) discuss and pose solutions from a different angle. Kohn describes the problem from a different perspective and that in the name of "improving schools", the best teachers and administrators have been beat down as a result of the plague of terms such as "tougher standards," "accountability," and "raising the bar". Kohn goes on to state that because of these terms and their implications and the approach used to achieve higher standards, schools have been turned into "test-prep" centers (p.1). Elmore acknowledges "education is a vast and extraordinarily complex enterprise that seems to defy simple generalizations" and goes on to discuss what he believes to be the difference between "dispersed" control and "decentralized" control (p.1). Elmore uses the term dispersed control because of his notion of local control of schools as being outmoded. Elmore makes the point that "political pluralism" is more straightforward as it "captures a fundamental principle of U.S. politics-that political decisions and actions are the result of competing groups with different resources and capacities vying for influence in a constitutional system that encourages conflict as an antidote to the concentration of power (p.2). Although there are differing ideas as to how to fix the problem, what commonly remains is there is a problem. There may also be different ideas as to where to affix blame if students are not performing at acceptable levels. Elmore argues that situations of low performing schools are reflective of inadequate policy makers and administrators (p.12). Once again the importance of a strong and positive

relationship between the policy makers (the board) and administrators (the superintendent) is the focus.

Public school superintendents today have an overwhelming number of responsibilities and must know and be able to perform a myriad of tasks (Cunningham, 1999). In a study entitled *Cultivating a Successful relationship Between the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Trustees*, the unknown author states "the superintendent's position as chief executive officer of the district and the superintendent's direct relationship with the board of trustees, render the Superintendent's position unlike any other in the public education arena (p.7). The superintendent cannot be an expert in one area and ignore the other areas. Cunningham (1999) advised that an effective superintendent does not try to do too much of any one thing. Superintendents must look at the "big picture" concept to be effective. To look at the superintendent in the 21st century, many would view them as an expert on schools. Boards, teachers, and community members look upon this expert as a "peace-keeper" in the district (Glass, Bjork and Brunner, 2000). However, Glass et al. goes on to state that while comparing the superintendent to the same position years ago, the superintendent of today must me more politically driven (p.3). However politically driven a superintendent is, Glass et al. (2000) wrote that superintendents do not have many, if any, powers given to them by state legislative decree but get their power from the local governing Board of Trustees for the school district. This local power has gone through a paradox of growth in the past few years. The perception viewed is an increase in power in some areas with a decrease in power in others. This is perhaps a result of the effort mandated through legislative control to

increase local accountability of school funding. There is also a perception of increased power in the area of site-based decision-making committees (SBDMC). These issues cloud the general perception of power that a superintendent has. While superintendents do not dominate school systems like they have done in years past, they do have the influence of recommending appointments, assignments, promotions, and salaries; they have the capacity to develop and control the flow of information in the district; they can use personnel to help analyze the school and the community; they can use this analysis to plan for the district's future; and they can act as a power broker and as a mediator in the district. (Sharp and Walter, 1997).

Studies by Hoyle, Ealy, Hogan and Skrla, (2000) and Hoyle, Hogan, Skrla and Ealy (2001) found increased student performance is resulting from increased economic and political attention given to superintendent evaluation and the demand for greater accountability. Yet with all the focus on improvement, there has been very little focus on improving school district governance (Goodman, Fulbright, and Zimmerman, 1997, and Hoyle 2001). Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) added the importance of "superintendent leadership" and "teamwork". Public school boards and superintendents are responsible for the education of over 53 million students and over 15,000 school districts nationwide (p.3). Texas educators are responsible for students making up 1,042 public school districts and according to the 1999 – 2000 Texas Education Agency's statistics, there were nearly four million students. The school boards and superintendents of the districts manage the "business" of schools in our state and will be part of the educational development of tomorrow's citizenry. It

seems obvious that the success of the school governance team is directly linked to the future of Texas' education and the nation's education as a whole.

Hoyle (2000) reports that there is a crisis in the superintendency and goes on to say that it reaches far beyond the schools of Texas and without the best and brightest eager to become the CEO's of school districts, our state and its children will suffer and calls energetic, talented, and visionary superintendents "to light the fire of others" (p.1). Without this there will be a lack of high performing districts.

When Hoyle et al. (2002) asked the question of why any one would become a superintendent, it seems the question was answered from the perspective of why "the best and brightest" are not becoming superintendents. Respondents of the question cited reasons such as financial pressure within the district, conflict with boards, personal attacks from media, political and other special interest groups, poor compensation packages, an increase in numbers of violent students, stress on personal family life and time spent with the family, and a decline in the respect for the position. What then are districts to do to attract the best and brightest? If answering this question by addressing the reasons for not becoming a superintendent listed above were simple, it most certainly would have been done and there would not be the crisis situation Texas school districts are now facing.

There may be numerous reasons for the crisis situation but one reason seems to be the center of discussion among superintendents. That is the problem of superintendent and board relationships and discourse between them. Hoyle (2002) states that "the common belief is that school board / superintendent relations are as contentious as the Hatfields and the McCoys" (p.9). Points of contention between the

board and superintendent fall into a number of different categories. Student achievement, curriculum design, school operations, budget constraints and personnel management are all hot topics that seem to be supported no matter what the personal philosophy is. Glass et al. (2000) report that board / superintendent relations are not that strained as is evidenced that 80% of superintendent evaluations fall into the "good" and "excellent" category. However, Glass et al. (2000) also state that one third of the superintendents found board members "not qualified" to carry out the duties they were elected to do. With this gleaning, Glass showed that school boards gave superintendents better scores that what superintendents gave the school boards. Even though it seems Glass draws conclusions regarding the high ratings given to superintendents on their evaluations by the boards as evidence of a lack of significant conflict, superintendents "believe that most of the severe conflicts are hidden and unreported to the Texas Education Agency" (Hoyle, p.10).

Throughout the state, there are many examples of successful governance teams, however it seems that no matter how much a high level of success is desired, many of the teams are not as successful as they want to be or can be. It is generally accepted by those dealing with the day-to-day tasks in education that board-superintendent conflict is a factor that increases the difficulty of our Texas schools to provide our children with the best education possible. "Most superintendents have a job description (88%), only 50% of evaluations follows the criteria in the job description…" (Stufflebeam, 1995). However, the conclusion of the study by Hoyle et al. (2001) was that research on Superintendent evaluations, even over the past fifty

years, “has provided few answers” relating leadership of the superintendent and student performance.

Although few answers may exist, there are several behaviors a superintendent can engage in to help reduce the perception that proper attention to the business of running a school district is not being attended to. As it is stated in the study entitled *Cultivating a Successful Relationship Between the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Trustees* (2002), “…it is critical that the Superintendent keep the Board informed of the Superintendent’s host of activities to avoid creating the impression that ‘the Superintendent is never in his office,’ i.e., the Superintendent must be attending to personal business on school time” (p.13). The same report goes on to suggest that another behavior that is beneficial and important to the success of the relationship between the superintendent and the board is that both parties must continue to be informed of the all the changes in laws, rules, regulations, and the policies that affect governance issues (p.5).

It would seem obvious that there would be behaviors the superintendent should not engage in that would be detrimental to the district and his career. Some of these behaviors fall into the different categories of legal but not ethical, illegal, and illegal and certainly unethical. This same study lists several of these behaviors, some of which include:

- Theft of school property;
- Misuse of authority;
- Tampering with documents;
- Active participation in board elections;

- Failure to keep up with changing attitudes and philosophies of the board and community;
- Failure to serve as community and role model; and
- Failure to administer and follow district policies (pp.14-16).

Perhaps the most obvious behaviors a superintendent can engage in would be those of displaying a positive attitude and common sense. It is imperative that the superintendent do his homework in order to deal effectively with conflict, confrontation and dissent. The report reminds superintendents that they "can win the battle but lose the war" if certain situations are not handled properly (p.13). Perhaps this is the point where a superintendent should personify the adage and answer the question "Do you want to be right or happy?"

Whether the behaviors a superintendent engages in are positive or negative, the realization that the position of the superintendent is extremely high profile and takes an individual who is beyond reproach to be successful (p.17).

Hoyle (2002) states it this way in the Sid Richardson Report "…the crisis in executive leadership by superintendents for Texas school districts is real …and can be solved only through collaborations among leaders…that believe in the children of Texas (p.vii).

Goodman and Zimmerman's follow up study *Getting There From Here* entitled Thinking Differently: *Recommendations for 21st Century School Board / Superintendent Leadership, Governance, and Teamwork for High Student Achievement* is based on one idea. That idea is the belief "school districts cannot effectively raise student achievement without strong leadership and teamwork from

the school board and superintendent" (p.iv). The premise of this idea is rooted in the concept that without trust, communication, teamwork, and solid leadership from the board and superintendent, there is little hope of raising the bar effectively to impact student achievement. Pressure from politicians and the corporate world for higher test scores are prevalent but still link minimum standards to graduation requirements and therefore contradict the desire to raise performance. If this country is to be serious about aligning the process of high standards and the development of all students, it is only obvious that "local educational leadership teams – superintendents and school board members – must work cooperatively and collaboratively to mobilize their communities to get the job done!" (Goodman and Zimmerman, p.1). In order to think differently about the crisis situation and to create a plan to improve the performance of the students, the current situation must be understood in order to have a starting point. There are a number of factors that can be attributed to the inadequacy of the current system. The U.S. Department of Education reports a projected shortage of 2.2 million teachers over the next ten years (Goodman and Zimmerman, 2000). This projected shortage is based on the fact that today national student enrollment is at an all time high of 53 million. This number will only rise accordingly as does the birth rate and the immigration rates. There is also a shortage of qualified principals, superintendents, and community members to serve as board members and educational leaders.

