

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE  
IN WORKING WITH BOARD MEMBERS IN  
TEXAS SCHOOLS**

**by**

**Keith W. Lutz**

**Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of  
East Texas State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirement  
for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1988**

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE  
IN WORKING WITH BOARDS IN  
TEXAS SCHOOLS

Approved:

A. Lynn Turner

Advisor

Robert L. Anderson Jr.

Ruth A. Stephens

Billy R. Webb

Jamena L. Williamson

Dean of the College

Keith L. McFarland

Dean for Graduate Studies and Research

COPYRIGHT 1988 by Keith W. Lutz

## ABSTRACT

### A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE IN WORKING WITH BOARD MEMBERS IN TEXAS SCHOOLS

Keith W. Lutz, Ed.D.  
East Texas State University, 1988

Advisor: Dr. Aaron Lynn Turner

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study was to better understand the role of the superintendent in performing decision-making tasks. The results of this study should prove useful in administrator training programs, selection procedures, and providing evaluation guidelines.

Procedure: A validated questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of 721 Texas school board members from 106 different school districts. Factors considered were school district size (average daily membership), length of service of the school board member, educational level of the school board member, districts that had an involuntary turnover during this past year, and board member responses to the same decision-making tasks in 1983.

#### Findings:

1. There was a significant difference in the perceived role of the

superintendent according to school district size, board member tenure, and educational level.

2. There was a difference in the disparity that existed in the role expectation for the superintendent as seen by board members and their superintendents, according to school district size.

3. There was a significant difference in role expectations of the superintendent where the superintendent left involuntarily in the past year when compared to role expectations of a school board where no change in the superintendent occurred.

4. There was a significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent by school board members from the Littleton study when compared to board members surveyed in this study.

#### Conclusions:

1. School boards seem to view the superintendent/school board relationship as one of working together as a team. Superintendents tend not to agree with this "shared" or "joint" perception.

2. School board members in smaller districts tend to assign a greater responsibility to the school board than those in larger districts.

3. School board members were willing to assign more responsibility to the superintendent in the personnel area than was indicated by the literature.

4. In districts where the superintendent left involuntarily during the past year, school board members assigned a larger degree of decision-making responsibility to the superintendent than those districts that had no superintendent change.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is sincerely grateful for the unlimited assistance, advice, and guidance of his major advisor, Dr. A. Lynn Turner. His patience and efforts are greatly appreciated. Sincere thanks are expressed to the other doctoral committee members for their cooperation and professional assistance: Dr. Ruth Ann Stephens, Dr. Robert Windham, and Dr. Billy Webb.

Appreciation is also expressed to the Texas School Boards Association and the Texas Association of School Administrators. Their endorsements, cooperation, and participation were extremely important to this study.

This effort is dedicated to the writer's wife, JoAnn, and his sons, Kevin and David. Without their courage to embark on this adventure, and their continuous support, encouragement, and confidence, this effort would not have been possible.

## CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	xii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	5
Research Questions . . . . .	6
Hypotheses . . . . .	6
Significance of the Study . . . . .	7
Delimitations of the Study . . . . .	9
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	9
Methodology and Procedures . . . . .	9
Definition of Terms . . . . .	11
Organization of Remaining Chapters . . . . .	11
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	13
Concept of Role . . . . .	13
Historical Background of the Superintendent Position . . . . .	15
Role and Responsibility of the Superintendent . . . . .	17
Role and Responsibility of the School Board . . . . .	22

Relationship Between Boards and Superintendents . . . . .	26
3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	33
Selection of the Sample . . . . .	33
Description of the Instrument . . . . .	34
Data Collection . . . . .	35
Treatment of Data . . . . .	36
4. PRESENTATION OF DATA . . . . .	38
Role of the Superintendent as Viewed by School Board Members in Texas . . . . .	39
Disparity That Exists in the Role Expectation for the Superintendent as Seen by Board Members and Their Superintendents . . . . .	54
Discrepancies In Superintendent Role Perception Between Individual Boards and the Average School Board Members Perception State-Wide . . . . .	60
Differences in Role Perception for the Superintendent of a Board Where the Superintendent Left Involuntarily In the Past Year . . . . .	64
Role of the Superintendent as Perceived by Texas School Board Members - A Comparison of 1983 and 1987 . . . . .	65
5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	74
Summary of the Study . . . . .	74
Summary of Major Findings . . . . .	75
Conclusions . . . . .	78
Recommendations . . . . .	79
Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .	79



BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	81
APPENDIXES	
A. Cover letter to Board Members. . . . .	86
B. Follow-up Letter to Board Members . . . . .	88
C. Second Follow-up Letter to Board Members . . . . .	90
D. Questionnaire Sent to Board Members Where No Superintendent Turnover Occurred . . . . .	92
E. Questionnaire Sent to Board Members Where A Superintendent Change Occurred During the Past Year . . . . .	95
F. Endorsement Letters . . . . .	99
G. Letters of Permission for Use of the Questionnaire . . . . .	102
H. Board Member Response to Questionnaire . . . . .	104
I. Board Member Response to Questionnaire (Littleton Study) . . . . .	108
VITA . . . . .	112

## TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number and Percentage of School Board Members Responding as Examined by District Size, Length of Service, and Formal Educational Level .....	40
2. The Role of the Superintendent as Viewed by School Board Members in Texas .....	41
3. Analysis of Variance of Board Member's Views of the Role of the Superintendent by District Size .....	46
4. Analysis of Variance of Board Member's Views of the Role of the Superintendent by Length of Service .....	50
5. Analysis of Variance of Board Members Views of the Role of the Superintendent by Educational Level .....	54
6. Disparity That Exists in the Role Expectation for the Superintendent, as Seen by Board Members and Their Superintendents. ....	57
7. Disparity in the Role Expectation for the Superintendent as Seen by Board Members and Their Superintendent. ....	60
8. Discrepancies in Superintendent Role Perception Between Individual Boards and the Average School Board's Perception State-Wide. ....	62
9. Differences in Role Perception of the Superintendent by a Board Where the Superintendent Left Involuntarily in the Past Year When Compared to Boards Where No Change in the Superintendent Occurred .....	65

10. Percentage Comparisons of Board Member Responses from 1983 and 1987 .....	67
11. Comparison of Role Perception of the Superintendent Between the Littleton Study and This Study Using T-tests .....	71

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

The professional status of the school superintendent has sped through several stages so fast that it has never been clearly defined. In his description of the superintendency, Burbank (1968: 3) stated:

The school superintendent is a newcomer to the professional scene. Unlike his fellow practitioners in medicine, law, and the church, he cannot draw upon centuries of tradition and long established canons of professional conduct. The scope and nature of his work in the matrix of society have not yet been clearly defined through the long view of history.

In the early stages of the superintendency, the role was not very significant and consisted of mainly clerical duties performed for the board of education. The clerical role was gradually replaced by duties that were instruction oriented. The turn of the century marked the beginning of an era of Progressivism, with the superintendency being subjected to the influence of scientific management and the practices of business and industrial management. The superintendent moved farther away from the traditional role of the "educator" and resembled a "businessman" who, in turn, took on the role as the executive officer for the board of education (Griffiths, 1966: 1-20).

During the early 1980s, the description of the superintendency continued to change as did most other expectations for education. According to Wiles (1983: 106,107), the school superintendency became an emerging role:

The complexity of school operations has altered the role from a purely academic one in the last century to one which might be characterized as managerial and political in this century. As such, the superintendent has two generic roles: to serve as the executive officer for the school district...and, as the individual accountable for all school operations. In the first role, the superintendent serves the board directly and the public indirectly. In the second role, the superintendent serves a variety of clientele including the board, administrators, teachers, parents, students, taxpayers, and citizens at large.

During the educational reform movement of the eighties, legislators from the state of Texas passed in the second session of the sixty-eighth legislature their own school improvement legislation in the form of the Educational Reform Act of 1984--House Bill 72. Due to this reform movement the question may be asked: has the implementation of this legislation caused school board members to view the role of the superintendent differently than prior to House Bill 72?

There has been much research completed during the past twenty years about the perceptions of the role of superintendent in the public schools. In many instances the research has shown a discrepancy in how school board members and superintendents perceive the role of the superintendent. Hess (1986: 15) explained that the problem is shared:

While failure to observe the formal roles clearly has resulted in the dismissal of many executives, it should be emphasized that both the executives and the board members must share blame for these failures. There are just as many closet administrators in board rooms as there are executives who view board rooms as adjuncts of their own offices.

The title Superintendent of Schools is usually used to describe the educational leader who serves as the chief school officer. The position represents the highest level of public school management (Wiles, 1983:103). The superintendent has broad discretionary decision-making powers. In extreme situations school board members come to rely completely on the

superintendent and eventually become nothing more than a rubber stamp. The other extreme is that the superintendent becomes nothing more than a hired hand. Both extremes are undesirable (Campbell, 1980: 240). The superintendent's close working relationship with the board of education and the fact that the superintendent serves at the pleasure of the board are enough to give added meaning to the importance of effective superintendent/board relations (Knezevich, 1984: 294).

In many superintendent-school board relationships, frequent disagreements often surface in respect to the rights and obligations of each. The age-old problem in many districts often goes unanswered as to who is to do what, what is policy making, and what is administration (Dykes, 1965: 110). The thorny problem of where policy making ends and administration begins has been tackled by superintendents, boards, and researchers. The fact is that there are no clear boundaries to separate the two functions. The bottom line is that where one ends and the other begins is where the board, not the superintendent, perceives it to be (Dykes, 1965: 110).

In his workshop manual for school leaders, Jongeward (82: 1) stated:

Like a good marriage or freedom itself, effective board/administrator relationships are the result of an investment of time and energy in the process. Fundamental to obtaining these strong and healthy relationships is knowing your role and having realistic expectations of others;

Superintendents and school boards have troubled relationships because they come from different camps. The board is the boss and the superintendent is an employee who is hired to be a leader. In a real sense both the superintendent and the board are in charge (Jongeward, 82: 51). In many cases the areas of responsibility are not clear and both groups must learn to speak the other's language before roles and expectations can be

clarified. When a problem exists, it is usually "solved" by ignoring it (Jongeward, 82: 51).

The tug of war over who is to govern seems to be divided into two schools of thought. The first is one of team management and shared responsibility with the superintendent being the key leadership figure. "Boards and superintendents that approach policy development and future planning in a cooperative fashion will most likely avoid the conflict of roles that tends to result when common objectives are misunderstood or unknown." (PSBA, 77: 9) Most of the literature suggests that the roles are very much like two spheres and when the two do not touch or overlap, or they exist alone, a problem exists. The management team makes management decisions, but it is not the task of the team to establish policy nor supervise daily administrative operations (Jongeward, 82: 1).

The other side of the coin is voiced by Relic (1986: 25-26), who said,

Somehow, we've forgotten the difference between policy and administration. Somehow, we've begun to obliterate the distinction between public officials and professional educators. . . . We've concocted a new doctrine called shared responsibility that at best has created a muddle in some school systems and at worst, complete chaos. . . . What could be more counterproductive and chaotic than a school system in which the euphemism "shared responsibility" means no one really knows what anyone else is supposed to do?

In a doctoral study completed at East Texas State University, Littleton (1983) researched the role of the superintendent as viewed by school board members in Texas. Littleton found the typical board profile to be extremely varied as to how board members view the superintendent's role.

In a second study at East Texas State University, Zachary (1988) surveyed the superintendents of Texas as to their perceptions of the role of the superintendent. After testing for the variables of district size, superintendent tenure, and educational level of the superintendent, Zachary addressed the question of role perception, and sought to determine if there were a difference between the boards and superintendents.

This research, an extension of the Littleton and Zachary studies, will contribute to the larger body of research on role perception of the superintendent. The research will provide information for the development and formation of instruments used in interviewing candidates, administrative evaluations, and for mitigation of discrepancies in role perceptions. The study will provide information that will enable superintendents and board members to communicate on role expectations and that will aid in the development of policies related to role definition.

### Statement of the Problem

The study examined the role of the superintendent in performing particular decision-making tasks as seen by board members. Other concerns were to investigate school board member's perception of the superintendent role as affected by district size, length of service, and educational level of the school board member.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to better understand the role of the superintendent in working with the board in performing decision-making tasks. In addition, the study should promote a common understanding between school board members and superintendents as to the role of the superintendent. The results of this study should prove useful in administrative training programs, selection procedures, and providing evaluation guidelines.



### Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the role of the superintendent as viewed by school board members in Texas?
2. How much disparity exists in the role expectations for the superintendent, as seen by board members and their superintendents?
3. What are the discrepancies in superintendent role perception between individual boards and the average school board member perception state-wide?
4. What are the role perceptions of the superintendent by a board where the superintendent left involuntarily in the past year?
5. Have Texas board members changed in their expectations for the role of the superintendent since the Littleton study of 1983, a year of major Texas educational reform?

### Research Hypotheses

Addressed in this study were the following hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas board members according to district size.
2. There will be no significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas board members according to board tenure.
3. There will be no significant difference in the perception of

the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas board members according to educational level.

4. There will be no significant difference in role expectations of the superintendent as perceived by school board members where the superintendent left involuntarily within the past year when compared to role expectations by school board members where no superintendent change occurred.
5. There will be no significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members from the Littleton(1983) study when compared to Texas board members surveyed in this study.

#### Significance of the Study

Many superintendents and school board members have tried to establish guidelines for their working relationship. Much of the literature indicates that more effort should be expended in defining the superintendent's role. Campbell ( 1980, 1980: 291) stated this need as follows:

The partnership between the chief administrator and his controlling board is a strategic one. Each has a unique role to play. Boards can err by attempting to administer the schools. Chief administrators can err by encouraging or permitting boards to become rubber stamps. Often the delineation of board-administration roles is attempted by a set of rules and regulations. These formalized statements are useful only if they reflect understandings which derive from mutual respect and explicit discussion. The development of such an understanding should be a prime objective of every chief administrator.

The Littleton study surveyed school board members in Texas as to their view of the superintendent's role. The participants were asked twenty-nine questions in the four areas of budgeting and finance, curriculum and student personnel, personnel, and school facilities and community relations. The variables of district size, board member tenure, and board member educational level were examined. The Zachary study followed the Littleton study and used the same instrument, but administered it to a random selection of Texas public school superintendents.

In both the Littleton study and the Zachary study, responses were collected from individual school board members and individual superintendents to develop a profile of a typical board response or a typical superintendent response. It was the intent of this study to use the instrument to survey the board of education as an entity. It is the entire board as one unit that establishes policy and governs the school district. This study surveyed the entire board of a structured random sample of districts whose superintendent responded to the Zachary study.

The study investigated the possibilities of change in school board member's expectations of the role of the superintendent from 1983 to 1987. During this four and one-half year period, House Bill 72 mandated much educational reform. Comparing the data indicated there was a change in board members' expectations of the superintendent's role. The results provided a vehicle for the beginning of better communications between participating board members and superintendents. The findings will allow superintendents to view the data and make some assumptions about their role and the expectations of the board. The results could provide a vehicle for the beginning of better communications between participating board

members and superintendents. The findings should be useful in the training of superintendents and board members.

### Delimitations of the Study

The following delimitations applied to this study:

1. Only school districts with high schools were included in this study.
2. One aspect of this was limited to members of school boards with five or more respondents.

### Limitations of the Study

1. Perceptions are personal expectations shaped by one's experiences, attitudes, achievements, educational level, and other factors, some perceptions may be more valid than others.
2. This investigation was limited to those school board members in districts whose superintendent participated in the Zachary study. The Zachary study included the use of a random sample of 490 superintendents from the public schools in the state of Texas.

### Methodology and Procedures

This study was an attempt to investigate the extent to which school boards and superintendents differ in their perceptions of the superintendent's role, as compared to findings in the Littleton and Zachary studies. The investigation was an experimental and a descriptive study. The data were collected from district school boards that participated in the

Zachary study. The data collected were presented in percentage and frequency count form to respond to the research questions. The hypotheses were tested with the appropriate statistical procedures.

The selection of the subjects for this study was limited to a population of approximately 425 Texas school districts used in the Zachary study. Of the 425 Texas school districts, a stratified random sample of approximately 103 districts, from three size groups, was selected. The data were collected from participating boards by questionnaire. Each superintendent of the selected districts was notified that their school board members were included in this study. A description of the study and a cover letter were included with the notification. The questionnaire, cover letter, return stamped envelope, background information sheet, and letters of endorsement, were sent to all board members of the selected districts. After the initial letter was mailed, a follow-up letter was sent to those school board members not responding. After a ten day wait, a third request was sent to individual board members in those boards with four responses. All home addresses for school board members selected for this study were provided for by the Texas Association of School Boards.

The initial contact was made with the superintendent and school board president of each school district selected for the study, requesting their participation. The survey instrument was sent to the home addresses of all school board members from each of the selected districts. Each school board member completed the survey form individually and returned it to the researcher, who compiled the individual board member responses into an individual board profile. Participating school districts that had at least five board members respond received their school district profile. The collected data were compared to the data in the Littleton and Zachary studies.

The instrument used for this study was the questionnaire developed and validated by D. Mark Littleton, December, 1983, at East Texas State University. A slight modification was made in the demographic section. A letter of permission to use the survey instrument was obtained from the author, and is included in the Appendixes.

### Definition of Terms

Expectations: A set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a position in determining how an actor should behave in a role (Behner, 1979: 3)

Individual boards: The board members collectively comprising a single unit.

Role: Behavioral patterns or functions expected of or carried out by an individual in a given societal context (Littleton, 1983:7).

School board: The school district agency created by the state, but generally popularly elected, on which the statutes of the state or commonwealth place the responsibility for conducting the local public education systems (Littleton, 1983: 7).

Superintendent: The highest position in the school district. The superintendent is an educational administrator employed by a board of education as the executive leader of the board (Behner, 1979: 3).

Tasks: The appropriate or assigned duties, responsibilities, missions or functions of an individual, office or organization (Littleton, 1983:6).

### Organization of Remaining chapters

This study contains five chapters. A review of the related literature may

be found in Chapter two. The methods and procedures used for the study are reported in Chapter 3. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter contains a limited review of the literature and research related to the role and responsibilities of the school district superintendent, school board, and their working relationship with each other. Insights into the perceptions and research of various authors through a review of relevant books, periodicals, documents, and research studies are divided into five areas: (1) the concept of role, (2) historical background of the superintendent position, (3) the role and responsibilities of the superintendent, (4) the role and responsibility of the school board, and (5) school board/superintendent relationships.

#### Concept of Role

The concept of role is still a vague term, and, when surveying the literature, a long list of definitions seems to be available. In their research of the concept of role, Neiman and Hughes (1951: 51) grouped the many definitions into three categories to give a sense of order. They were: "(a) definitions which use role to describe the dynamic process of personality development; (b) definitions in terms of society as a whole; and (c) definitions in terms of specific groups within a society." For the purposes of this study, the third category, definition in terms of specific groups, was used.



The main category of functional definitions in terms of specific groups was further divided into the sub-type role defined as "Participation in a Specific Group" (Neiman and Hughes, 1951:147). The definition used in this sub-type "was the literal dictionary sense, referring to the individual's assumption of, or assignment to, the performance of a part in a specific situation as one of the members of a group" (Neiman and Hughes, 1951:147). Under the definition stated, the concept of role has the following common elements:

1. In all definitions and usages of the concept there is involved either an individual definition of a specific situation or an individual acceptance of a group's definition of a specific situation.

2. Role behavior . . . involves the assumption of a process of symbolic interaction or communication as a prerequisite (Neiman and Hughes, 1951:147).

In one of the most comprehensive studies of the school superintendency role, Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958:13-17) also classified their review of the many definitions of role into three categories, defining role: (1) to include normative culture patterns; (2) as an individual's definition of his situation with reference to his and other's social positions; and (3) as the behavior of actors occupying social positions (Behner, 1979: 10).

The Gross study restricted the definitions of role to a set of expectations: "A role is a set of expectations, . . . it is a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position" (Gross, 1958: 61). In studying a particular role, an investigator would try to elicit from the members of specific populations the expectations they hold for someone in a specific position (Gross, 1958:61).

### Historical Background of the Superintendent Position

In 1647, the Massachusetts Bay Colony established precedents for the creation and maintenance of schools at a local level by passing the "Old Deluder Satan Act" (Wiles, 83:82). It was during this time that the schools were administered by lay committees which eventually came to be "school boards." The school board was an American invention and was an agency created by the state government with legal authority to govern the local districts (Wiles, 83:84).

During the early part of the nineteenth century, school boards became more independent of municipal boards and began to form their own natural boundaries. The business of education and school management became more complex, and the lay board members had difficulty in meeting the demands of their positions. Under the leadership of Horace Mann, the new position of superintendent was proposed to administer the daily operations of the school district. From 1837 to 1859, twenty-four cities had retained a school superintendent (NSBA, 1975: 3).

In 1895, the Department of Superintendents of the National Education Association delegated a committee of fifteen to study several issues, with one being school organization and governance. The Committee of Fifteen did not recommend the total elimination of local boards but did recommend that administrators control the schools. At the conclusion of this disagreement, school boards emerged in control of the legal power and many superintendents lost their jobs. (NSBA, 75:4).

According to Griffiths (1966: 2), the historical development of the superintendency could be grouped into three stages:

1. 1837-1910. During this period the superintendent was essentially

instructor orientated.

2. 1910-1945. During this period the superintendent was essentially a businessman more interested in the budget than in instruction.

3. 1945 -. The superintendent has now entered a period wherein his position is viewed as that of a professional school administrator.

Campbell (1980: 219) summarized the development of the superintendency essentially the same as Griffiths, except he identified four stages: (1) the role that was essentially a clerical role, (2) the role of an educator, usually a scholar of some reputation, (3) the role of a business manager, and (4) finally the role of chief executive and chief professional advisor in the school system. Wiles (1983: 105) indicated a fifth stage may have evolved during the 1980s to include that of a master politician .

While the development of the superintendency began in the nineteenth century, it was not until the twentieth century that attempts to professionalize the position were made. During this century, at least four movements in management had a major impact upon the superintendent position. They were as follows:

(1.) Scientific management: The major contributor to this movement was Fredrick Taylor who formulated the management principles of time study, price rate, separation of planning from performance, and the scientific methods of work principle.

(2.) Human relations: The democratic approach was introduced to administration during the 1930s and 1940s.

(3.) Structuralism: This movement was largely a product of the 50s and 60s.

(4.) Open system: The most current stage which stresses interdependence between an organization and its environment (Campbell,1980:225-227).

Callahan (1962:Preface), viewed the changes in educational administration as influenced by the business world:

... what was unexpected was the extent, not only of the power of the business industrial groups, but of the strength of the business ideology in the American culture on the one hand and the extreme weakness and vulnerability of schoolmen, especially school administrators, on the other ( I am now convinced that what has happened in American education since 1900 can be explained on the basis of the extreme vulnerability of our schoolmen to public criticism and pressure and that this vulnerability is built into our pattern of local support and control).

### The Role and Responsibility of the Superintendent

The growth in importance and the broadening of function of the school superintendent have seldom been brought about by legal means. The legal status of the superintendent lags far behind practice. Despite the fact that practically all systems are now administered by full time superintendents, state law in general still vests most administrative and executive functions in the local school boards (Dykes, 1965:70). The state of Texas is no exception. Section 23.26 (b) of the Texas Education Code (1986:205) states that trustees shall have the exclusive power to manage and govern the public free schools of the district.

The school superintendent has much the same responsibilities to the local school board as the commissioner of education has to the state board of education. Thus, the superintendent is the chief operating officer of the district, responsible for implementing the policies of the board (Kemerer, 1982:13). The superintendent should always be clearly designated in the law as the administrative head of the school system, with the local school board designated as the legislative or policy-making body (Dykes, 1965:233).

In most school districts in the United States, the superintendent is recognized as the chief executive to the board. The superintendent is seen as the "most visible, most vulnerable, and potentially most influential member of the school organization" (Campbell, 1980:233).

Most of the literature in school administration suggests that the board of education is to legislate and that the superintendent is to execute. This concept has given rise to the notion that the superintendent is to be the executive officer of the school board (Griffiths, ;1966:92).

In addition to being the executive officer to the board, the superintendent is also the individual accountable for the total school operation. As the executive officer of the board, the superintendent serves the school board directly and the public indirectly. In the second role, the superintendent directly serves a variety of clients including teachers, parents, students, taxpayers, and citizens at large (Wiles, 1983:105).