There is an old adage that implies that if one continues to do the same thing over and over but expects to get different results, they are a fool! For this not to be personified perhaps more than it is already, there needs to a total shift and a rethinking

of how teachers teach, how students learn, and what teamwork and self-development mean to superintendents and board members.

However important these other factors may be, and not to be dismissed, this study will remain focused on the superintendent and board relationship and leadership and suggest the impact of teaching and learning be explored in a future study.

To rethink teamwork is a simple matter. There are countless examples of good and bad situations. What may be good in one district may not be very good in another. Whatever the case, "a unity of purpose, a clear mission, and a sense of responsibility for action to achieve a long term vision (Goodman and Zimmerman, 2000, p.130) are the cornerstones to achieve a governance team that is unified in its leadership. Hoyle (2002) writes about a "dream team". With this he talks about eager and qualified superintendents and responsible and qualified board members working together in an atmosphere where personal agendas and hidden political power plays are set aside. Goodman, Fulbright and Zimmerman (1997), said it this way, "in an atmosphere of cooperation and mutual support, an effective leadership team … if freed from political distractions, can work successfully on its most critical task: promoting high achievement for all students" (p. 4). In the study titled *Cultivating a Successful Relationship Between The Superintendent of Schools and The Board of Trustees*, the author states "successful working relationship between the superintendent and the board "does not just happen—it must be cultivated" (p.1). The author goes on to state "The success of any school district in fulfilling the mission to educate and prepare children depends on teamwork between the Superintendent and the Board of Trustees" and "Teamwork founded on trust and respect for each other

and the responsibilities that each has in managing and overseeing the management of the school district" (p.1). This study continues with the argument that "education is a continual process", and particularly true in the context of the relationship between the superintendent and the board (p.4).

A mutual understanding of the role of the superintendent by the board of education and the superintendent is imperative to the task of maintaining an effective school district. Just as the superintendent is the "voice" of the school district, the president of the board is the "voice" of the board (Casburn,1975). Casburn goes on to state that if the perception of the role of the superintendent is not similar to that of the board, then the mutual expectation of an effective school district is compromised and many times to the point of being counter productive. If everyone agrees that improved student performance is a main goal, and the superintendent leads the process necessary for attainment of this goal, and the relationship of the board and superintendent affect the ability of the superintendent to lead effectively, then it must also hold true that if the perceived responsibilities and role of the superintendent are not shared by policy makers (the board) and the decision makers (school administrators), no matter what kind of job the superintendent does, he or she is not perceived to be effective by stakeholders. To have an effective leadership team, each member of the team must have a clear understanding of what his or her role is if they are to be effective. It is also important that each team member perform only the responsibilities relating to his or her role. Even though the superintendent and board need to be on the same team, their roles are very different. Specifically, the board's responsibility is to select and work with a superintendent and to make policy. The

role of the superintendent is to work with the board to enforce policies and act as the chief executive officer for the district.

One of the first jobs of the board is to select a qualified superintendent. As Glass, Bjork and Brunner (2000) point out, there are several ways a board goes about selecting the superintendent. The most common way in which according to Glass et al. (2000) occurs 54% of the time is for the board to serve as its own search committee. Smaller school districts are more likely to use this method as using a search firm can be cost prohibitive for smaller districts. Whatever the method used, boards need to understand the importance of selecting the "right" person for the job. The 2000 Study cites that 40.1 percent of superintendents thought they were hired because of personal characteristics (p.47). The study also goes on to state that this percentage is down compared to a study done in 1982 and suggested an explanation for this was due to a growth in "maturity" for the profession and a use of more clear and concise criteria used to hire the superintendent (p.47). The board's responsibilities does not end with the selection of a superintendent. In fact, Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) list in their *Thinking Differently* report several responsibilities. This list includes serving as advocates for all stakeholders in education by keeping in mind the attitude of "putting students first" when it comes to goals, policies and budgetary issues; evaluating their own leadership, governance and the level of training attained; to delegate the day-to-day administrative chores of the school district to the superintendent and to not micro-manage personnel and student discipline (p.18).

Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) are very clear about the responsibilities of the superintendent as well. Those responsibilities are listed as taking care of the day-to-day activities which includes supporting and developing district committees or teams to improve curriculum, teaching models and learning; to administer all personnel issues; overseeing the all programs within the district and by providing "continuous leadership to ensure that the board policies and responsibilities of the board / superintendent team are addressed each day" (p.20). Hoyle, Ealy, Hogan, and Skrla (2001) make it very clear that there are responsibilities that need to be shared by the board and superintendent independent of their respective responsibilities. Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) agree as well and in their study *Thinking Differently* and the recommendations that were derived from it, list key responsibilities that must be shared. Although some of the responsibilities listed were also inherent in the separate duties for each, some must become a process through the melding together of the job descriptions. One of which is the ongoing evaluation of leadership governance and teamwork that is student centered (p.18). Other responsibilities include creating and adopting a responsible budget that reflects the priorities of the district goals, developing an atmosphere of safety and trust for students and teachers, develop and articulate the vision, mission and goals of the district, and to act as educational leaders and community liaisons (p.19).

These responsibilities are very clearly stated and are easily read and understood. There are state mandated training sessions, there are certification requirements that must be met, and more than one legislator, corporate leader and community member is an expert. Hoyle has been instrumental in developing

professional standards for superintendents. These standards were printed in the American Association of School Administrators and entitled *Professional Standards for the Superintendency*. These standards include: leadership and district culture, policy and governance, communications and community relations, organizational management, curriculum planning and development, instructional management, human resources management, and values and ethics of leadership (Goodman, Fulbright, Zimmerman, 1997, p.112). With all the recommendations and standards, why then is it so difficult to achieve Hoyle's "dream team" between superintendents and boards? Is it because boards and superintendents just won't or can't get on the same page? Perhaps it is because they are unable due to laws and other constraints to get on the same page even with all the information telling them how. One constraint is that perhaps the tenure of board members needs to be changed. If by the time a board hires a new superintendent and then up to three of the board members are up for re-election, even if one of them doesn't get re-elected or chooses not to run for re-election, there is a drastic change in the factors that "fit" together to hire the superintendent in the first place. Hoyle presents a third recommendation in the Richardson Foundation study as increasing the tenure of board members, changing meeting schedules and increasing the level of training (Hoyle, 2002, p.19). It is suggested that the legislature increase board tenure from three years to six-year terms. The basis for this drastic realignment is that is takes two to three years to adequately prepare board members for meaningful involvement when it comes to long range goals (p.20). If this is true, then just about the time a board member is truly ready, that board member may not be re-elected and once again putting a stop to continuity

of goals and planning. If a board member had reasonable time to adequately prepare for the job of board member, perhaps there may be a reduction in the urgency of distracters such as single agenda political pressure groups who threaten efforts for re-election and an increase in focus on doing what matters and working as a team to set effective goals for the district. Hoyle goes on to suggest that there should be State legislative reform in different areas. The proposed changes range from mandated orientation programs more extensive and inclusive than present, changing the financial disclosure laws that may stifle willing citizens form serving on the board (p. 20) to perhaps the one that makes the most sense currently of not subjecting self-evaluation meetings and team development workshops of the board and superintendent subject to the open meetings act. This would allow a safe environment for the team to honestly evaluate every aspect of their leadership and development without the fear of public scrutiny due to the fact that currently what is said in those meetings is public information and could be used against individuals.

These may all seem to be great ideas, however, getting to the "dream situation" will not transpire over night as laws would have to change and in Texas, the legislature only meets every two years. As a result, it is business as usual within the current laws.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Following a review of the literature, this study was designed to collect data pertaining to the perception of the role of the superintendent by presidents of the board of education, superintendents and other school administrators. A questionnaire initially developed by Dr. Raymond G. Fast (Appendix D, page 118) was adapted and used to collect data from superintendents, other school administrators and presidents of the boards of education.

Population

The population for this study was the list of Superintendents, Associate Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Area Superintendents and Presidents of the Boards of Education in Region 20 ESC as was listed in the *2002 – 2003 Texas School Directory* that is published by The Texas Education Agency (TEA) and lists provided by the Education Service Center for Region 20 ESC. Due to current stipulations in the Texas Education Code, it was assumed that each person listed as the board president was duly elected to the position of president by the other board

members. It was also assumed that each person listed in the directory as the superintendent, was hired by the duly elected board members and certified by the State of Texas to hold the position of superintendent. The list of positions immediately subordinate to the superintendent was supplied by Region 20 ESC. The population consisted of 50 board presidents, 50 superintendents, and 63 other school administrators. The entire population received questionnaires.

Instrumentation

The instrument used for this study was the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire (SBQ) developed by Raymond G. Fast in 1968. There were four changes made to the questionnaire to reflect current operations with regard to testing, finances and operating procedures. The first change is under the heading of *Instructional Leadership* where the addition of "The superintendent assures that Instructional Leadership aligns curriculum with TAKS" is found. TAKS (Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) is a new State mandated standardized test as of 2002 and was not in used at the time this survey was created. The second change is found under the heading *Curriculum*, where item 10 "The superintendent conducts curriculum audits to assure alignment with TAKS" was also added. Under the heading *Staff / Personnel Administration*, the word "stenographer" was omitted from

the list of examples of non-professional staff to account for the third change. School districts generally do not use stenographers on a day-to-day basis. The final change was the omission of an item under the heading Financial Administration. Fast's original survey stated item 18 as "The superintendent assists the School Board in resisting demands for higher salaries from militant teacher groups". This was omitted because the State now mandates a minimum salary schedule and that there are very few if any "militant" teacher groups. Fast's survey was chosen for this study because it would reveal the self-perception of the role of the superintendent, the perception of the role of the superintendent by other school administrators and the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by presidents of the board of education.

The Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire is a forced choice Likert- type instrument consisting of 38 items covering nine different dimensions of administrative behaviors of the superintendent. The nine dimensions include: Instructional Leadership, Curriculum, Staff / Personnel Administration, Pupil / Personnel Administration, Financial Administration, School Plant and Business Management, Public Relations, Administrative Structure and Organization, and General Planning.

Each of the 38 items required the respondent to choose one of the following choices regarding their perception of the role expectation of the superintendent.

(1) Never;

(2) Almost never;

(3) Seldom;

(4) Occasionally

(5) Often;

(6) Almost Always; and

(7) Always.

A copy of the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire (Fast, 1968) with the changes described above to the instrument is presented in Appendix D (page 118).

Fast (1968) stated his confidence and satisfaction as to the validity of the SBQ:

> The numerous evaluations of the instrument and the succeeding additions, modifications, and deletions of items as discussed earlier, further contributed to both the content and construct validity of the instrument. Consequently, the validity of this instrument was inferred on the basis of rational analysis of specific dimensions and individual acts which both experts in the field and other research have shown to be indicative of the major functions of school superintendents (p.68).

Reliability coefficients were obtained for each of the nine dimensions of the questionnaire. Fast used the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 to provide homogeneity or a quantitative measure of internal consistency on the SBQ. The reliability coefficients ranged form a low of .55 on Administrative Structure and Organization to a high of .85 on School Plant and Business Management. Fast (1968) noted that "since many dimensions had reliability coefficients of more than .80, the majority were above .70,

and none fell below .51, it was felt that the instrument as a whole was reliable and could be used for drawing valid inferences" (pp.71-72). The reliability coefficients for each of the nine domains are as follows:

1)	Instructional Leadership	.80
2)	Curriculum	.68
3)	Staff / Personnel Administration	.75
4)	Pupil / Personnel Administration	.84
5)	Financial Administration	.66
6)	School Plant and Business Management	.85
7)	Public Relations	.56
8)	Administrative Structure and Organization	.55
9)	General Planning	.80

Data Collection

There are 50 public school districts in Region 20 ESC. Questionnaires were mailed to all 50 presidents of the board of education, 50 superintendents and to 63 other school administrators. The questionnaires were mailed with a cover letter establishing consent for participation and assurance of confidentiality (Appendices A,B,C pages 112-116). The initial mailing achieved a 30 percent response rate form board presidents, a 58 percent response rate from superintendents, and a 48 percent response rate from the other school administrators. Approximately three weeks after the packets were mailed to the population, another packet was mailed to non-

respondents in an effort to achieve a greater return. A total of 9 more responses from board presidents were received along with 6 more responses from superintendents and 8 more responses from other school administrators. Eight weeks after the initial contact, the researcher called the offices of the superintendents and other school administrators who did not respond. Phone numbers for board presidents proved difficult to get as they were listed as the school phone number or were unavailable. The researcher spoke personally to 7 superintendents and 9 other school administrators. This produced 3 more responses from the superintendents and 2 more responses from other school administrators. During the phone conversation, superintendents and other school administrators were given the opportunity to respond verbally or to have another packet Faxed to them. All chose to respond from the Faxed copy. A final return rate of 48 percent of questionnaires for board presidents, 76 percent of the questionnaires for superintendents, and 63 percent of questionnaires for other school administrators was achieved. There were only four districts out of the 50 in which the board president, superintendent, and the other school administrators from the same district responded in a "matched set".

As questionnaires were returned, they were sorted into three groups according to the title of the individual. Data were entered into a spreadsheet, and separate spreadsheets were maintained for board presidents, superintendents, and other school administrators.

Data Analysis

Results of the study were reported using graphic techniques, numerical interpretations and due to a low return rate of questionnaires, qualitative interpretations. Analysis and interpretation of the data follow the principles presented in *Educational Research: An introduction by Gall et al.* (1996). The data collected from the questionnaire were entered into an Excel spreadsheet on a personal computer and analyzed using statistical program Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows-Standard Version 11.0 (SPSS, Inc., 2003). Descriptive statistical analysis produced means and standard deviations. An ANOVA procedure produced sums of squares, degrees of freedom (*df*), mean squares, "F" values and the "significance" value.

Data analysis included specific statistical procedures for use in answering each research question. The questions were:

1) Is there conflict reflected in the responses regarding role expectations of the superintendent as perceived by school board presidents, superintendents, and other school administrators from Texas public school districts in Region 20 ESC?
2) Are there differences in the perceptions of the role expectation of superintendents between the president of the board of education and superintendents in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?

3) Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between the president of the school board of education and other school administrators in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?
4) Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between superintendents and other school administrators in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant differences existed between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators pertaining to the role expectations of the superintendent. The role expectations of the superintendent were measured by 38 items on the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire. The presentation of the data collected on the 38 items is divided into nine sections. Those nine sections are: Instructional Leadership, Curriculum and Instruction, Staff / Personnel Administration, Pupil / Staff Administration, Financial Administration, School Plant and Business Management, Public Relations, Administrative Structure and Organization and General Planning.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the analysis of data that were collected during this study and also to present the applied statistical techniques.

Description of the Sample

The population for this study was made up of three groups. Those groups included board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators. It was assumed the board presidents were duly elected and the superintendents that were

listed in the 2002 / 2003 TEA Directory for ESC Region 20 were certified to hold that position by the State of Texas and had been hired by the board. The remainder of the population was made up of all the deputy, associate and assistant superintendents that were employed in the districts within ESC Region 20.

Instructional Leadership

Table 1 through Table 10 refer to the role expectation of the superintendent regarding time spent in *Instructional Leadership*. It should be noted that the only instances where significant difference was found was in Table 4, Table 6 and Table 10. Table 4 refers to the role expectation of superintendents regarding time spent planning in-service activities. Table 6 refers to the role expectation of superintendents regarding the amount of time encouraging innovative teaching methods and Table 10 refers to the role expectation of superintendents regarding time aligning the curriculum with TAKS. In all other instances, there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 1

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding teacher evaluation, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent dealing with teacher evaluation

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.75	2.36
Superintendents	38	5.66	1.76
School Administrators	39	4.46	2.42

Table 2

ANOVA results of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent dealing with teacher evaluation

Source	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	29.22	2	14.61	3.08	0.050
Within Groups	464.75	98	4.74		
Total	493.97	100			

Table 2 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.050. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference

between the population means. In other words, school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived that the same amount of time was spent on teacher evaluation.

Criterion 2

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding planning in-service activities, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 3 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent planning in-service activities

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.25	0.90
Superintendents	38	6.29	0.80
School Administrators	40	4.88	2.08

Table 4

ANOVA results of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent planning in-service activities

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	47.62	2	23.811	11.19	0.000
Within Groups	210.69	99	2.13		
Total	258.31	101			

Table 4 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.000. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, time spent planning in-service activities, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between superintendents and other school administrators. Based on these data, superintendents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time planning in-service activities while central office staff perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time on planning in-service activities. Board presidents and superintendents feel the same and collectively think superintendents spend more time planning in-service activities that what school administrators believe.

Criterion 3

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding innovative teaching methods, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 5 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 5

Descriptive statistics of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent encouraging innovative teaching methods

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.17	0.92
Superintendents	38	5.55	1.06
School Administrators	40	5.18	1.78

Table 6

ANOVA results of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent in encouraging innovative teaching methods

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	14.75	2	7.38	3.96	0.022
Within Groups	184.50	99	1.86		
Total	199.25	101			

Table 6 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.022. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, encouraging innovative teaching methods, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between other school administrators and the board presidents. Based on these data, board presidents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time encouraging innovative teaching methods while central office staff perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time encouraging innovative teaching methods. Superintendents feel that superintendents spent more time encouraging innovative teaching methods that what other school administrators

feel and less time encouraging innovative teaching methods than what board presidents believe.

Criterion 4

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding time spent with principals working on developing instructional programs, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 7 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 7

Descriptive statistics of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent with principals regarding instructional programming

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.46	1.41
Superintendents	38	4.71	1.37
School Administrators	40	4.72	2.03

Table 8

ANOVA results of the school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent with principals with regards to instructional programming

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	10.07	2	5.03	1.81	0.170
Within Groups	275.75	99	2.79		
Total	285.82	101			

Table 8 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.170. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same regarding the amount of time spent with principals regarding instructional programming.

Criterion 5

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding curriculum alignment with TAKS, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 9 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 9

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent with curriculum alignment with TAKS

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.25	0.99
Superintendents	38	6.29	0.80
School Administrators	40	5.25	1.82

Table 10

ANOVA results of the superintendents and school board presidents in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent with curriculum alignment with TAKS

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	25.53	2	12.76	7.19	0.001
Within Groups	175.82	99	1.78		
Total	201.34	101			

Table 10 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.001. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means.

Because this topic, time spent with curriculum alignment, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between the superintendent and other school administrators. Based on these data, superintendents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time aligning the curriculum with TAKS while central office staff perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time on aligning the curriculum with TAKS. Board presidents and superintendents feel the same and collectively think superintendents spend more time with curriculum alignment with TAKS that what other school administrators believe.