In sparsely populated schools, the superintendent may double as the principal or even as a part-time teacher. In middle-sized school districts, the superintendents will usually work directly with the principals and a few central office personnel. In the larger districts, the superintendent may work with several top administrative assistants and several key central office personnel. Despite the difference in size and complexity, "the superintendent stands at the top of the hierarchy of the organization" (Campbell, 1980:234).

Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of the school superintendent are abundant. Griffiths (1966:70-71) suggests the role of the superintendent can be divided into four parts:

1. Improving educational opportunity. All aspects of the instructional program are included in this part . . . what shall be taught and how it shall

be taught are considered here.

2. Obtaining and developing personnel. The divisions of the job concerned with recruitment, selection, placement, and promotion of personnel are relevant here. All matters of personnel administration are likewise considered. Pupil personnel problems are considered under this head in addition to matters relating to professional and non-professional personnel.

3. Maintaining effective relations with the community. This part of the job is more broadly conceived than mere public relations. It includes interpreting the schools to the public and studying the community so as to further education.

4. Providing and maintaining funds and facilities. The business and housekeeping aspects of school administration are included in this part of the job. Included are budget planning, plant maintenance, construction and renovation of buildings, and similar functions.

Blumberg agrees with Griffiths' four job functions, now generally accepted as "the" job description for the superintendency, but suggests two new dimensions be added. The new dimensions do not replace the standard expectations of the superintendency but supplement them. The two categories, according to Blumberg (1985: 44), include:

1. Politics - the essence of the superintendency is the ability to be a manager of the political structures within a school system.
2. Public Property - being a superintendent means becoming public property (Blumberg, 1985:44).

Goldhammer (1974: 54) suggests that as the executive officer of the board, it is the responsibility of the superintendent to do three particular things:

1. It is his responsibility constantly to assist the board to evaluate the effectiveness of the educational enterprise and the extent to which it is meeting both the needs of education generally and the aspirations of the community particularly.
2. It is his responsibility to advise the board of various alternatives of action with respect to any problems with which the school district is confronted. It is his responsibility to assist the board in understanding the consequences for the community and for the public schools.

3. It is his responsibility to execute the policies which the board has established and to inform the board of the intent to which effectiveness of the educational program is promoted or hindered as the result of those policies.

The American Association of School Administrators and National School Boards Association (1979: 35-37) has prepared a pamphlet that states some reasonable expectations of a superintendent of schools. As summarized, a school board should expect the superintendent to perform the following functions: (1) serve as its chief executive officer, (2) be its professional advisor in all matters and recommend appropriate school policies for consideration, (3) implement and execute board policy, (4) keep them fully and accurately informed about the school program, (5) interpret the needs of the school system, (6) present his/her professional recommendations on all problems and issues for board consideration, (7) devote a great share of thought and time to the improvement of instruction, (8) be alert to advances and improvements in educational programs, (9) lead in the development and operation of an adequate program of school community relations, (10) participate in community affairs, (11) use great care in nominating candidates for appointment to the school staff, (12) recommend for purchase equipment, books, and supplies that are appropriate to the purposes and needs of the school system, (13) present for consideration an annual budget that is designed to serve the needs of the school system, (14) establish and oversee the financial operations of the school district to insure adherence to budget provisions and the wise use of school funds, and (15) be a skilled politician in order to work effectively with many publics.

The dimensions of the public school administrator are inadequately defined and not well understood. However, according to Tope (1965: 20), six

dimensions can be readily pointed out:

1 As a public administrator - The superintendent performs public service in a public manner.

2 As a policy advisor - Recommendations of policy matter have come to be expected. The superintendent may well be the most vital factor in the whole process of developing policy which in turn determines the kind of educational program provided.

3 As the expert - The complexity of the American society has created the need for specialization.

4 As a professional worker -The administrator must present the profession to the school board and to the profession, the board.

5 As active in the community - Sound community relations are not something that is desirable and worth attaining; they are essential.

6 As educational leader - This dimension can be thought of as a summation of the other dimensions.

Today's superintendent is expected to plan, organize and direct a force of professional and auxiliary employees work with a lay school board, and at the same time, be responsive to different constituencies within the school community and the community at large (Burbank, 1968:25). To exercise real leadership, a superintendent must assume, usually simultaneously, the three roles of politician, manager, and teacher. To keep the level of potential conflict to a minimum, an effective superintendent will shift among the three roles to be played. Those less agile superintendents (those with narrow



skills in instruction, politics, and managing) continue to leave the superintendency, just as they did in the past (Cuban, 1985:29).

### The Role and Responsibility of the School Board

When reviewing the board/superintendent relationship, it is as important to understand the school board's role as it is to understand the superintendent's role. The role of the school board member is perhaps the most ill-defined in all levels of local government. Individual board members have no legal power, though the school board is considered a corporation. The state education agency usually is responsible for defining the board's rights and responsibilities, but this is ordinarily done in the most general terms. To further complicate the situation, the board rarely undertakes to define them. The board's role is simply an accumulation of customs, attitudes, and legal precedents without much specificity. Many school board members seem to move about in a sea of confusion about their power (Koerner, 1968:122).

According to Edwards (1955: 146):

The courts have been called on many times to clarify the role of the school board. The powers of the local board, as agreed upon by the courts are:

1. those expressly granted by statute;
2. those fairly and necessarily implied in the powers expressly granted;
3. those essential to the accomplishments of the objects of the corporation (Edwards, 1955:146).

Goldhammer cites five sources of control over the local school board. Each source gives the board authority to act in a somewhat specific situation and limits the independent actions of the board. The five areas cited by

Goldhammer (1974: 2) are as follows:

1. Constitutional provisions - These are usually quite broad and the establishment of specific laws is usually considered a legislative function.
2. Legislative enactments - School boards are subject to legislative control and are limited to the powers provided by statute.
3. Rules and regulations of the state board - State legislatures usually consider it their function to establish broad outlines for the operation of education and leave the specifics to a state agency or local school board.
4. Legal interpretation - The two agencies that interpret statutes that affect schools are courts and the state attorney general.
5. Societal demands - As a result of increased pressures to extend school programs, school boards have done so and justified their actions on the basis of implied powers, or the legislatures have extended the board's power.

According to the Texas Education Agency's legal council, David Thompson, in a recent article for the *Houston Post* (1987: 10A):

School trustees' inflated ideas of their authority may be fostered, he says, by the fact the school board is like the board of directors for a large corporation, supervising the budget, employment and construction for what is "the biggest business in virtually every town in Texas." But schools are not only a big business, but a public business, which means the state has the authority to monitor internal operations, even to the point of appointing a master to oversee operations in problem plagued districts. . . . "I'd say that governance is our biggest source of problems," Thompson said of the accreditation reviews made in all districts. . . . "Frankly some superintendents don't want to stick their necks out and they let the board do everything. Others want to tell the school board after they've done it what they did."

Goldhammer (1964: 37) stated that little research has been completed on how school board members view their particular function with respect to the superintendent of schools. In his study, he wrote that board members were found to believe that there was a distinction between policy making and administration. "The board members defined administration as 'running the school'; their definition of policy making was close to 'making the rules by which schools will be run'" (Goldhammer, 1964: 37).

In the same study by Goldhammer(1964:41), the most influential member of the board had more difficulty in defining a board member relationship with the superintendent. It was presumed that because he did not want to share influence with the superintendent, he looked upon the position as a relationship of competition.

A board's primary function is to make policy and the superintendents function is to implement that policy. Because "the authority of a local board lies in the board as a corporate body, such a corporate body must operate by the policies it establishes" (Wiles, 1985:73).

Wiles (1983,87) lists the following among the many duties of board members:

1. Selection of the superintendent of schools.
2. Establishment of procedures and policies in accordance with which educational services are administered and which programs are developed.
3. Establishment of policies for planning improvements and accountability.
4. Acquisition and development of properties; and provision of supplies.
5. Enactment of provisions for financing schools and adoption of a budget.
6. Adoption of personnel policies for appointment of instructional and non-instructional staff.
7. Appraisal of the work of the schools and adoption of plans for improvement.

According to the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association (79:39-41), the school board has some specific responsibilities it must guarantee if it hopes to attract and retain top-flight superintendents. Among these responsibilities are the following:

1. To write clear and concise statements of policy indicating what is expected of the superintendent in terms of job performance.

2. To assist the superintendent with counsel and advice, giving of its judgement, business experience, and familiarity with the local school system and community . . .

3. To delegate to the superintendent responsibilities for all executive functions, to refrain from handling directly any administrative details, and to give the superintendent authority commensurate with his or her responsibilities.

4. To make all employees of the school system responsible to the superintendent . . . and to require and receive all reports from them through the superintendent.

5. To refer all applications, complaints, and other communications, oral or written, to the superintendent, except when they come to the board on appeal from decisions of the superintendent.

6. To provide adequate safeguards for all personnel that will allow them to perform on a professional basis.

7. To hold the superintendent strictly responsible for the administration of the school and to keep the board fully informed.

Members of the board of education represent the people of the local community, carrying out the will of the state legislature. According to Weber (1971:17), the function of the school board is as follows: (1) agree on the principles that should serve as overall guidelines to those who administer the school program; (2) adopt policies that are consistent with state statutes and the principles listed previously; (3) enact rules and regulations governing the operation of schools, personnel management, and student behavior that are consistent with previous stated policies; (4) employ a superintendent and other professional personnel to administer the plan of action for operation of the school; (5) employ non-professional personnel to assist the professional staff; (6) evaluate the work of the superintendent; (7) dismiss teachers in the manner provided for by statute, policies, rules, and regulations of the board; (8) provide adequate funds, facilities, and equipment to operate the program of education; (9) perform such duties as required by statute and regulation of the state education agency; (10) see that the education program is reported accurately to the

community; (11) keep accurate records of board actions; and (12) see that people know about these actions.

Due to the nature of the legal structure that gives the board of education complete executive and legislative power over the schools at the local level, the degree to which the superintendent is to participate is determined by the board. In the final analysis, the role the superintendent is to play depends on the wishes and desires of the local school board (Dykes, 1965:152).

### The Relationship Between Boards and Superintendents

The relationship between board members and superintendents deserves continued attention in both research and in practice. It is at the board level that the citizen's expectations blend with professional judgements. The quality of a school system is in part a reflection of the working relationship between the board and the administration (Campbell, 1980:215).

It has been shown by experience that, if the clearer the division of responsibility based on duties to be performed, the greater the chances for significant improvement in board/superintendent relations. A division of labor is not just the dividing up the work. The objective is to arrive at a sensible, workable synthesis of operation that will assure efficiency and the proper set of checks and balances. Such a scenario is achieved when the superintendent initiates the action and the school board evaluates it (Dykes, 1965:112-113).

Research has found that if a board feels their information is inadequate, they tend to take refuge in the areas of physical facilities and

finances, leaving control over the actual educational program in the hands of the administration (Zeigler, 1974:154). Research also suggests that the superintendent who is too slow in educational planning may end up with the board in administration. As the executive to the board, the superintendent must anticipate the needs of the school system and have definite ideas on how to remedy them before the board recognizes them. If a superintendent must go before the board for his every action, he/she is encouraging--in fact, requiring--the board to become an administrative body (Dykes, 1965: 147).

The American Association of School Administrators and National School Boards Association (1979: 44) feel that a system must be devised to insure the superintendent and the school board be allowed to discharge their proper functions without infringing on each other's responsibilities. To avoid a certain amount of these problems, they recognize:

1. The role and function of a school board and superintendent must be mutually understood.
2. The concept of effective school management must be the mutual objective of the school board and the superintendent.
3. Because change is inevitable, a board and a superintendent must constantly assess the way they work together in the face of change

In an effort to maintain a productive relationship between the board and the superintendent, the board of education may look for the following general areas from the superintendent, as identified by Dykes (1965:118):

1. Execution of policies - all policies, not just the ones the superintendent agrees with.
2. Problems not covered by policy - matters not covered by policy and are appropriate for board consideration.
3. Information - expect full information on all aspects of the educational program.
4. Sharing - the superintendent must be willing to share the work, as well as the credit and blame.

5. Teamwork - to expect the superintendent to deal with the board as a whole rather than portions of it.

6. Supporting - the superintendent should assume the responsibility for building community confidence in and respect for the board by supporting board actions.

Equally as important to good school board-superintendent relationships is how well the board measures up to what the superintendent feels is due. The areas, according to Dykes (1965: 118), include:

1. Policies - the superintendent has the right to expect the board to establish and live by a complete set of sound written policies.