Curriculum and Instruction

Table 11 through Table 20 refer to role expectations of the superintendent regarding issues pertaining to *Curriculum and Instruction*. It should be noted that the only instances where significant difference was found was in Table 12 and Table 20. Table 12 refers to role expectations of the superintendent as related to time spent encouraging staff to investigate new curricula. Table 20 refers to role expectations of superintendents relating to time spent conducting curricula audits. In all other instances, there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 6

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding time spent encouraging staff to investigate new curricula, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 11 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 11

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent encouraging staff to investigate new curricula

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.96	1.23
Superintendents	38	5.84	0.97
School Administrators	40	5.03	1.73

Table 12

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent encouraging staff to investigate new curricula

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	18.27	2	9.13	4.84	0.010
Within Groups	186.97	99	1.89		
Total	205.26	101			

Table 12 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.010. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, time spent encouraging staff to investigate new curricula, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between board presidents and other school administrators. Based on these data, board presidents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time encouraging staff to investigate new curricula while central office staff perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time encouraging staff to investigate new curricula. Board presidents and superintendents feel the same and collectively think

superintendents spend more time encouraging staff to investigate new curricula that what other school administrators believe.

Criterion 7

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding staff member involvement in curriculum and instruction, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 13 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 13

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to staff member involvement in curriculum and instruction

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.25	1.03
Superintendents	38	6.29	0.80
School Administrators	40	5.80	1.36

Table 14

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to staff member involvement in curriculum and instruction

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	5.49	2	2.75	2.25	0.111
Within Groups	120.72	99	1.22		
Total	126.21	101			

Table 14 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.111. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement regarding staff member involvement for curriculum and instruction.

Criterion 8

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding curricular changes without staff involvement, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 15 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 15

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to curricular changes without staff involvement

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	2.04	1.33
Superintendents	38	1.63	0.68
School Administrators	39	2.08	1.84

Table 16

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to curricular changes without staff involvement

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	4.44	2	2.22	1.17	0.316
Within Groups	186.57	98	1.90		
Total	191.01	100			

Table 16 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.316. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical

difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived that the same level of agreement regarding curricular changes without staff involvement.

Criterion 9

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding time spent in scholarly work relating to curriculum and instructional trends, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 17 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 17

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent in scholarly work relating to curriculum and instructional trends

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.96	1.43
Superintendents	38	4.08	1.40
School Administrators	40	4.40	1.72

Table 18

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent in scholarly work relating to curriculum and instructional trends

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	11.38	2	5.69	2.40	0.096
Within Groups	235.32	99	2.38		
Total	246.70	101			

Table 18 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.096. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived that the same amount of time was spent in scholarly work relating to curriculum and instructional trends.

Criterion 10

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding time spent conducting curriculum audits, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 19 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 19

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent conducting curriculum audits

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.46	1.67
Superintendents	38	5.11	1.29
School Administrators	40	3.45	1.91

Table 20

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent conducting curriculum audits

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	54.14	2	27.07	10.02	0.000
Within Groups	267.44	99	2.70		
Total	321.58	101			

Table 20 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.000. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means.

Because this topic, time spent conducting curriculum audits, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between superintendents and other school administrators. Based on these data, superintendents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time conducting curriculum audits while other school administrators perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time conducting curriculum audits. Responses from board presidents and superintendents indicate that board presidents feel the superintendent spends less time conducting curriculum audits than what superintendents feel but more time that what other school administrators feel.

Staff / Personnel Administration

Table 21 through Table 30 refer to role expectation of the superintendent regarding *Staff / Personnel Administration*. It should be noted that in each case, there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 11

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding promotion from within the district, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 21 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 21

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to promotion of personnel from within the district

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.63	1.10
Superintendents	38	4.79	1.44
School Administrators	40	5.13	1.34

Table 22

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to personnel promotion from within the district

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	24.27	2	2.14	1.21	0.302
Within Groups	174.32	99	1.76		
Total	178.59	101			

Table 22 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.302. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical

difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement regarding promotion of personnel from within the district.

Criterion 12

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the hiring of the highest qualified non-professional staff, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 23 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 23

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to hiring the most highly qualified non-professional staff

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.38	1.61
Superintendents	38	4.89	1.81
School Administrators	40	4.53	1.77

Table 24

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to hiring the most highly qualified non-professional staff

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	10.90	2	5.45	1.78	0.174
Within Groups	303.18	99	3.06		
Total	314.08	101			

Table 24 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.174. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement regarding the hiring of the most highly qualified non-professional staff.

Criterion 13

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding consideration of local values pertaining to filling vacant positions, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of

variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 25 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 25

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to consideration of local values when filling vacant positions

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.04	1.71
Superintendents	38	4.45	1.77
School Administrators	40	4.55	1.81

Table 26

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to consideration of local values pertaining to filling vacant positions

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	4.06	2	2.03	0.65	0.525
Within Groups	310.25	99	3.13		
Total	314.31	101			

Table 26 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.525. This was greater than the alpha level of

0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to consideration of local values pertaining to filling vacant positions.

Criterion 14

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding promotion of staff welfare by focusing on teacher's issues, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 27 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 27

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent promoting staff welfare by focusing on teacher's issues

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.96	0.86
Superintendents	38	5.55	1.08
School Administrators	39	5.77	1.35

Table 28

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent promoting staff welfare by focusing on teacher's issues

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	2.51	2	1.25	0.95	0.390
Within Groups	129.28	98	1.32		
Total	131.79	100			

Table 28 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.390. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement as to the amount of time spent on promoting staff welfare by focusing on teacher's issues.

Criterion 15

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding monitoring the impact on the students and community by observing the personal life of staff, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way

analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 29 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 29

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent monitoring the impact on students and community by observing the personal life of staff

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	3.83	1.17
Superintendents	38	3.24	1.03
School Administrators	40	3.55	1.55

Table 30

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent monitoring the impact on students and community by observing personal life of staff

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	5.40	2	2.70	1.63	0.201
Within Groups	164.10	99	1.66		
Total	169.50	101			

Table 30 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.201. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement pertaining to the amount of time spent on monitoring the impact on students and community by focusing on the personal life of staff.

Pupil / Personnel Administration

Table 31 through Table 38 refer to the role expectation of the superintendent in reference to *Pupil / Personnel Administration*. It should be noted that the only instances where significant difference was found was in Table 38. Table 38 refers to role expectations of the superintendent regarding time spent insuring the compilation of extensive student records. In all other instances, there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 16

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the establishment of school admission policies, between school board presidents, superintendents and school

administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 31 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 31

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent establishing school admission policies

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.04	2.20
Superintendents	38	4.11	1.64
School Administrators	39	3.67	1.88

Table 32

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent establishing school admission policies

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	4.16	2	2.08	0.59	0.556
Within Groups	345.20	98	3.52		
Total	349.36	100			

Table 32 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.556. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement pertaining to the amount of time spent establishing school admission policies.

Criterion 17

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding making final recommendations for student expulsion, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 33 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 33

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent making final recommendations for student expulsion

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.17	1.99
Superintendents	38	4.39	1.99
School Administrators	40	3.70	2.21

Table 34

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent making final recommendations regarding student expulsions

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	9.71	2	4.85	1.12	0.330
Within Groups	428.81	99	4.33		
Total	438.52	101			

Table 34 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.330. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement pertaining to the amount of time spent on making final recommendations for student expulsion.

Criterion 18

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding exercising control over co-curricular activities, between school board presidents, superintendents and school

administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 35 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 35

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent in exercising control over co-curricular activities

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.58	1.38
Superintendents	38	4.63	1.85
School Administrators	40	4.22	1.19

Table 36

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent exercising control over co-curricular activities

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	3.69	2	1.85	0.81	0.448
Within Groups	225.65	99	2.28		
Total	229.34	101			

Table 36 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.448. This was greater than the alpha level of

0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement pertaining to exercising control over co-curricular activities.

Criterion 19

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the compilation of extensive student records, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 37 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 37

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent insuring compilation of extensive student records

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.21	1.72
Superintendents	37	5.81	1.02
School Administrators	40	4.33	1.70

Table 38

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent insuring the compilation of extensive student records

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	42.96	2	21.48	9.64	0.000
Within Groups	218.41	98	2.23		
Total	261.37	100			

Table 38 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.000. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, time spent insuring the compilation of extensive student records, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between superintendents and other school administrators. Based on these data, superintendents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time spent insuring the compilation of extensive student records while other school administrators perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time insuring the compilation of extensive student records.

Financial Administration

Table 39 through Table 46 refer to the role expectation of the superintendent with regards to *Financial Administration*. It must be noted that in each case, no significant difference was found.

Criterion 20

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding prioritizing budget with student needs, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 39 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 39

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to prioritizing the budget with student needs

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.46	1.22
Superintendents	37	5.49	1.26
School Administrators	40	5.40	1.41

Table 40

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to prioritizing the budget with student needs

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	0.15	2	0.07	0.04	0.958
Within Groups	168.80	98	1.72		
Total	168.95	100			

Table 40 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.958. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to prioritizing the budget with student needs.

Criterion 21

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding alignment of the budget with a full use of teachers and staff, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 41 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 41

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to aligning the budget with full use of teachers and staff

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.50	1.41
Superintendents	38	5.39	1.39
School Administrators	40	5.33	1.85

Table 42

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent aligning budget with full use of teachers and staff

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	0.46	2	0.23	0.09	0.913
Within Groups	249.85	99	2.52		
Total	250.31	101			

Table 42 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.913. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical

difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to alignment of the budget with full use of teachers and staff.

Criterion 22

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding over budgeting the initial budget draft, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 43 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 43

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to over budgeting on the initial budget draft

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	3.08	1.28
Superintendents	38	4.00	7.12
School Administrators	37	2.43	1.43

Table 44

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to over budgeting the initial budget draft

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	46.44	2	23.22	1.12	0.330
Within Groups	1986.91	96	20.70		
Total	2033.35	98			

Table 44 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.330. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to over budgeting the initial draft budget.

Criterion 23

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding establishment of procedures for handling funds, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 45 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 45

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to establishing procedures for handling funds

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.29	0.75
Superintendents	38	5.97	0.94
School Administrators	40	6.35	1.29

Table 46

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to establishing procedures for handling funds

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	3.05	2	1.52	1.36	0.262
Within Groups	111.03	99	1.12		
Total	114.08	101			

Table 46 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.262. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical

difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to the establishment of procedures for handling funds.

School Plant and Business Administration

Table 47 through Table 58 refer to the role expectation of the superintendent with regards to School Plant and Business Management. It should be noted that the only instances where significant difference was found was in Table 50, Table 54, Table 56 and Table 58. Table 50 refers to role expectations of the superintendent relating to the development of programs for plant operations and maintenance. Table 54 refers to role expectations of superintendents in the area of favoring local contractors pertaining to building needs. Table 56 refers to role expectations of superintendents regarding the formulation of building use policies and Table 58 refers to role expectation of the superintendent regarding the development of an adequate pupil transportation system. In all other instances, there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 24

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding prediction of future building needs through the use of surveys, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 47 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 47

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to predicting future building needs through the use of surveys

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.75	1.03
Superintendents	38	6.13	0.74
School Administrators	40	5.55	1.36

Table 48

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to predicting future building needs by the use of surveys

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	6.72	2	3.36	2.85	0.063
Within Groups	116.74	99	1.18		
Total	123.46	101			

Table 48 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.063. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical

difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to predicting future building needs by the use of surveys.

Criterion 25

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding programs for efficient plant operations and maintenance, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 49 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 49

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent developing programs of plant operations and maintenance

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.50	0.83
Superintendents	38	5.55	1.13
School Administrators	40	4.78	1.61

Table 50

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent developing programs for plant operations and maintenance

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	13.98	2	6.99	4.21	0.018
Within Groups	164.37	99	1.66		
Total	178.35	101			

Table 50 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.018. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, time spent developing programs for plant operations and maintenance, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between superintendents and other school administrators. Based on these data, superintendents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time developing programs for plant operations and maintenance while other school administrators perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time on developing programs for plant operations and maintenance. Board presidents and

superintendents feel the same and collectively think superintendents spend more time developing programs for plant operations and maintenance that what other school administrators believe.

Criterion 26

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding recommendations to the board pertaining to building demographics, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 51 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 51

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to making recommendations to the board pertaining to building demographics

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.04	1.46
Superintendents	38	5.84	1.03
School Administrators	40	6.13	1.24

Table 52

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to making recommendations to the board pertaining to building demographics

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	1.61	2	0.81	0.54	0.585
Within Groups	148.39	99	1.50		
Total	150.00	101			

Table 52 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.585. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement pertaining to the amount of time taken to make recommendations to the board relating to building demographics.

Criterion 27

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding favoring local contractors pertaining to building needs, between school board presidents, superintendents and

school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 53 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 53

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to favoring local contractors pertaining to building needs

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	4.29	2.01
Superintendents	38	3.47	1.74
School Administrators	38	4.50	1.80

Table 54

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to favoring local contractors pertaining to building needs

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	21.71	2	10.85	3.25	0.043
Within Groups	323.93	97	3.34		
Total	345.64	99			

Table 54 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.043. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05.

As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, favoring local contractors pertaining to building needs, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between other school administrators and superintendents. Based on these data, other school administrators perceived that superintendents favored local contractors pertaining to buildings needs more than what superintendents believed. Board presidents believed that superintendents favored local contractors pertaining to building needs more than what superintendents believed and less than what other school administrators believed.

Criterion 28

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the formulation and enforcement of building use policies, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 55 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 55

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the formulation and enforcement of building use policies

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.33	0.92
Superintendents	38	5.53	1.22
School Administrators	40	5.68	1.35

Table 56

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the formulation and enforcement of building use policies

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	10.23	2	5.12	3.48	0.035
Within Groups	145.58	99	1.47		
Total	155.81	101			

Table 56 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.035. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means.

Because this topic, the formulation of building use policies, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between board presidents and superintendents. Based on these data, board presidents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time formulating building use policies while superintendents perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time on the formulation of building use policies. Superintendents and other school administrators feel the same and collectively think superintendents spend less time formulating building use policies that what board presidents believe.

Criterion 29

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the development of an adequate pupil transportation system, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 57 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 57

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the development of an adequate pupil transportation system

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.25	0.90
Superintendents	38	5.34	1.55
School Administrators	37	5.46	1.63

Table 58

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the development of an adequate pupil transportation system

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	13.40	2	6.70	3.18	0.046
Within Groups	202.24	96	2.10		
Total	215.64	98			

Table 58 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.004. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means.

Because this topic, developing an adequate pupil transportation system, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between board presidents and superintendents. Based on these data, board presidents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time developing an adequate pupil transportation system while superintendents perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time developing an adequate pupil transportation system. Superintendents and other school administrators feel the same and collectively think superintendents spend less developing an adequate pupil transportation system that what board presidents believe.

Public Relations

Table 59 through Table 66 refers to the role expectation of the superintendent with regards to *Public Relations*. It must be noted that in each case, there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 30

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the superintendent's accessibility to the community, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 59 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 59

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's accessibility to the community

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.04	1.04
Superintendents	38	5.79	0.99
School Administrators	40	5.58	1.47

Table 60

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's accessibility to the community

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	3.30	2	1.65	1.13	0.328
Within Groups	145.05	99	1.47		
Total	148.35	101			

Table 60 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.328. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical

difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to the superintendent's accessibility to the community.

Criterion 31

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the superintendent's participation and support of local community organizations, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 61 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 61

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's participation and support of local community organizations

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.83	1.09
Superintendents	38	5.92	0.88
School Administrators	40	5.85	1.25

Table 62

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's participation and support of local community organizations

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	0.15	2	0.07	0.06	0.940
Within Groups	117.20	99	1.18		
Total	117.35	101			

Table 62 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.940. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to the superintendent's participation and support of local community organizations.

Criterion 32

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the superintendent's relationship with the local media, between school board presidents, superintendents and school

administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 63 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 63

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's relationship with the local media

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.29	0.86
Superintendents	38	5.92	0.94
School Administrators	40	6.13	1.04

Table 64

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's relationship with the local media

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	2.11	2	1.06	1.13	0.326
Within Groups	92.10	99	0.93		
Total	94.21	101			

Table 64 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.326. This was greater than the alpha level of

0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement with regards to the superintendent's relationship with the local media.

Criterion 33

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding a "laize faire" approach pertaining to school–community relations, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 65 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 65

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to a "laize faire" approach to school-community relations

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	2.96	2.03
Superintendents	38	3.00	1.32
School Administrators	40	2.25	1.19

Table 66

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to a "laize faire" approach to school-community relations

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	13.12	2	6.56	3.03	0.053
Within Groups	214.46	99	2.17		
Total	227.58	101			

Table 66 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.053. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement regarding the superintendent's "laize faire" approach to school-community relations.

Administrative Structure and Organization

Table 67 through Table 74 refer to the role expectation of the superintendent pertaining to *Administrative Structure and Organization*. It should be noted that the only instances where significant difference was found was in Table 70 and Table 72.

Table 70 refers to role expectations of the superintendent relating to the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections. Table 72 refers to role expectations of superintendents in the area of providing board members with an agenda prior to board meetings. In all other instances, there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 34

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding time spent on local projects as opposed to regional or state projects, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 67 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 67

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent on local projects as opposed to regional or state projects

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	5.75	1.36
Superintendents	38	5.68	1.17
School Administrators	40	5.88	1.07

Table 68

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to time spent on local projects as opposed to regional or state projects

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	0.73	2	0.36	0.26	0.769
Within Groups	137.09	99	1.39		
Total	137.81	101			

Table 68 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.769. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement pertaining to time spent on local projects as opposed to regional or state projects.

Criterion 35

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way

analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 69 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 69

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	1.67	0.87
Superintendents	38	2.50	0.98
School Administrators	38	2.21	1.66

Table 70

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	10.24	2	5.12	3.20	0.045
Within Groups	155.15	97	1.60		
Total	165.39	99			

Table 70 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.045. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between superintendents and board presidents. Based on these data, superintendents perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of time regarding the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections while board presidents perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time relating to the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections. Other school administrators perceived that superintendents spent more time than board presidents but less time than superintendents when it came to the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and trustee elections.

Criterion 36

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding providing school board members with an agenda prior to board meetings, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of

variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 71 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 71

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to providing board members an agenda prior to board meetings

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.33	0.76
Superintendents	38	6.37	0.75
School Administrators	40	6.80	0.69

Table 72

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to providing board members with an agenda prior to board meetings

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	4.84	2	2.42	4.55	0.013
Within Groups	52.58	99	0.53		
Total	57.42	101			

Table 72 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.013. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05.

As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that one of the means in the population, from which these sample means were drawn, was different from at least one of the other means. Because this topic, providing board members with an agenda prior to board meetings, was scored by three groups, it was necessary to conduct a *post hoc* analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). The *post hoc* analysis indicated there was a statistically significant difference in the perceptions between other school administrators and the board presidents. Based on these data, other school administrators perceived that superintendents spent a greater amount of providing board members with an agenda prior to board meetings while board presidents perceived that superintendents spent substantially less time providing board members with an agenda prior to board meetings. Board presidents and superintendents feel the same and collectively think superintendents spend less time providing board members with an agenda prior to board meetings that what other school administrators believe.