2. Support - the superintendent has the right to expect the support of the school board as long as he or she is the superintendent.

3. Unit Operation - the superintendent has the right to expect the board to work as a complete team.

4. School Personnel - the superintendent has the right to expect the school board to deal with all personnel through the superintendent.

5. Protection - the superintendent has the right to expect the school board to provide protection against unwarranted demands and unfair criticism.

6. Evaluation - the board should evaluate results as represented by the progress of the entire educational enterprise.

In a nationwide study of school board members and superintendents, the *American School Board Journal* (Alvey, 1985: 21) found that board members desired more authority in all issues asked about. The survey results indicated that, by far, the greatest disagreement was in the personnel area that included hiring, promoting, firing, and transferring of staff members. Superintendents wanted more authority and so did board members (Alvey, 1985:21).

Several studies have been conducted regarding current perceptions of the superintendent's role. Smith (1975:102-103) found that superintendents and board chairmen in Iowa did not agree on phases of how the superintendent's role was to be performed. There was a significant difference between board members and superintendents in the categories;

Establishes Administrative Team Work, Recommends Dismissal of Ineffective Personnel, and Facilitates Cooperative Decision Making. When the results were compared by district size, the number of significant differences were reduced.

Sweet (1987: 59,60), in a South Dakota study of superintendents and school board presidents, found that the variables of school district enrollment, educational level of both the superintendent and board president, and tenure in their position were significant in affecting the role perception of the superintendent. The recommendations provided by Sweet's study, like most similar studies, specified the need for further definition of the role for both the board president and the superintendent role.

In Arizona, Bart (1980:87-89) found that board members and superintendents differed significantly on Personnel Administration, Curriculum Development, Teaching Materials, Finance and Budget, and Public Relations. The largest disagreement in role and function was found between rural board members and rural superintendents. Superintendents from rural and urban areas agreed more with each other than with board members.

Behner(1979:142-150) indicated that significant differences were found with respect to the area in which it was perceived that a superintendent should function in his or her role. The primary area of differences between board members and superintendents was in the area of the relationship with teachers. Superintendents felt board members should be more supportive than the board members felt they should be. The other area of considerable difference was in who bears the prime responsibility for



setting instructional programs. The superintendents felt their role was considerably more important than did board members.

Tippet (1981:42,2955-A) conducted a study that researched the role and functions of the superintendent as perceived by both superintendents and school board presidents. Tippet found that, while the size of district had no effect on role perceptions, tenure on the board and educational level did make a difference. Tippet (1981: 42,2955-A) reported that the boards and superintendents perceived the same skill areas but in a different order:

When board members were asked to list in order of importance administrative content skill areas which superintendents should possess, they listed the following areas from most to least important: (1) curriculum development, (2) school finance, (3) personnel management, (4) superintendent-board relations, (5) accomplishment of goals, (6) public relations, (7) policy formulation, and (8) school construction. . . When superintendents were asked to list in order of importance administrative content skill areas which superintendents should possess, they listed the following areas from most to least important: (1) school finance, (2) superintendent-board relations, (3) personnel management, (4) public relations, (5) accomplishment of goals, (6) curriculum development, (7) policy formulation, and (8) school construction.

The major findings by Littleton (1983:67) of the role functions of the superintendent as viewed by Texas school board members were as follows:

1. There was a wide disagreement among school board members in Texas as to the role of the superintendent.
2. School board members in this study viewed many (15 of 29) of the tasks as "superintendent with board input."
3. School Board members desired input into instructional programs of the district. Few board members were willing to give superintendents total responsibility for the instructional program.
4. Although most board members viewed the operation of a building program as "superintendent with board input," they viewed the selection of the architect as "board with superintendent input," or as a "shared superintendent and board."

5. The way that a school board member viewed the role of the superintendent appeared to be related to school district size.
6. Board members in this study with an earned doctorate tended to delegate more responsibility to the superintendent. Board members with other educational backgrounds were not as likely to delegate responsibility to the superintendent.
7. There was no difference in the role of the superintendent as viewed by school board members when accounting for school board member tenure.

In another Texas study, a follow-up to the Littleton(1983) study, Zachary (1988) examined the role of the superintendent as seen by the superintendent. Using the survey instrument from the Littleton study, the results indicated superintendents assigned the dominant role to the superintendent in twenty-six of the twenty-nine decision making tasks.

Other major findings by Zachary (1988: 79-81) were as follows:

1. Superintendents clearly believed that the superintendent should play the major role in decision-making, indicating a preference for the superintendent making decisions with board input, closely followed by the superintendent making decisions alone.
2. Few superintendents were willing to assign board members total responsibility for decision-making in any area.
3. Superintendents regarded "Personnel" as their domain and expected to assume primary responsibility for decision-making in this area.
4. Superintendents were willing to share responsibility or let the board make decisions with superintendent input . . . Establishes the annual tax rate, . . . Determines the amount of a bond issue, . . . Selects the architect for a desired building program.
5. Superintendents appeared to be somewhat uncertain regarding their responsibility in the areas of student suspension, student expulsion, and community use of school facilities.
6. Superintendents . . . tended to assign more responsibility to the superintendent in decision-making than did the board members in the Littleton study.
7. Respondents in both studies indicated that they believed the superintendent should play the major role in decision-making, indicating a preference for the superintendent making decisions with board input, followed by the superintendent making decisions alone.

In a special report, the Pennsylvania School Boards Association Commission (1977: 27) felt that the relationship between superintendents and school board members could best be strengthened by both parties if the following were kept in mind:

1. Keeping students the center of the decision-making process.
2. Understanding the difference between policy and administrative rule.
3. Understanding the legal role and function of the two parties.
4. Keeping each other informed
5. Being tolerant and open-minded.
6. Participating in continuing inservice training.
7. Exerting positive leadership when faced with difficult decisions.
8. Assuming their proper decision-making role.

The review of the literature indicated that the role of the superintendent continues to be poorly defined. The reoccurring theme throughout the literature is that the superintendent is to execute policy (run the school), and the school board's function is to legislate (establish the rules to run the school). In order to maintain the vital ingredients of mutual trust and confidence, the defining and communicating of each party's role and function will continue to be of the utmost importance in superintendent/school board relationships.

## Chapter 3

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the procedures used in this study. The chapter is divided into four parts: (1) selection of sample, (2) data collection, (3) description of the survey instrument, and (4) treatment of the data.

#### Selection of the Sample

The population selected for this study was Texas school board members from the districts where the superintendent participated in the Zachary study. The sample for the Zachary study included 490 Texas school superintendents, of which 427 participated. For the purposes of this study, the 427 districts were categorized into one of three size groups. Group 1 consisted of school districts with 1000 or less students in Average Daily Membership. Group 2 represented school districts with 1,001 to 10,000 students in ADM; and Group 3 consisted of districts with more than 10,000 students in average daily membership(ADM). Twenty-three schools were identified from group 1 and all were selected; 182 school districts were identified from group 2, and 40 were randomly selected; 217 were identified from group 3, and 40 school districts were randomly selected. The rationale for forty school districts to be chosen from group 2 and 3, with

twenty-three from group 1, was to keep the approximate ratio among district sizes as the original population selected from the Zachary study. In addition to the 103 randomly selected districts, three school districts were selected because a known turnover in the superintendent's position had occurred against his/her choice. The three districts were part of the original population. The data from the three individual districts were used only for addressing hypothesis number four.

### Description of the Instrument

The questionnaire used for this study was developed, validated, and administered by Duard Mark Littleton for a doctoral study completed in 1983 at East Texas State University. Permission to use the instrument was received from the author and is included in appendix G.

The instrument was validated by a panel consisting of Dr. Charles Matthews, Executive Director of the Texas Association of School Administrators, Dr. Ralph Poteet, Superintendent of Schools in Mesquite, Texas; Dr. John Horn, Superintendent of Schools in Allen, Texas; Mrs. Judy Gilreath, board member for Sulphur Springs ISD; Mr. Jerry Gideon, Superintendent of Schools in Frankston, Texas; and Dr. Paul McCash, Past President of Texas Association of School Boards. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part was designed to gather background information from the respondents in the form of school district size according to average daily membership, the number of years served as a school board member, and the level of formal education of the board member. Fifteen schools in the random sample, according to Texas Education Agency records, had a change of personnel in the superintendent position. Those school board

members identified in schools were also asked the reasons for the superintendent turnover. The second part of the questionnaire was designed to describe the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members. The instrument consisted of twenty-nine items that inquired to what degree the school board/superintendency team worked together to perform selected tasks. The tasks were divided into four categories: (1) budgeting and finance, (2) curriculum and student personnel, (3) personnel, (4) school facilities and community relations. Those responding to the survey were asked to mark each of the twenty-nine items with one of the following responses: (1) school board alone, (2) school board with superintendent input, (3) shared jointly by school board and superintendent, (4) superintendent with board input, (5) superintendent alone. Copies of the instrument are included in appendices.

#### Data Collection

After the 106 school districts were identified, the home mailing addresses of the school board members and board presidents were obtained through the Texas Association of School Boards. A current list of district superintendents was obtained from the Texas Education Agency. A letter explaining the purpose of the study, a copy of the instrument used, and endorsement letters from the Texas Association of School Administrators and the Texas Association of School Boards were sent to the board presidents and superintendents for their information. Four days later, questionnaires were mailed to all board members in the selected sample. Each board member received a questionnaire, a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study,

letters of endorsement from TASA and TASB, and a self-addressed stamped envelope (items may be found in the appendices).

The initial response from the board members produced 363 questionnaires. Ten days later, a follow-up letter was mailed, which resulted in eighty additional responses. Ten days later, a third request, sent only to members of board where four members had earlier responded, generated 39 more returns. The total number of questionnaires returned was 482, representing 67 percent of the sample.

In order for a board to be included in the data to address hypotheses numbers 4 and 5, five or more board members had to return the questionnaire. From the 103 boards surveyed, 44 boards returned five or more questionnaires, for a 44 percent return.

### Treatment of the Data

The data collected from this research were recorded by frequency count and by percentages. Responses to items by categories were placed in Appendices D. Data were analyzed according to the research questions and hypotheses stated in Chapter One, analyzing each response using the variable of school district size, length of service on the board, and the educational level of the board member. The analyzed results for the first research question were displayed in percentage form.

Comparisons were made between the responses of superintendents from Zachary's study and responses of school board members from this research. A one-way analysis of variance was used to test the three hypotheses. All hypotheses were stated in the null at the .05 level of significance.

Discrepancies between the average board member responses and those of an individual board were treated with descriptive statistics. The analyzed results were displayed by discrepancy score.

Comparisons were made between the responses of board members where the superintendent left involuntarily and responses of board members where no change occurred. A t-test was used to test for significance.

The final research question compared the responses of board members from the Littleton study of 1983 to the board member responses of this study. A t-test was used to test for significance.



## Chapter 4

### PRESENTATION OF DATA

The study examined the role of the superintendent in twenty-nine different decision-making task areas. All participants were asked to indicate who should perform the listed tasks. Respondents had a choice from the following: (1) school board alone, (2) school board with some input from the superintendent, (3) jointly by the school board and superintendent, (4) superintendent with some input from the school board, or (5) superintendent alone.

This chapter is organized into six sections for the purpose of analyzing and reporting the data from this study. The first section of the chapter reports the demographic data representing the participating school boards and members who participated in this study. The second portion of the chapter examines the role of the superintendent, as viewed by school board members from the state of Texas. The third section describes the disparity that exists in the role expectations for the superintendent, as seen by board members and their superintendents in individual districts. The fourth section presents the discrepancies in superintendent role perception between individual boards and the average school board members perception. The fifth section details the differences in role perceptions between individual boards where the superintendent left involuntarily during the past year and boards where no change in the superintendent

occurred. The sixth section compares board member's expectations for the role of the superintendent, as reported in 1983, with board member's expectations since passage of educational reform legislation.

The demographic data indicate that the largest percentage of the respondents had three or less years of experience. The category of four to seven years of experience was the next largest category, followed by eight or more years of service. The pool of respondents seemed to be well educated. A total of 86 percent had at least some college, and 63.3 percent had at least a bachelor's degree.

#### The Role of the Superintendent as Viewed by School board Members in Texas

This section presents the data that are in response to the first research question, "What is the role of the superintendent as viewed by the members of school boards from the state of Texas?" Later in this section, the data are used to address the first three hypotheses.

The data for the first research question are displayed in Table 2 and listed by percentages with a sample of 482. The frequency counts by individual task may be found in Appendix H.

The data contained in Table 2 illustrate the category choices of "superintendent with board input" and "superintendent alone" accounted for the largest percentage of responses in eighteen of the twenty-nine tasks. In eleven of the twenty-nine tasks, board members indicated that they wished to share equally in the degree of involvement in performing the tasks. The large number of categories having such a high percentage of

Table 1

Number and Percentage of School Board Members Responding  
as Examined by District Size, Length of Service, and  
Formal Educational Level

---



---

Variable: District Size (student ADM)		
Group	Number	Percent
1 (1,000 or less)	63	34.0
2 (1001 - 10,000)	208	43.3
3 (10,001 +)	108	22.5
No Response	3	.2

---

Variable: Length of Service		
Length of service	Number	Percent
0 to 3 yrs.	211	43.8
4 to 7 yrs.	157	32.5
8 +	114	23.7

---

Variable: Years of Formal Education		
Education Level	Number	Percent
Some High School	13	2.7
High School	53	11.0
Some College	110	22.8
Bachelors Degree	172	35.7
Master's Degree	83	17.2
Earned Doctorate	50	10.4
No Response	1	.2

---

superintendent involvement suggest that school board members want the superintendent to have a large degree of involvement in the decision-making process. The categories that contained the higher average percentage rate were as follows: (1) "shared," 31.3 percent; (2) "superintendent with board input," 29.7 percent; and (3) "superintendent alone," 26.3 percent.

Table 2

The Role of the Superintendent as Viewed  
by School Board members in Texas

Task	Board	Board with input	Board- Supt. shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
1. Establishes the annual budget	1%	8%	53%	33%	4%	1%
2. Establishes the annual tax rate	13%	27%	48%	9%	2%	1%
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue	6%	22%	58%	8%	1%	5%
4. Maintains fiscal account- ability	2%	4%	34%	39%	21%	0%
5. Submits federal grant proposals	0%	2%	11%	27%	57%	3%
6. Establishes salary con- siderations for district personnel	1%	12%	43%	31%	13%	0%

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
7. Establishes fringe bene- fits for district personnel	3%	11%	47%	29%	9%	1%
8. Administers expenditures within the budget	0%	2%	13%	34%	50%	1%
9. Maintains control over budget and amendments	5%	10%	29%	32%	22%	2%
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	4%	11%	41%	32%	11%	1%
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination	8%	10%	35%	35%	11%	1%
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district	2%	8%	26%	40%	23%	1%
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt	3%	4%	17%	39%	36%	1%
14. Decides on student suspensions of ten or more days	7%	10%	22%	19%	42%	0%
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students	6%	10%	22%	17%	44%	1%
16. Selects admin- istrative personnel other than the superintendent	1%	9%	29%	38%	23%	0%
17. Selects teachers	1%	4%	16%	31%	48%	0%
18. Selects non- professional personnel	0%	3%	9%	21%	67%	0%
19. Selects coaches	2%	9%	29%	31%	28%	1%

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district	1%	4%	20%	39%	35%	1%
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel	2%	5%	11%	24%	58%	0%
22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space	1%	3%	26%	40%	30%	0%
23. Oversees a construction program	1%	4%	31%	38%	26%	0%
24. Selects the architect for a desired building program	12%	18%	48%	17%	5%	0%
25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program	2%	6%	35%	37%	19%	1%
26. Determines community use of school facilities	5%	16%	40%	27%	11%	1%
27. Informs the community of board positions and actions	4%	6%	34%	25%	30%	1%
28. Considers citizen complaints	3%	5%	51%	27%	14%	0%
29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance	2%	2%	32%	41%	23%	0%
Totals	3%	8%	31%	30%	26%	1%

The tasks of establishing the annual tax rate, determining the amount of a bond issue, and selecting an architect, were the areas that had a largest response toward the "board alone" or "board with superintendent input" selection, but in all three instances, the "board/superintendent shared" category received the largest percentage of responses. The tax rate had a "board with superintendent input" response of 27 percent. The bond issue task had a "board with superintendent input" response of 22 percent and the architect selection task had a "board with superintendent input" response of 18%.

The tasks of establishing the annual budget and considering citizen complaints were the only two areas to receive a majority of the responses under the shared category. The respondents indicated the following tasks to be performed on a "shared" basis, or on "superintendent with board input" basis: (1) maintaining control over the budget and amendments, (2) maintaining fiscal accountability, (3) establishing the educational philosophy of the district, (4) approving program development, modification or termination, (5) establishing educational specifications for the architect in a building program, and (6) determining the extent of needed school building maintenance.

The largest percentage of responses were recorded in the categories of "superintendent with board input" or the "superintendent alone" to perform the following tasks: (1) submitting federal grant proposals, (2) administering expenditures within the budget, (3) deciding on textbooks to adopt, (4) deciding on student suspensions of ten or more days, (5) deciding on expulsions of disruptive students, (6) selecting teachers for the district, (7) selecting non-professional personnel, (8) determining professional development requirements within the district, (9) evaluating the

performance of administrative personnel, (10) determining the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space, oversees a construction program, (11) overseeing a construction program, and (12) determining the extent of needed school building maintenance.

In the personnel section the three tasks of selecting teachers, selecting non-professional personnel, and determining professional development requirements within the district had a percentage response that clearly indicated a preference for "superintendent with board input" or "superintendent alone". The tasks of selecting administrative personnel other than the superintendent and selecting coaches, received a mixed response. The responses ranged from the category of "shared" to the category of "superintendent alone" with no one category dominating the percentage of responses.

The data in Table 3 address the hypothesis "There will be no significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas board members according to district size." The data list the mean, F ratio, and the pairs that were statistically significant in this study. The variable used was school district size, based on the average daily membership of students, with the sizes being: group 1, 1 - 1000; group 2, 1001 - 10,000; and group 3, over 10,000. Significant differences were obtained between school districts in group 1 and group 2, with significant differences obtained in fourteen out of twenty-nine task areas. The next largest area of differences was between the small schools (group 1) and the large schools (group 3), with ten of twenty-nine task areas showing significant differences. Differences between medium sized schools (group 2) and large schools (group 3) were significant in ten of twenty-nine task areas. Using the mean scores from Table 3, a one-way analysis of variance was



done. The value of F was 3.02 to indicate significance at the .05 level and 4.66 for significance at the .01 level. The level of significance is denoted by the appropriate asterisk in Table 3. The data indicated a significant difference in the perceived role of the superintendent, as seen by school board members of Texas according to school district size. A significant level of .05 was obtained for twenty of the twenty-nine task areas. Therefore, the data support the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 3  
Analysis of Variance of Board Member's Views of the Role  
of the Superintendent by District Size

Task	Mean Group. 1 1-1000 N=163	Mean Group. 2 1000- 10,000 N=208	Mean Group. 3 10,000+ N=108	F-ratio	Pairs of groups signif. at .05
1. Establishes the annual budget	3.37	3.35	3.17	3.15*	(3,2)(3,1)
2. Establishes the annual tax rate	2.68	2.63	2.41	3.27*	(3,2)(3,1)
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue	2.58	2.81	2.90	7.12**	(1,2)(1,3)
4. Maintains fiscal account- ability	3.72	3.86	3.54	4.28*	(3,2)
5. Submits federal grant proposals	4.24	4.53	4.50	6.57**	(1,3)(1,2)

Task	Mean Group. 1 1-1000 N=163	Mean Group. 2 1000- 10,000 N=208	Mean Group. 3 10,000+ N=108	F-ratio	Pairs of groups signif. at .05
6. Establishes salary considerations for district personnel	3.21	3.65	3.31	12.75**	(1,2)(3,2)
7. Establishes fringe benefits for district personnel	3.38	3.37	3.07	4.75**	(3,2)(3,1)
8. Administers expenditures within the budget	4.18	4.35	4.49	5.01**	(1,2)(1,3)
9. Maintains control over budget and amendments	3.44	3.68	3.57	2.15	
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	3.42	3.46	3.07	6.31**	(3,1)(3,2)
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination	3.30	3.39	3.27	.56	
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district	3.78	3.85	3.59	2.83	
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt	4.08	4.09	3.84	2.72	
14. Decides on the student suspensions of ten or more days	3.83	3.68	3.93	1.45	
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students	3.90	3.79	3.81	.41	

Task	Group. 1 1-1000 N=163	Group. 2 1000- 10,000 N=208	Group. 3 10,000+ N=108	F-ratio	Pairs of groups signif. at .05
16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent	3.31	3.81	4.21	34.82**	(1,2) (1,3)(2,3) (1,2)
17. Selects teachers	3.69	4.36	4.72	57.19**	(1,3)(2,3) (1,2)
18. Selects non-professional personnel	4.04	4.72	4.87	55.67**	(1,2)(1,3) (1,2)
19. Selects coaches	3.37	3.72	4.42	40.03**	(1,3)(2,3)
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district	3.83	4.11	4.25	8.22**	(1,2)(1,3)
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel	4.06	4.43	4.57	11.62**	(1,2)(1,3)
22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space	3.83	4.02	4.04	2.77	
23. Oversees a construction program	3.73	3.85	3.95	2.12	
24. Selects the architect for a desired building program	2.73	2.95	2.83	2.32	
25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program	3.32	3.79	3.95	20.07**	(1,2)(1,3)
26. Determines community use of school facilities	3.03	3.40	3.23	6.38**	(1,2)

Task	Group. 1 1-1000 N=163	Group. 2 1000- 10,000 N=208	Group. 3 10,000+ N=108	F-ratio	Pairs of groups signif. at .05
27. Informs the community of board positions and actions	3.73	3.87	3.46	5.19**	(3,1)(3,2)
28. Considers citizen complaints	3.34	3.64	3.26	8.96**	(3,2)(1,2)
29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance	3.58	3.91	4.03	11.04**	(1,2)(1,3)

\* denotes significance at the .05 level

\*\* denotes significance at the .01 level

The data in Table 4 addressed the hypothesis, "There will be no significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas board members according to board tenure." The data list the mean, F ratio, and the pairs that indicated a significant difference at the .05 level. The data are grouped on years served on the school board into the three categories of 0 to 3 years, 4 to 7 years, and 8 plus years. Of the twenty-nine task areas, six areas tested significant at the .05 level with the greater number taking place between group 1 (0-3 years) and group 3 (8 plus years). No pattern in the differences was exhibited in terms of desired level of board involvement. Using the mean score from Table 4, a one-way analysis of variance was completed. The level of significance is designated by the appropriate asterisk at the bottom of Table 4. Since the value of F was greater than 3.02 in five of twenty-nine task areas at the .05 level, the data indicated that there was a significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members

according to length of service on the school board. Therefore, the data support the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 4  
Analysis of Variance of Board Member's Views of the  
Role of the Superintendent by Length of Service

Task	Mean Group 1 0-3 yrs. N=211	Mean Group 2 4-7 yrs. N=157	Mean Group 3 Over 8 yrs. N=114	F-ratio	Pairs of groups Signif. at .05 level
1. Establishes the annual tax rate	3.24	3.30	3.48	4.43*	(1,3)(2,3)
2. Establishes the annual tax rate	2.57	2.59	2.65	.32	
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue	2.77	2.72	2.76	.24	
4. Maintains fiscal accountability	3.71	3.76	3.77	.21	
5. Submits federal grant proposals	4.38	4.43	4.47	.49	
6. Establishes salary considerations for district personnel	3.38	3.46	3.44	.45	
7. Establishes fringe benefits for district personnel	3.29	3.26	3.37	.48	
8. Administers expenditures within the budget	4.33	4.43	4.18	3.10*	(3,2)

Task	0-3 yrs. Mean Group 1 4-7 yrs. N=211	Mean Group 2 Over 8 yrs. N=157	Mean Group 3 Signif. at N=114F-ratio	Pairs of groups .05 level
9. Maintains control over budget and amendments	3.51	3.55	3.71	1.33
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	3.35	3.31	3.41	.37
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination	3.32	3.23	3.49	2.11
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district	3.75	3.77	3.81	.18
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt	4.01	4.03	4.06	.09
14. Decides on student suspensions of 10 or more days	3.99	3.62	3.63	4.82** (2,1)(3,1)
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students	3.92	3.92	3.57	3.35* (3,1)(3,2)
16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent	3.70	3.83	3.66	1.26
17. Selects teachers	4.12	4.37	4.17	3.57* (1,2)
18. Selects non-professional personnel	4.46	4.60	4.51	1.38
19. Selects coaches	3.71	3.84	3.74	.75
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district	4.02	4.05	4.05	.08

Task	Mean Group 1 0-3 yrs. N=211	Mean Group 2 4-7 yrs. N=157	Mean Group 3 Over 8 yrs. N=114	F-ratio	Pairs of groups Signif. at .05 level
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel	4.03	4.38	4.34	.30	
22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space	3.97	3.96	3.93	.09	
23. Oversees a construction program	3.80	3.89	3.81		
24. Selects the architect for a desired building program	2.94	2.85	2.68	2.71	
25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program	3.71	3.70	3.54	1.53	
26. Determines community use of school facilities	3.30	3.15	3.24	.91	
27. Informs the community of board positions and actions	3.65	3.75	3.82	.98	
28. Considers citizen complaints	3.37	3.48	3.54	1.59	
29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance	3.86	3.81	3.77	.40	

\*denotes significance at the .05 level

\*\*denotes significance at the .01 level

The data in Table 5 addressed the hypothesis, "There will be no significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as

perceived by Texas board members according to educational level." The data list the mean scores, F ratio, and the pairs that indicated a significant difference at the .05 level. The data are grouped into the following categories: (1) some high school, (2) high school diploma, (3) some college, but no degree, (4) bachelor's degree, (5) master's degree, and (6) earned doctorate. Of the twenty-nine task areas, eighteen areas have significant differences at the .05 level.