Criterion 37

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding taking a neutral stand on divisive community issues, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 73 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 73

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to taking a neutral stand on divisive community issues

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	3.96	1.40
Superintendents	38	4.13	1.49
School Administrators	40	3.95	1.69

Table 74

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to taking a neutral stand on divisive community issues

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	0.76	2	0.38	0.16	0.855
Within Groups	239.20	99	2.42		
Total	239.96	101			

Table 74 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.855. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which

these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement regarding the superintendent taking a neutral stand on divisive community issues.

General Planning

Table 75 through 76 refer to role expectations of the superintendents pertaining to *General Planning*. It must be noted that there was no significant difference found.

Criterion 38

The null hypothesis, investigating the potential differences in perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents regarding the development of long range plans designed for district improvement, between school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Table 75 reports the descriptive statistics for the three groups.

Table 75

Descriptive statistics of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to the development of long range plans designed for district improvement

Group	n	M	SD
School Board Presidents	24	6.04	1.04
Superintendents	38	5.45	1.29
School Administrators	40	5.98	1.42

Table 76

ANOVA results of school board presidents, superintendents and school administrators in the role expectations of superintendents as related to developing long range plans designed for district improvement

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	7.35	2	3.67	2.20	0.116
Within Groups	165.33	99	1.67		
Total	172.68	101			

Table 76 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.116. This was greater than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to fail to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that all the means in the population, from which

these sample means were drawn, were the same. That is, there was no statistical difference between the population means. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and school administrators perceived the same level of agreement regarding the development of long range plans designed for district improvement.

Summary of Results

The results of the data analysis pertaining to the research questions have been presented in this chapter. The research questions are as follows:

1) Is there conflict reflected in the responses regarding role expectations of the superintendent as perceived by school board presidents, superintendents, and other school administrators from Texas public school districts in Region 20 ESC?

2) Are there differences in the perceptions of the role expectation of superintendents between superintendents and the president of the board of education in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?

3) Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between school administrators and school board presidents in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?

4) Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between superintendents and other school administrators in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?

Research question one asked "Is there conflict reflected in the responses regarding role expectations of the superintendent as perceived by school board presidents, superintendents, and other school administrators from Texas public school districts in Region 20 ESC?". The data collected demonstrated that for the most part, board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators had much the same perception regarding the role expectations of the superintendent. However, there were areas where significant difference was found. Those areas include the domains of Instructional Leadership (see Tables 4, 6, and 10), Curriculum (see Tables 12, 20), Pupil / Personnel Administration (see Table 38), School Plant and Business Management (see Tables 50, 54, 56, and 58) and Administrative Structure and Organization (see Tables 70 and 72). There were 12 different criteria were significant difference was found out of 38 total criteria.

Research question two asked "Are there differences in the perceptions of the role expectation of superintendents between superintendents and the president of the board of education in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?". The data collected illustrates that in all 38 items on the questionnaire, the board president and the superintendent had the same perception of the role expectations of the superintendent for the most part. There were however, three areas where significant difference was found. These areas include the domains of School Plant and Business Management (see Table 56 and Table 58) and Administrative Structure and Organization (see Table 70). Table 56 deals with the development of building use policies, Table 58 deals with the development of an adequate pupil transportation system and Table 70 deals with the superintendent's participation with regards to school board candidates and

trustee elections. The criteria in the two domains where the perception between the board president and the superintendent were different dealt with relatively minor points of the role expectation of the superintendent and by themselves, probably would not create enough turmoil that would force or cause a superintendent to leave.

Research question three asked "Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between other school administrators and school board presidents in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?". The data indicates that in all 38 items on the questionnaire, board presidents and other school administrators view the role expectation of the superintendent the same for the most part. In other words, there was no significant difference and the superintendent and other school administrators perceive the role of the superintendent in the same way. However it must be noted that there were three domains each containing one criteria where there was significant difference found. Those domains include Instructional Leadership (see Table 6), Curriculum (see Table 12) and Administrative Structure and Organization (see Table 72). Table 6 refers to time spent in encouraging innovative teaching methods, Table 12 deals with time spent encouraging staff to investigate new curricula and Table 72 deals with providing board members with an agenda prior to board meetings. The domains where the perception is different regarding the role expectation of the superintendent realistically would not negatively reflect on the superintendent to the point where it would adversely affect the superintendent's employment.

Research question four asked "Are there differences in the perception of the role expectation of superintendents between superintendents and other school administrators in Texas public schools in Region 20 ESC?". The data collected illustrates that in six different criteria found in four different domains on the questionnaire, the superintendent and other school administrators had significantly different perceptions of the role expectations of the superintendent. The four domains include Instructional Leadership (see Table 4 and Table 10), Curriculum (see Table 20), Pupil / Personnel Administration (see table 38), and School Plant and Business Management (see Table 50 and Table 54). Table 10 deals with the amount of time the superintendent spends aligning the curriculum with TAKS. Table 20 deals with the amount of time the superintendent spends with curriculum audits relating to TAKS. Table 38 deals with time spent insuring the compilation of extensive student records. Table 50 deals with time spent developing programs for plant operations and maintenance and Table 54 deals with favoring local contractors pertaining to building needs. Even though this question revealed the most significant difference, it was between the superintendent and other school administrators. This significant difference could be an indication of a lack of communication, however, this would not necessarily play a role in adversely affecting the status of the superintendent as other school administrators do not have authority to evaluate superintendents.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains an introductory statement and a summary of the purpose, procedures and findings of the study. Conclusions derived from the research findings are presented as concisely as possible with related discussion and implications. Finally, recommendations are presented for board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators, and researchers. Future research strategies are also suggested.

Introduction

The relationship between the board and the superintendent continues to be one of the most important relationships in a school district. Individuals such as Richard Elmore (2001) argue that situations of low performing schools are reflective of inadequate policy makers and administrators (p.12). It then stands to reason that a positive reflection would result from a knowledgeable board and a superintendent with an adequate skill level. However, this skill level can be misleading in the way that when comparing the role of the superintendent of today with the role of the superintendent of a decade or more ago, Glass (2000) reminds us that the superintendent of today must be far more politically driven and have adequate skills in being a "peace-keeper" to be effective (p.3). Cunningham(1999) states that the

superintendent must keep his eye on the "big picture" and that to be effective, not do too much of any one thing. In short, Cunningham (1999) says that the job of a superintendent in unlike any other in the public education arena (p.7). Hoyle, Ealy, Hogan, and Skrla (2001) continue to argue that the concept of teamwork between the board and superintendent is crucial. There are over 15,000 school districts nation wide with 1,042 of those being found in Texas. It is the responsibility of the boards and superintendents in the State of Texas to work collaboratively and with the best interest of the students in mind. School improvement then should be about accountability in raising test scores and helping students to become better prepared for society. With the success of school districts resting on the shoulders of boards and superintendents, why then is the relationship between the board and the superintendent still described by Hoyle (2000) as being like that of the Hatfields and McCoys (p.9)? To measure an increase in accountability, superintendent evaluations have been changed to reflect the work being done as measured by test scores. Studies by Glass et al. (2000) state that board and superintendent relationships are not as strained as perceived. This is evidenced by Glass et al. (2000) who state that 80% of superintendent's evaluations fall into the "good" and "excellent" category. However, this same research also stated that superintendents didn't rate the boards as highly as the boards rated the superintendents. Superintendents indicated that board members were not qualified to be an effective trustee. Hoyle et al. (2000) explains the difference between the perception of the amount of conflict and the results by Glass is that the major conflicts that force a superintendent to leave or make him want to leave a district are hidden and never reported to the Texas Education Agency (p.10). A

discrepancy exists because of the deception of non-reporting compared to the high ratings of superintendents by boards. Therefore, this discrepancy could possibly mask the true relationship between the board and the superintendent. What helps make a good relationship between the board and the superintendent is open, honest and frequent communication. In the study entitled *Cultivating a Successful Relationship Between the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Trustees,* "…it is crucial that the superintendent keep the board informed of the Superintendent's host of activities to avoid the impression the Superintendent is never in the office…" (p.13). If the behavior of the superintendent is so vital to the perception of the job he is doing, then as this same report states, the realization that the job of the superintendent is extremely high profile and takes an individual who is beyond reproach to be successful (p.17). Hoyle states in the Sid Richardson Report, "the crisis in executive leadership by superintendents for Texas school districts is real…and can be solved only through collaborations among leaders...that believe in the children of Texas (p.vii). With this hope of success, the "dream team" as Hoyle (2002) states it, is an attainable goal. Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) talk of a unity of purpose, a clear mission, and a sense of responsibility as being the cornerstones to achieve a governance team that is unified in its leadership. There are many individuals "out there" who posses the skills to be an effective leader. Hoyle (2002) addresses the question as to why the best and the brightest are not going into the roles of superintendents and reports that among other reasons, conflict with the board is a main concern. What ever the reason, when it comes to issues of the perceived role expectation of the superintendent, board presidents, superintendents and other school

administrators seem to be on the same page for the most part. However, when it comes to board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators being on the same page regarding the effectiveness of the leadership team, the amount of conflict that Hoyle (2002) states as "being real" is something that needs to addressed. As Glass, Bjork and Brunner (2000) report, their leadership will significantly shape and mold the schools of the next century (p.1). The future of public school systems depends to a great extent on the leadership competencies; the knowledge, proficiencies, and skills of school superintendents and the relationship they forge with the board of trustees.

Summary of Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of this study was two fold. First, to evaluate if conflict is reflected in the responses regarding the role expectation of the superintendent and secondly to determine if a congruence exists regarding the perceptions of the role expectations of the superintendent that is held by board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators. The study was limited to those public school districts found in ESC Region 20. The Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire (SBQ) was sent to the 50 board presidents, 50 superintendents and 63 other school administrators within ESC Region 20. The questionnaires were coded prior to mailing with a three-digit code. This code identified the groups of board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators. This code was matched to a master list taken from the TEA 2002-2003 Directory and from ESC Region 20. The code was for the sole

purpose of matching non-respondents for the purpose of "follow-up" mailings. All responses were held in confidence.

Description of Participants

Participants in the study consisted of board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators from the 50 districts that are in ESC Region 20. The number of responses for board presidents was (n=24/50), for superintendents (n=34/50), and for other school administrators (n=40/63). There were no other factors considered regarding the respondents other than their individual responses to the 38 different items found on the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire.

Summary of Major Findings

Four research questions were posed for this study. Questions were answered using descriptive statistics with all decisions on the significance of findings made using an alpha level of .05.

The Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire is a forced choice Likert-type instrument consisting of 38 items covering nine different dimensions of administrative behaviors of the superintendent. The nine dimensions include: Instructional Leadership, Curriculum, Staff / Personnel Administration, Pupil / Personnel Administration, Financial Administration, School Plant and Business Administration, Public Relations, Administrative Structured and Organization, and General Planning.

In all nine dimensions and over all 38 items, the data collected suggested that there was minimal significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent between board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators. The three groups all agree for the most part that the role expectations of the superintendent are perceived in the same way. Because post-hoc analysis revealed minimal significant differences, the suggestion of a high level of conflict between the board and the superintendent does not exist to a significant level when it comes to job performance. In other words, board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators seem to agree that the superintendent is doing the right things regarding running the district

Conclusions

The major findings in the study suggest the following conclusions:

1. It may be inferred from this study that due to the lack of any significant difference regarding the role expectation of the superintendent between board presidents, superintendents and other school administrators, that everyone agrees that the superintendent is "doing what needs to be done" and doing "it" effectively.
2. The findings indicate that board presidents and superintendents are on the same page and view the perceptions of the role expectations of the superintendent in the same way.

3. The findings indicate that board presidents and other school administrators agree and view the role expectations of the superintendent in the same way.
4. The findings indicate that superintendents and other school administrators are "on the same page" and view the role expectations of the superintendent in the same way.

The fact that there may still be dissension between boards and superintendents does not stem from different perceptions of what the superintendent should be doing. If there is dissention between the board and the superintendent, the results of the data using the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire did not indicate the source of this dissention. Therefore, the inference is that the source of any significant dissention stems from other factors. Some of these factors may include poor communication skills, personality conflicts, conflict over personal agendas of board members and superintendents, poorly qualified board members, inadequate training, or simply that the board president does not accurately represent or reflect the sentiments of the rest of the board. Hoyle (2002) emphasizes in the report sponsored by the Sid Richardson Foundation, that there should be reforms that would address some of these issues.

Reforms extending board member terms from three years to six years would ensure a more qualified board through extensive and cohesive training and also produce a board that is more stable. Through extensive training over a longer period of time, board members would be able to "use" their training. Often, just when a board member is "ready" to be effective, their term is expired and they may or may not be re-elected to the board.

In many instances, within months of hiring a superintendent, the possibility of up to three board members not being on the board after the election, can be devastating to the district and to the superintendent. If this were to happen, the make up, the goals, and the direction of the board can take some drastic changes and affect the relationship between the board and the superintendent no matter what kind of job the superintendent is doing.

Reforms not requiring the board to do "self-evaluations" in open sessions may produce data that more accurately reflects the true dynamics of the board and thus a clearer picture of the true relationship between the board and the superintendent. Currently, the board may feel pressure to give the impression that the relationship of the leadership team is stable and effective where if discussions were to be private, discourse and concerns could be addressed openly and honestly. Through this private approach to self-evaluation, conflict could be dealt with appropriately and as a result, the effectiveness of the leadership team would be enhanced.

Recommendations

Recommendations are offered with the realization that laws and legislation would need to change in order to facilitate a movement toward a stronger, more effective leadership team.

1. Increase the length of terms for board members from three years to at least five years

2. Modify the Open Meeting Act to allow board "self-evaluation" to be private
3. Use an instrument that examines the true dynamics of relationships between the board and the superintendent to study the aspects of personality, character, prejudices and attitudes regarding those relationships

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Develop another instrument that focuses on the perception of role expectations regarding the performance of board members (Glass et al., 2000)
2. Design research questions that focus on the amount of training and the length of tenure for board members
3. Design research questions that focus on conflict resolution training, skills and implementation of the training

REFERENCES

Ancona, D., Kochan T., Scully D., Van Maanen, K., & Wesley, D. (Eds.). (1999). *Managing for the future: Organizational behavior and processes.* Cincinnati OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Basom, M.R. (1999, summer). Getting better at building superintendent-school board relations. *ERS Spectrum, 17*(3*)*, 23-26.

Brown, B., (1998). *Conflict management: Trends and issues alerts.* Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse of Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Bryant, M.T. (1989). Factors contributing to board member participation in in-service activities. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 5*(2) 117-127.

Casburn, E. (1975). The role of the superintendent of schools as perceived by superintendents and presidents of the boards of education. Ph.D. Dissertation: Texas A&M University, College Station

Cooke, K.M., (2002, April). The superintendent's role in promoting teamwork. *Superintendents Only*, *9*(8), 5-9.

Cultivating a successful relationship between the superintendent and the board of trustees. (n.d.). (personal collection, P.J. Running).

Cunningham, R. (1999). *The most crucial competencies for school superintendents: Implications for policy, professionals and preparatory programs.* University of Pittsburgh: ProQuest.

Edwards, R.J. (2000, March). A board view: Let educators do their job. *The School Administrator*, 20-24.

Elmore, R., (1997). The politics of education reform. Issues in science and technology. Available: http://www.nap.edu/issues/14.1/elmore.html.

Fast, R., (1968). *Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire*. Cited by Casburn (1975). Ph.D. Dissertation: Texas A&M University, College Station.

Gall, M.D., Borg, W., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). New York: Longman.

Glass,T., (1992). *The 1992 study of the American school superintendency*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, T., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Goodman, R., Fulbright, L. & Zimmerman, W. (1997). *Getting there from here: School board-superintendent collaboration: Creating a school governance team capable of raising student achievement.* Arlington, VA: Education Research Service.

Goodman, R., & Zimmerman, G. (2000). *Thinking differently: Recommendations for 21st century school board / superintendent leadership, governance, and teamwork for high student achievement.* Arlington, VA: Education Research Service.

Hoyle, J., Ealy, C., Hogan, D., & Skrla, L. (2000, March). *Superintendent performance evaluation and its relationship to district student performance.* Paper

presented at the National Conference on Education—American Association of School Administrators, San Francisco, CA.

Hoyle, J.R., (1995). *Leadership and futuring: Making visions happen.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoyle, J.R., Hogan,D., Skrla,L & Ealy,C. (2001). Superintendent performance evaluation and its relationship to district student performance. In T.J. Kowalski (ed.), *21st century challenges for school administrators* (pp. 272-274). Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.

Hoyle, J.R., (2002). *Superintendents for Texas school districts: Solving the crisis in executive leadership*. Report sponsored by the Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum. Forth Worth, TX.

Kohn, A., (1991). Rescuing our schools from "tougher standards". Available: http://www.alfiekohn.org.

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (Eds.) (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and loose it, why people demand it.* San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

London, S., (1992). *The politics of education* (an interview with Benjamin Barber). Available: http://www.scottlondon.com/interviews/barber.html.

Laskoskie, S., (2003). *The impact on school governance of the team of eight school board training as perceived by selected school boards and superintendents in Texas public schools.* Ph.D. Dissertation Texas A&M University, College Station.

Maddux, R.B. (1995). *Successful negotiation: Effective "win-win" strategies and tactics* (3rd ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Crisp Publications.

McAdams, R.P. & Cressman, B.K. (1997, September). The roles of Pennsylvania superintendents and school board members as perceived by superintendents and school board members. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *21*(1), 44-57.

Metzger, C. (1997). Involuntary turnover of superintendents. *Thrusts for Educational Leadership*, *26*, 20-22.

Ondorvich, P. (1997). Hold them, fold them, or walk away. *The School Administrator. 2*(54), 12-15.

Owens, R. G. (1987). *Organizational behavior in education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Riley,R.W., (1998) Education first: Building America's future. Fifth annual State of American education speech, Seattle, WA. Available: http://www.ed.gov/speeches/980217.html.

Sharp, W., & Walter, J. (1997*). The school superintendent: The profession and the person.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Co. Inc.

SPSS Inc. (2003). Statistical package for social science for Windows 11.0. Chicago IL: SPSS, Inc.

Strayhorn, C. 10 principals for Texas in the 21st century. *Fiscal notes*. March 2003. [On-Line] Available: www.window.state.tx.us.

Stufflebeam, D. (1995). Improving superintendent performance. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9,* 305-316.

Texas Administrative Code. (n.d.). Available: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/rules/home/index/html.

Texas Association of School Boards. (2002, January/February). Team players: Boards, superintendents urged to work as leadership teams, *Texas Lone Star*, *20*(1), 10-12.

Texas Education Agency (1997). *Report on the status of Texas superintendents.* Austin: Author.

Texas Education Agency (2000). *2000-2001 quick reference fact report.* Austin: Author.

Texas Education Code. (n.d.) Available: http://www.capital.state.tx.us.statutes/ed001100.html#ed032.11.201.

Texas school law bulletin. (2000). Austin: West Group.