The group with "some high school", group 1, differed with the "high school diploma" group in twelve different task areas, the "some college" group in twelve different task areas, the "bachelor's degree" group in fourteen different areas, the "master's degree" group in fourteen different task areas, and the "earned doctorate" in thirteen different areas. The two general areas of major differences were in the personnel areas and school facility/ community relations area.

Group 2 (high school diploma) revealed differences with the "some college" group, "bachelor's degree" group, and the "master's degree" group in five different task areas. The general areas of major differences were in the budgeting/finance areas and the curriculum/student personnel area.

Group 3 (some college) differed from the "bachelor's degree" group in four of the task areas and with "masters" and "doctorate" groups in one task group each. Groups 4 and 5 did not differ with each other.

From the data presented in Table 5, a pattern was displayed in task 18, selection of non-professional personnel. The pattern displayed was that as the educational level of the board member increased, so did the mean response for each group. The group with the lowest level of education differed significantly from the other five groups in twelve to fourteen task areas.



Using the mean score from Table 5, a one-way analysis of variance was completed. The level of significance is denoted by the appropriate asterisk at the bottom of Table 5. Since the value of F was greater than the established significance level of 2.23 at the .05 level in fourteen of the twenty-nine task areas, the data indicated there was a significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent, as perceived by Texas school board members according to educational level. Therefore, the data support the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Disparity That Exists in the Role Expectation  
for the Superintendent, as Seen by Board  
Members and Their Superintendents

This section of the study presents the data dealing with the research question, "How much disparity exists in the role expectations for the superintendent, as seen by board members and their superintendents in individual districts?" For the purposes of this research question, only the

Table 5

Analysis of Variance of Board Members Views on the Role  
of the Superintendent by Levels of Education

Task	Mean Gr. 1 some H.S.	Mean Gr. 2 H.S.	Mean Gr. 3 some college	Mean Gr. 4 Bach. degree	Mean Gr. 5 Master degree	Mean Gr. 5 Earned Doct.	F-ratio.	Pairs of signif. group at .05 level
1	3.23	3.11	3.40	3.38	3.24	3.26	1.76	
2	2.62	2.60	2.72	2.56	2.44	2.66	1.05	
3	2.75	2.71	2.72	2.79	2.78	2.67	.32	
4	43.38	3.87	3.71	3.76	3.74	3.72	.69	
5	4.15	4.23	4.33	4.52	4.47	4.47	1.79	
6	2.69	3.49	3.41	3.51	3.39	3.28	2.42*	(1,6)(1,5)(1,3) (1,2)(1,4)

Task	Mean Gr. 1 some H.S.	Mean Gr. 2 H.S.	Mean Gr. 3 some college	Mean Gr. 4 Bach. degree	Mean Gr. 5 Master degree	Mean Gr. 5 Earned Doct.	F-ratio	Pairs of signif. group at .05 level
7	3.31	3.51	3.27	3.31	3.38	3.04	1.54	
8	3.69	3.87	4.23	4.44	4.48	4.55	8.23*	(1,3)(1,4)(1,5) (1,6)(2,3)(2,4) (2,5)(2,6)(3,4) (3,5)(3,6)
9	3.15	3.43	3.46	3.65	3.66	3.62	1.04	
10	3.54	3.81	3.29	3.31	3.32	3.16	3.04*	(2,6)(2,3)(2,4) (2,5)
11	3.31	3.41	3.40	3.26	3.30	3.32	.31	
12	3.38	3.92	3.78	3.72	3.76	3.86	.88	
13	3.58	3.77	3.90	4.17	4.13	4.02	2.70*	(2,5)(2,4)(3,4)
14	3.92	3.75	3.69	3.82	3.75	3.88	.25	
15	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.92	3.75	3.92	.39	
16	2.92	3.68	3.65	3.84	3.76	3.74	2.52*	(1,3)(1,2)(1,6) (1,5)(1,4)
17	3.15	3.96	4.09*	4.33	4.37	4.30	6.13**	(1,2)(1,3)(1,6) (1,4)(1,5)(2,4) (2,5)(3,4)
18	3.69	4.37	4.41	4.60	4.64	4.64	4.58**	(1,2)(1,3)(1,4) (1,5)(1,6)(3,4)
19	3.00	3.53	3.55	3.88	4.01	3.82	4.67**	(1,6)(1,4)(1,5) (2,4)(2,5)(3,4) (3,5)
20	3.23	4.19	3.93	4.12	4.06	3.98	3.09*	(1,3)(1,6)(1,5) (1,4)(1,2)
21	3.77	4.37	4.26	4.42	4.40	4.22	1.56	
22	3.08	3.88	3.97	4.03	3.94	4.00	3.17*	(1,2)(1,5)(1,3) (1,6)(1,4)
23	2.85	3.86	3.76	3.95	3.73	4.00	4.54**	(1,5)(1,3)(1,2) (1,4)(1,6)
24	2.38	2.87	2.87	2.87	2.73	3.04	1.19	
25	2.77	3.45	3.54	3.83	3.64	3.87	5.36**	(1,2)(1,3)(1,5) (1,4)(1,6)
26	2.77	3.28	3.30	3.17	3.32	3.26	.95	
27	3.69	3.98	3.81	3.60	3.74	3.67	1.19	
28	2.77	3.77	3.48	3.39	3.20	3.49	3.34*	(1,4)(1,5)(1,3) (1,6)(1,2)(4,2) (5,2)
29	2.92	3.79	3.71	3.85	3.90	4.10	4.65**	(1,3)(1,2)(1,4) (1,5)(1,6)(3,6)
N =	13	53	110	172	83	50		

\*denotes significance at the .05 level

\*\*denotes significance at the .01 level

data from school boards that had five or more members to respond were included in this part of the study. The mean score of all twenty-nine tasks were calculated for each individual board and subtracted from the mean score of the superintendent from that particular district. The difference in board means and that of the superintendent, provided a disparity score. Each disparity score is designated with a plus or a minus. The plus indicates that the superintendent mean for all twenty-nine tasks was larger than the school board mean. The minus indicates the school board mean for all twenty-nine tasks was larger than the superintendent mean. Disparity scores were then placed in rank order within three school district size categories. The data in Table 6 illustrate that in group one (1-1000 ADM), the discrepancy score for the fourteen school boards ranged from .11 to 1.01. A disparity of .50 or larger was considered an important role differential. A difference of at least a .50 or larger between the mean of the school board and their superintendent was found in six of the fourteen school boards. Of the twenty school boards in size group 2 (1001-10,000 ADM), the range in disparity scores was from .04 to .51 difference in means. Only two school boards displayed a disparity score of over .50. In group three (over 10,000), the range in disparity scores was .24 to .94. Of the ten school boards, five had a disparity score of .50 or higher.

In Table 6, a score of .50 or higher was considered an important difference between the school board mean and the superintendent mean. In the three different size groups, a total of twelve school districts had a disparity score of .50 or higher. These disparities were all indicated with a plus sign indicating that superintendents perceived the task more their responsibility while the boards indicated more school board input. Of the forty-four school districts identified, only two districts had a disparity score

of .50 designated with a minus sign. This indicated that the boards perceived the tasks as more the responsibility of the superintendent, and the superintendents saw the tasks being performed with more board input.

Table 6

Disparities That Exist in the Role Expectation for  
the Superintendent, as Seen by Board Members  
and Their Superintendents

District size 1 (1 to 1000 ADM)				
Rank	Dist. I.D.	Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Supt. Mean (all 29 tasks)	Disparity
1	371	3.51	4.52	1.01+
2	379	3.21	4.00	.79+
3	354	3.36	4.14	.78+
4	240	3.56	4.31	.75+
5	299	3.50	4.14	.64+
6	210	3.74	3.14	.60-
7	309	3.86	4.35	.49+
8	220	3.60	3.97	.37+
9	197	3.47	3.79	.32+
10	335	3.39	3.69	.30+
11	343	2.96	3.24	.28+
12	370	3.55	3.41	.14-
13	263	3.46	3.59	.13+
14	285	3.65	3.76	.11+
District Size 2 (1001 to 10,000 ADM)				
Rank	Dist. ID	Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Supt. Mean (all 29 Tasks)	Disparity
1	118	4.30	3.79	.51-
2	019	3.90	4.41	.51+
3	137	3.66	3.24	.42-
4	154	3.80	4.21	.41+
5	179	3.54	3.14	.40-
6	008	3.69	4.07	.36+
7	021	3.58	3.93	.35+
8	169	3.94	4.28	.34+
9	097	3.56	3.24	.32-

## District Size 2 (1001 to 10,000 ADM)-continued

Rank	Dist. ID	Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Supt. Mean (all 29 Tasks)	Disparity
10	138	3.91	3.66	.25-
11	110	3.72	3.97	.25+
12	150	3.76	3.55	.21-
13	099	3.85	4.00	.15+
14	066	3.99	3.86	.13-
15	024	3.59	3.48	.11-
16	067	3.80	3.90	.10+
17	100	3.73	3.66	.07-
D18	165	3.96	4.03	.07+
19	009	3.75	3.69	.06-
20	146	3.75	3.79	.04+

## District Size 3 (over 10,000 ADM)

Rank	Dist ID	Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Supt. Mean (all 29 tasks)	Disparity
1	419	3.51	4.45	.94+
2	411	3.47	4.24	.77+
3	412	3.62	4.38	.76+
4	401	3.53	4.14	.60+
5	406	3.56	4.10	.54+
6	417	3.75	3.29	.46-
7	405	3.73	3.28	.45-
8	420	3.71	3.38	.33-
9	421	3.83	3.59	.24-
10	408	3.48	3.72	.24+

+ = the superintendent mean is larger than the board mean

- = the board mean is larger than the superintendent mean

Data in Table 7 were collected from all responding school boards that had five or more members to participate in the study. Each of the twenty-nine tasks is listed with the average mean score for superintendents and for school boards displayed by size according to ADM. A disparity score was obtained by subtracting the two average mean scores.

Group 1 (1 to 1000 ADM) received a disparity score between the two mean scores of at least .50 in eight of the twenty-nine task areas. In the area of budget and finance, there was a wide difference in mean scores in four of the nine tasks, with the largest difference being in the area of maintaining control over the budget and amendments. The general area of personnel received the widest difference in mean scores between board members and superintendents. All six task areas in the personnel area had a disparity score between .55 and .87, with school boards indicating more board input and superintendents indicating more administrative control. A lack of role concensus in the personnel area was evident.

Group 2 (1001 to 10,000ADM) received a disparity score between the two mean scores of at least .50 in only three of the twenty-nine areas. The largest discrepancy for group 2 boards and superintendents was in the student personnel area that addressed student suspensions and expulsions. In the three tasks areas with at least a .50 disparity, the superintendents indicated the decision is made more by the superintendent. The board responses thought it to be more a "joint" or "board decision with superintendent input."