Thomas, J.Y. (2001). *The public school superintendency in the twenty-first century: The quest to define effective leadership*. Ottawa, Canada: Ottawa Centre for Research and Innovation.

Tjosvold, D. (1993). *Learning to manage conflict: Getting people to work together productively.* New York: Macmillan.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

BOARD PRESIDENT

May 7, 2002

Dear Board President:

My name is Peter Running and I am the Superintendent in Nordheim. I am currently writing my dissertation for my Ed.D. through Texas A&M. I very much need your help! I believe the study I am conducting is important and the information may be able to help school districts. My study deals with the role of the Superintendent as it is perceived by school administrators and Presidents of the Board. In order for my data to be valid, I need input from Board Presidents such as yourself. I know how busy you are and of the great demand on your time. However, I believe this to be an important enough study to ask you to spend about 10 minutes of your time and complete the enclosed survey and then return it in the self addressed – stamped envelop. I am assuring confidentiality in that names are only associated with a code for the purposes of follow up communication. The data will be aggregated for analysis. Names of individuals, the position that individuals hold or specific school districts will not be mentioned.

Your cooperation and help in completing this survey and returning it by May 27, 2002 will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Running

Dr. John Hoyle
Professor / Committee Chair
Texas A&M University

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETEING THE SURVEY

Read each statement carefully and based upon YOUR perception of how that behavior relates to the job of a superintendent, circle the corresponding number in the appropriate column. i.e.: Circle the number 1 for "Never" meaning your perception of the superintendent's job never involves this behavior. Circle number 2 if your perception of the superintendent's job "Almost Never" involves this behavior. Circle the number 3 if your perception of the superintendent's job "Seldom", or circle 4 for "Occasionally", or circle 5 for "Often", or circle 6 for "Almost Always" or circle 7 for "Always" involves this behavior.

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

SUPERINTENDENT

May 7, 2002

Dear Superintendent:

My name is Peter Running and I am the Superintendent in Nordheim. I am currently writing my dissertation for my Ed.D. through Texas A&M. I very much need your help! I believe the study I am conducting is important and the information may be able to help school districts. My study deals with the role of the Superintendent as it is perceived by school administrators and Presidents of the Board. In order for my data to be valid, I need input from Superintendents such as yourself. I know how busy you are and of the great demand on your time. However, I believe this to be an important enough study to ask you to spend about 10 minutes of your time and complete the enclosed survey and then return it in the self addressed –stamped envelop. I am assuring confidentiality in that names are only associated with a code for the purposes of follow up communication. The data will be aggregated for analysis. Names of individuals, the position that individuals hold or specific school districts will not be mentioned.

Your cooperation and help in completing this survey and returning it by May 27, 2002 will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Running

Dr. John Hoyle
Professor / Committee Chair
Texas A&M University

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETEING THE SURVEY

Read each statement carefully and based upon YOUR perception of how that behavior relates to the job of a superintendent, circle the corresponding number in the appropriate column. i.e.: Circle the number 1 for "Never" meaning your perception of the superintendent's job never involves this behavior. Circle number 2 if your perception of the superintendent's job "Almost Never" involves this behavior. Circle the number 3 if your perception of the superintendent's job "Seldom", or circle 4 for "Occasionally", or circle 5 for "Often", or circle 6 for "Almost Always" or circle 7 for "Always" involves this behavior.

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER

OTHER SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

May 7, 2002

Dear Deputy, Associate, Assistant, or Area Superintendent:

My name is Peter Running and I am the Superintendent in Nordheim. I am currently writing my dissertation for my Ed.D. through Texas A&M. I very much need your help! I believe the study I am conducting is important and the information may be able to help school districts. My study deals with the role of the Superintendent as it is perceived by school administrators and Presidents of the Board. In order for my data to be valid, I need input from Deputy, Associate, Assistant or area Superintendents such as yourself. I know how busy you are and of the great demand on your time. However, I believe this to be an important enough study to ask you to spend about 10 minutes of your time and complete the enclosed survey and then return it in the self addressed –stamped envelop. I am assuring confidentiality in that names are only associated with a code for the purposes of follow up communication. The data will be aggregated for analysis. Names of individuals, the position that individuals hold or specific school districts will not be mentioned.

Your cooperation and help in completing this survey and returning it by May 27, 2002 will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Running

Dr. John Hoyle
Professor / Committee Chair
Texas A&M University

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETEING THE SURVEY

Read each statement carefully and based upon YOUR perception of how that behavior relates to the job of a superintendent, circle the corresponding number in the appropriate column. i.e.: Circle the number 1 for "Never" meaning your perception of the superintendent's job never involves this behavior. Circle number 2 if your perception of the superintendent's job "Almost Never" involves this behavior. Circle the number 3 if your perception of the superintendent's job "Seldom", or circle 4 for "Occasionally", or circle 5 for "Often", or circle 6 for "Almost Always" or circle 7 for "Always" involves this behavior.

APPENDIX D

THE INSTUMENT
SUPERINTENDENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE
(SBQ)

SUPERINTENDENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONAIRE

	Never	Almost Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	Always
Instructional Leadership							
1. The superintendent sees to it that teachers are evaluated on a formal basis at least once a year and that reports on these evaluations are presented to the school board.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The superintendent sees to it that regular in-service seminars, workshops and institutes are conducted frequently for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The superintendent is familiar with and encourages teachers to use new and improved methods and innovations as soon as they are available.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The superintendent spends much time developing instructional programs and working closely with his principals in this regard.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. The superintendent assures that Instructional Leadership aligns curriculum with TAKS.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Curriculum							
6. The superintendent encourages staff members to investigate new curricula through visits to other schools, reading, research and experimentation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. The superintendent has committees of staff members in on all major decisions involving the changing of the instructional program, selection of new textbooks, audio-visual aids and other instructional supplies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. The superintendent together with the board makes most of the curriculum and instructional changes without getting the staff very involved.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. The superintendent spends much time reading professional articles, attending professional conferences, doing his own research and writing professional journals, so that he will become familiar with the recent curriculum trends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. The superintendent conducts curriculum audits to assure alignment with TAKS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff / Personnel Administration							
11. In considering promotions the superintendent usually favors staff from within the system over outsiders.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. The superintendent sees to it that the best non-professional staff (i.e., caretakers, repairmen and bus drivers) are employed by the board.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. The superintendent gives consideration to local values or feelings regarding race, religion or ethnic origin in filling vacant positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Never	Almost Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	Always
14. The superintendent promotes the general welfare of the staff by means of striving for better teachers' salaries, reduced teacher loads, smaller class sizes, and greater emphasis on specialization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. The superintendent keeps a watchful eye on the personal life of his staff because of the impact it may have on the children or community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pupil / Personnel Administration							
16. The superintendent establishes school admission policies including determination of age, testing, and planning for parent interviews.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. The superintendent makes the final recommendations with respect to cases of pupil expulsion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. The superintendent exercises some control over athletic and other co-curricular activities to see that they do not get out of hand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. The superintendent sees to it that pupil personnel records are kept of all pupils, dealing with such things as census, examination results and promotions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Financial Administration							
20. In drawing up the budget, the superintendent places the educational needs of the school children above such factors as cost to the taxpayer.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. The superintendent makes full use of teachers and other staff in drawing up pertinent items of the budget.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. The superintendent "over-budgets" on his original draft in anticipation of large "cuts" by the school board.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. The superintendent, through his staff, establishes adequate procedures for the handling and accounting of funds.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
School Plant and Business Management							
24. The superintendent conducts surveys and constantly keeps up to date to predict future building needs and trends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. The superintendent develops and conducts efficient programs of plant operation and maintenance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. The superintendent makes recommendations to the board with regard to the selection of types of buildings required, school sites, contractors and architects.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. The superintendent favors local firms of contractors, subcontractors and architects, over outside firms, all things being equal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Never	Almost Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always	Always
28. The superintendent with the board formulates and enforces policies governing the use of school facilities by community groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. The superintendent develops an adequate system of pupil transportation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Public Relations							
30. The superintendent keeps his office open to all community members at all times.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. The superintendent actively supports worthy community organizations by speaking to the groups or by holding office in them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. The superintendent establishes regular channels of communication with local newspapers, radio and television.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. The superintendent leaves the responsibilities of public relations to the board and staff. He lets the board members interpret their policies to the public, and principals and staff handle the school-community relations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Administrative Structure and Organization							
34. The superintendent spends more time in the local area than on state or regional projects or conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. The superintendent urges people whose personality and ability are respected to run for the school board, and sometimes even gives them a helping hand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. The superintendent provides board members with an agenda at least two or three days before each board meeting.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. The superintendent always takes a neutral stand on issues on which the community is evenly divided.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
General Planning							
38. The superintendent gives much of his effort to the development of long-range plans for the growth and improvement of the school system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

VITA

PETER JOHN RUNNING
P.O. Box 275
Nordheim, TX 78141

EDUCATION

2004	Doctor of Education, Educational Administration Educational Human Resource Development Texas A&M University College Station, Texas
1993	Master of Education, Educational Administration Educational Human Resource Development Texas A&M University College Station, Texas
1979	Bachelor of Science in Education School of Education University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan

EXPERIENCE

6/99 – Present	Superintendent of Schools Nordheim Independent School District Nordheim, Texas
3/97 – 6/99	Superintendent of Schools Alvord Independent School District Alvord, Texas
6/96 – 6/97	Assistant Principal, R. L. Turner High school Carrollton Farmers Branch Independent school District Carrollton, Texas
6/93 – 6/96	Associate Principal, Brenham High School Brenham Independent School District Brenham, Texas
9/79 – 6/93	Taught in grades K-12 and coached athletics for various school districts