Group 3 (over 10,000), received a disparity score between the two mean scores of at least .47 in six of the twenty-nine task areas. The largest differences in mean scores were in the task areas of determining community use of school facilities, informing the community of board positions and actions, and considering citizen complaints.

From the three groups, a pattern could be established only for group 1. In smaller sized districts, the school board members differed from the superintendents in all six tasks in the personnel area. Without exception, the

school board wanted more input than the superintendents were inclined to accord them.

The Discrepancies in Superintendent Role Perception Between Individual Boards and the Average School Board's Perception State-Wide

This section of the study presents the data that are in response to the

Table 7

Disparity in the Role Expectation for the Superintendent,  
as Seen by Board Members and  
Their Superintendents

Task	Group I			Group II			Group III		
	A Supt.	B Brd.	C Disp.	A Supt.	B Brd.	C Disp.	A Supt.	B Brd.	C Disp.
1	3.50	3.13	.37	3.25	3.45	.20	3.0	3.07	.07
2	3.14	2.65	.49	3.00	2.74	.26	2.60	2.48	.12
3	2.62	2.55	.07	2.95	2.87	.08	2.8	2.82	.02
4	4.14	3.67	.47	4.15	3.91	.24	3.90	3.50	.40
5	4.71	4.55	.16	4.63	4.57	.06	4.60	4.52	.12
6	3.50	2.77	.73	3.40	3.62	.22	3.60	3.22	.38
7	3.21	3.37	.16	3.20	3.37	.17	3.40	2.91	.49
8	4.29	3.85	.44	4.65	4.39	.26	4.70	4.48	.22
9	4.00	3.19	.81	4.10	3.86	.24	3.80	3.36	.44
10	3.21	3.48	.27	3.05	3.49	.44	3.00	2.83	.17
11	3.57	3.44	.13	3.55	3.46	.09	3.00	3.15	.15
12	3.86	3.86	.00	3.74	3.92	.18	3.80	3.57	.23
13	4.36	4.24	.12	4.25	4.19	.06	4.10	3.66	.44
14	4.29	3.91	.38	3.11	3.80	.69	3.60	3.84	.24
15	3.93	3.74	.19	3.20	3.84	.64	3.20	3.78	.58
16	3.93	3.28	.65	3.95	3.81	.14	4.40	3.93	.47
17	4.43	3.56	.87	4.45	4.39	.06	4.50	4.61	.11
18	4.64	3.92	.72	4.74	4.74	.00	5.00	4.82	.18
19	4.07	3.31	.76	4.32	3.71	.39	4.67	4.31	.36
20	4.29	3.68	.61	4.25	4.07	.18	4.50	4.12	.38
21	4.57	4.02	.55	4.85	4.42	.43	4.80	4.52	.28
22	4.00	3.83	.17	3.85	4.02	.17	4.22	3.93	.29
23	4.07	3.70	.37	4.30	3.76	.54	4.22	3.85	.37
24	3.07	2.76	.31	2.95	2.90	.05	3.10	2.67	.43

Task	Group I			Group II			Group III		
	A Supt.	B Brd.	C Disp.	A Supt.	B Brd.	C Disp.	A Supt.	B Brd.	C Disp.
25	3.57	3.28	.29	3.60	3.87	.27	4.22	3.83	.39
26	3.14	2.88	.26	3.30	3.48	.18	4.00	3.08	.92
27	3.93	3.65	.28	3.80	3.86	.06	3.78	3.30	.48
28	3.64	3.34	.30	3.80	3.58	.22	3.78	3.22	.56
29	4.29	3.53	.76	4.05	3.99	.06	4.22	3.86	.36

Columns A and B are reported by mean score

Column C is reported by calculating the difference between A and B

N=14

N=20

N=10

research question, "What are the discrepancies in superintendent role perception between individual boards and the average school board member's perception state-wide?" In this section, individual school boards are those boards that had five or more members respond. A mean score was calculated and displayed for those individual boards by size category. The average school board mean scores were derived from the 482 individual respondents. All mean scores and the discrepancy between them are displayed in Table 8.

The mean score of each board with five or more respondents was compared to the mean score for all board members who responded. The difference between the two means was reported as a plus or minus discrepancy score. A plus discrepancy score indicated an individual board's mean was larger than the average board member's mean, and a minus discrepancy score illustrated an individual board's mean score was smaller than the average board member mean.

The data in Table 8 indicate that in size group 1 (1-1000 ADM), twelve of the fourteen school boards displayed a minus discrepancy score. The largest minus disparity was .71, and the largest plus disparity was .19 based



on a scale of 1.0 to 5.0. Eighty-six percent of the identified schools were below the average board member mean.

Size group 2 (1001-10,000ADM) indicated a reversal of the results in group 1. This size category had fifteen of twenty school boards displaying a plus discrepancy score, or 75 percent of the boards. The largest minus discrepancy was .18 on a scale of 1.0 to 5.0. A total of seventy-five percent of the identified schools were above the average board member mean.

Size group 3 (over 10,000 ADM) displayed a compromise between size groups 1 and 2. Four boards indicated a plus discrepancy score and six boards indicated a minus discrepancy score. The plus discrepancy that received the largest score was .08 and the largest minus discrepancy score was .24, based on a scale of 1.0 to 5.0. The range in means between all individual boards was from 2.96 to 4.03 based on the same 1.0 to 5.0 scale.

Table 8

Discrepancies in Superintendent Role Perception  
Between Individual Boards and the Average School  
Boards Perception State-Wide

District size 1 (1 to 1000 ADM)			
Dist. I.D.	Ind. Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Avg. Brd. Mean (all 29 tasks)	Disparity
371	3.51	3.67	-.16
379	3.21	3.67	-.46
354	3.36	3.67	-.31
240	3.56	3.67	-.11
299	3.50	3.67	-.17
210	3.74	3.67	+.07
309	3.86	3.67	+.19
220	3.60	3.67	-.07

## District size 1 (1 to 1000 ADM) -continued

Dist. I.D.	Ind. Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Avg. Brd. Mean (all 29 tasks)	Disparity
197	3.47	3.67	-.20
335	3.39	3.67	-.28
343	2.96	3.67	-.71
370	3.55	3.67	-.12
263	3.46	3.67	-.21
285	3.65	3.67	-.02

## District Size 2 (1001 to 10,000 ADM)

Dist. ID	Ind. Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Avg. Brd.. Mean (all 29 Tasks)	Disparity
118	4.30	3.67	+.63
019	3.90	3.67	+.23
137	3.66	3.67	-.01
154	3.80	3.67	+.13
179	3.54	3.67	-.13
008	3.69	3.67	+.02
021	3.58	3.67	-.09
169	3.94	3.67	+.17
097	3.56	3.67	-.11
138	3.91	3.67	+.24
110	3.72	3.67	+.05
150	3.76	3.67	+.09
099	3.85	3.67	+.18
066	3.99	3.67	+.22
024	3.59	3.67	-.18
067	3.80	3.67	+.13
100	3.73	3.67	+.06
165	3.96	3.67	+.29
009	3.75	3.67	+.08
146	3.75	3.67	+.08

## District Size 3 (over 10,000 ADM)

Dist ID	Ind. Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Avg. Brd. Mean (all 29 tasks)	Disparity
419	3.51	3.67	-.16
411	3.47	3.67	-.20
412	3.62	3.67	-.05
401	3.53	3.67	-.14

## District Size 3 (over 10,000 ADM) -continued

Dist ID	Ind. Board Mean (all 29 tasks)	Avg. Brd. Mean (all 29 tasks)	Disparity
406	3.56	3.67	-.11
417	3.75	3.67	+.08
405	3.73	3.67	+.06
420	3.71	3.67	+.04
421	3.83	3.67	+.15
408	3.48	3.67	-.24

+ = the indiv. brd. mean is larger than the average board member mean  
 - = the average board member mean is larger than the indiv. brd. mean

Differences in Role Perception of the Superintendent  
by a Board Where the Superintendent  
Left Involuntarily in the Past Year

The data presented in this section are in response to the fourth hypothesis that stated "There will be no significant difference in role expectations of the superintendent as perceived by school board members where the superintendent left involuntarily within the past year when compared to role expectations by a school board members where no change in the superintendent occurred." The data displayed in Table 9 are listed by task area, group mean, and the difference between the two means. Group 1 was made up of members from school boards where the superintendent left the district involuntarily during the past year. This group had 32 respondents. Group 2 was made up of all school board members from districts that experienced no superintendent turnover. There were 406 respondents for group 2. The data show that the smallest difference in mean scores was .00, and the largest difference in mean scores was .46

An independent  $t$ -test was used to compute the difference between the mean scores for the two school board groups. As reported in Table 9, the task areas of deciding on textbooks, selecting administrative personnel, establishing educational specifications for the architect, considering citizen complaints, and determining the extent of needed school building maintenance were the only tasks to produce a significant  $t$ -value at the .05 level. Five of twenty-nine task areas produced significant  $t$ -values with mean differences greater than the 1.96 needed for significance; therefore, the data support the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The Role of the Superintendent as Perceived  
by Texas School Board Members  
- A Comparison of 1983 to 1987-

The data presented in this section are in response to the research question, "Have Texas board members changed in their expectation for the role of the superintendent since the Littleton study of 1983, a time period that marked the beginning of Texas educational reform and House Bill

Table 9

Differences in Role Perception of the Superintendent by  
 a Board Where the Superintendent Left Involuntarily  
 in the Past Year When Compared to Boards Where  
 No Change in the Superintendent Occurred

Task	Mean Group 1 (no supt. change)	Mean Group 2 (supt. change)	Diff.	t-value	Level Of Sign.
1	3.31	3.25	.06	.46	

Mean Task	Mean Group 1 (no supt. change)	Mean Group 2 (supt. change)	Diff.	Level t-value	Of Sign.
2	2.59	2.66	.07	.37	
3	2.77	2.77	.00	.01	
4	3.76	3.66	.10	.61	
5	4.42	4.57	.15	.99	
6	3.41	3.68	.27	1.58	
7	3.29	3.36	.07	.40	
8	4.33	4.38	.05	.31	
9	3.55	3.61	.06	.30	
10	3.33	3.59	.26	1.44	
11	3.32	3.52	.20	.97	
12	3.75	4.03	.28	1.56	
13	3.98	4.44	.46	2.54	.05
14	3.75	3.97	.22	.91	
15	3.78	4.10	.32	1.32	
16	3.73	4.09	.35	2.09	.05
17	4.21	4.39	.18	1.03	
18	4.53	4.81	.28	1.93	
19	3.82	3.81	.01	.08	
20	4.03	4.25	.22	1.33	
21	4.33	4.53	.20	1.12	
22	3.96	4.00	.04	.27	
23	3.83	4.03	.20	1.20	
24	2.84	3.09	.27	1.35	
25	3.67	4.03	.36	2.17	.05
26	3.20	3.48	.28	1.52	
27	3.73	3.74	.01	.06	
28	3.39	3.72	.33	2.09	.05
29	3.81	4.13	.32	2.02	.05

---

Seventy-Two?" Data were gathered by D. Mark Littleton (1983) regarding the views of Texas school board members on the role of the superintendent. The data from his dissertation, "A Descriptive Study of the Role of the Superintendent as Viewed by School Board Members in Texas" were used with the permission of the author. The data displayed in Table 10 are reported by percentage with the top number being the board response from the Littleton study and the bottom number being the board response for this study.

The data in Table 10 illustrate that over a period of four years, perceptions of Texas school board members have shifted towards emphasizing a higher degree of involvement of the superintendent. This shift can be noted in twelve of the twenty-nine decision-making task areas, with ten of the twelve tasks being in the budget/finance area and the school facilities/community relations area. Four task areas had approximately a 10 percent increase in the "superintendent with board input" or "superintendent alone" response. The increase of approximately 10 percent was at the expense of the "board with superintendent input" response, which decreased by approximately 10 percent in the same four task areas. Over the four-year time period, only one task shifted from superintendent dominance back toward more board input. That task was the first one, establishing the annual budget

Table 10

Percentage Comparisons of Board Member Responses  
from 1983 and 1987  
(Top figure = 1983, Bottom figure = 1987)

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
1. Establishes the annual budget	00.80 00.80	11.55 08.30	27.89 53.30	52.59 33.20	06.77 04.10	00.40 00.20
2. Establishes the annual tax rate	11.16 13.10	34.66 27.20	29.88 48.30	19.92 09.10	03.59 01.90	00.80 00.40
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue	08.37 05.60	34.47 22.00	39.84 57.70	08.37 08.10	04.78 00.80	05.18 05.80

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
4. Maintains fiscal account- ability	01.20 01.50	10.76 03.90	24.30 33.80	34.66 39.20	27.89 20.50	01.20 01.00
5. Submits federal grant proposals	00.40 00.20	04.78 02.10	02.79 11.40	35.86 26.60	51.79 57.10	04.38 02.70
6. Establishes salary con- siderations for district personnel	03.19 01.00	27.09 12.20	29.08 42.70	31.08 30.70	08.76 12.70	00.8 00.6
7. Establishes fringe bene- fits for district personnel	05.18 03.10	29.08 11.20	37.05 46.70	22.31 29.30	05.58 09.10	00.8 00.6
8. Administers expenditures within the budget	01.99 00.20	05.18 02.10	08.76 12.70	34.66 34.40	49.0 50.0	00.4 00.6
9. Maintains control over budget and amendments	05.58 04.80	18.73 10.40	15.14 29.30	35.46 32.20	23.51 22.00	01.59 01.50
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	05.58 04.10	16.73 11.00	31.08 41.30	35.46 31.50	10.76 11.40	00.40 00.60
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination	04.38 07.70	19.12 10.00	27.89 35.10	37.45 35.10	11.16 11.40	00.00 00.80
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district	00.80 01.50	10.36 07.70	22.31 26.30	38.65 40.20	26.69 23.40	01.20 00.80
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt	01.99 02.50	11.16 03.90	16.33 17.40	41.83 39.40	26.69 35.70	02.39 01.00
14. Decides on student suspensions of ten or more days	15.14 07.30	29.88 09.80	17.13 21.60	13.94 19.10	23.11 41.50	00.80 00.80

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students	15.54 06.20	26.29 10.00	15.54 21.60	13.15 17.40	27.89 44.00	01.59 00.80
16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent	03.59 01.20	22.71 08.70	15.94 28.80	40.64 38.00	16.33 23.00	00.80 00.20
17. Selects teachers	01.59 00.60	13.94 04.40	11.95 16.20	34.26 30.70	38.25 47.50	00.00 00.60
18. Selects non-professional personnel	01.20 00.40	08.76 02.90	06.77 08.50	21.91 20.50	61.35 67.20	00.00 00.40
19. Selects coaches	02.39* 01.50	25.10 09.30	16.33 29.30	32.27 31.10	22.31 28.40	01.59 00.40
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district	01.59 01.20	10.36 03.90	18.73 19.70	36.25 39.20	32.67 35.10	00.40 00.80
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel	06.77 01.50	08.76 05.00	10.36 10.60	27.49 24.30	45.42 58.30	01.20 00.40
22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space	00.00 00.60	09.16 03.10	18.73 25.90	41.43 39.80	30.68 29.90	00.00 00.60
23. Oversees a construction program	00.40 01.20	13.15 03.70	19.12 30.70	40.24 37.60	24.70 25.50	02.39 01.20
24. Selects the architect for a desired building program	13.15 11.60	35.86 18.00	28.69 47.90	17.93 16.60	02.79 04.80	01.59 01.00
25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program	02.79 01.50	15.14 06.40	27.09 34.60	35.86 36.90	17.13 18.90	01.99 01.70



Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
26. Determines community use of school facilities	07.57 04.60	27.89 16.00	28.29 40.20	25.90 27.00	09.96 10.80	00.40 01.50
27. Informs the community of board positions and actions	03.98 03.70	08.76 05.80	31.47 33.80	25.10 25.30	29.08 29.90	01.59 01.50
28. Considers citizen complaints	03.19 02.50	13.94 04.80	47.01 51.20	19.52 27.20	13.94 13.70	02.39 00.60
29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance	00.40 * 01.50	07.97 02.10	24.30 32.00	43.43 40.90	23.11 23.00	00.80 00.60

The fifth hypothesis stated, "There will be no significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members from the Littleton (1983) study when compared to Texas board members surveyed in this study." An independent *t*-test was used to compute the difference between the mean scores for the two different studies. The data listed in Table 11 list the specific tasks, the mean score for board member response from the Littleton study and this study, *t*-values, and level of significance. Only those task areas that indicated a significant *t*-value are displayed.

The data in Table 11 indicated a significant *t*-value for seventeen of the twenty-nine tasks, at a .05 level of significance. Of the seventeen task areas that were significant at the .05 level, further examination indicated that thirteen were significant at the .001 level. With seventeen task areas

showing a significant t-value, the data support the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 11  
Comparison of Role Perception of the Superintendent  
Between the Littleton Study and This Study  
Using T-tests  
1983-1987

Task	Mean 1987	Mean 1983	t-value	level of signif.
1. Establishes the annual budget	3.32*	3.53	3.81	.001
2. Establishes the annual tax rate	2.59	2.93	4.72	.001
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue	2.75	2.66	1.50	
4. Maintains fiscal accountability	3.74	3.78	.57	
5. Submits federal grant proposals	4.42	4.40	.33	
6. Establishes salary considerations for district personnel	3.42	3.15	3.86	.001
7. Establishes fringe benefits for district personnel	3.30	2.94	5.14	.001
8. Administers expenditures within the budget	4.33	4.24	1.50	
9. Maintains control over budget and amendments	3.57	3.53	.50	

Task	Mean 1987	Mean 1983	t-value	level of signif.
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	3.35	3.27	1.03	
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination	3.33	3.32	.11	
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district	3.77	3.81	.05	
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt	4.03	3.81	2.85	.001
14. Decides on student suspensions of ten or more days	3.79	3.00	7.90	.001
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students	3.84	3.12	7.20	.001
16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent	3.73	3.44	3.82	.001
17. Selects teachers	4.21	3.93	3.84	.001
18. Selects non-professional personnel	4.52	4.33	2.97	.001
19. Selects coaches	3.76	3.48	3.50	.001
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district	4.03	3.88	2.05	.05
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel	4.34	3.97	4.81	.05

Task	Mean 1987	Mean 1983	t-value	level of signif.
22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space	3.96	3.94	.29	
23. Oversees a construction program	3.83	3.78	.69	
24. Selects the architect for a desired building program	2.85	2.61	3.00	.001
25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program	3.67	3.50	2.43	.05
26. Determines community use of school facilities	3.24	3.03	2.63	.001
27. Informs the community of board positions and actions	3.73	3.68	.58	
28. Considers citizen complaints	3.45	3.28	2.43	.05
29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance	3.83	3.82	.14	
.05 level =1.96	.001 level =2.58			

This chapter presented an analysis of the data used in this study. The frequency data, mean discrepancy scores, and percentage comparisons were used to analyze each of the research questions followed by the statistical analysis of each hypothesis. A summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations may be found in chapter 5.

## Chapter 5

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section is the summary of the study, and the second is a summary of the findings and conclusions. The third section of the chapter includes the recommendations based upon the conclusions, and the fourth contains the recommendations for further study.

#### Summary of the Study

This study examined the role of the school superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members and addressed five major research questions and five hypotheses. The results of this study were compared to the results of the Littleton study of 1983 and the Zachary study of 1987.

A review of the related literature suggested that the position of the superintendent is often ill-defined and is seldom addressed by school boards or superintendents. The superintendency lacks definition by law in most states, but the literature indicates that the general position description is that school boards legislate and superintendents implement. Because the role of the superintendent is usually not clearly defined, the potential for poor superintendent/school board relations exists. As a consequence, the educational process may suffer throughout the school district.

The findings of this study will contribute to a larger body of research on role perception of the superintendent. The conclusions should provide information for the development and formation of instruments used in interviewing candidates, administrative evaluations, and for mitigation of discrepancies in role perceptions. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations could provide information that will enable superintendents and board members to communicate on role expectations and will aid in the development of policies related to role definition.

The population selected for this study was Texas school board members from the districts where the superintendent participated in the Zachary study. The size of the random sample from the Zachary study amounted to 103 school boards which were comprised of 721 individual members. Of the 721 questionnaires that were mailed, 482 usable instruments were returned, for a response rate of 67 percent. Of the 103 boards surveyed, 44 boards returned five or more questionnaires.

### Summary of Major Findings

The major findings regarding the role of the superintendent, as perceived by school board members in Texas are as follows:

1. School board members in Texas are well educated on the average, with over 63 percent possessing at least a bachelor's degree.
2. School board members in Texas have an average length of service on school boards of less than four years.
3. School board members perceived that the superintendent should play a major role in the decision-making process. Nearly 60 percent of the school board responses were in the "superintendent with board input "

category or in the "superintendent alone" category, which amounted to sixteen of the twenty-nine tasks.

4. Establishing the annual tax rate and determining the amount of a bond issue were tasks a majority of board members indicated to be a shared responsibility. A large minority indicated there should be more board control over the performance of these tasks.

5. School boards clearly perceived that the superintendent should play the dominant role in selecting teachers and non-professional personnel. School board members were not certain as to their responsibilities in selecting coaches. This uncertainty was illustrated by the wide range of responses received from school board members for the task of selecting coaches.

6. There was a significant difference in the perceived role of the superintendent as seen by Texas school board members, according to school district size. A pattern existed where the smaller sized districts perceived personnel issues more of a board responsibility than a superintendent responsibility.

7. There was a significant difference in the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members according to board tenure.

8. There was a significant difference in the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members according to educational level. The group classified as "some high school" displayed the greatest number of significant differences when compared to all other levels of completed education. The major differences were in the areas of personnel and school facility/community relations.

9. There was a difference in the disparity that existed in the role

expectation for the superintendent as seen by board members and their superintendents, according to school district size. In Six of fourteen small school districts, board members reported at least a .50 mean difference between the superintendent and his/her school board. Tasks indicating the largest number of .50 disparity scores were in the personnel area, with all six tasks showing large discrepancies. The board members in large districts reported a disparity score of .50 or higher in five of ten boards, with the largest discrepancies appearing in the school facility/community relations area.

10. Individual school boards in the small school category differed from the average school board member response by assigning less responsibility to the role of the superintendent in decision making tasks. Individual school boards in the medium sized schools differed from the average school board member response by assigning more responsibility to the role of the superintendent in decision making tasks.

11. There was a significant difference in role expectations of the superintendent as perceived by school boards where the superintendent left involuntarily in the past year when compared to role expectations of a school board where no change in the superintendent occurred.

12. During the time frame from 1983 through 1987, school board members have shifted from a more board-dominated position, to a position of involving the superintendent to a higher degree in the decision-making process. The task of establishing the annual budget was the only task that indicated a shift toward more school-board dominance. There was a significant difference in the perception of the role of the superintendent as perceived by Texas school board members from the Littleton study when compared to Texas board members surveyed in this study.



### Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions appear to be justified:

1. School boards seem to view the superintendent/school board relationship as one of working together as a team. School board members perceive the decision-making process as a "shared" or joint responsibility with the superintendent. The results illustrate for school superintendents while school boards are prone to agree as to the role of the superintendent. Superintendents do not tend to agree with this "shared" or "joint" perception.

2. School board members in smaller districts tend to assign a greater responsibility to the school board than larger districts. In most instances, the larger the size classification, the greater the assignment of responsibility to the superintendent. There were some important exceptions noted in the area of curriculum and student personnel, as the larger schools assigned less responsibility to the superintendent than did school boards of medium-sized districts.

3. School board members were willing to assign more responsibility to the superintendent in the personnel area than was indicated by the literature. The major exception to this was in the smaller school classification of 1000 students or less.

4. There is a wide range in expectations for the superintendent from individual board to the next board. Interested parties would not be able to predict expectations of an individual board by studying the state board member average profile.

5. In districts where the superintendent left involuntarily during the past year, school board members assigned a larger degree of decision-

making responsibility to the superintendent than those in districts that had no superintendent change. Expecting a high degree of involvement from the superintendent could partially explain the reason for superintendent turnover in those districts.

6. Major educational reform legislation seems to have promoted a shift from a more dominant board position to a position that includes the superintendent to a higher degree in the decision-making process. This shift was possibly due to the complexity of major educational reform legislation, increased accountability, and the strengthened role of the state education agency.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented on the basis of the findings in this study:

1. School boards and superintendents should define their respective roles in written policy statements with expectations, goals, and evaluation standards included. To promote a positive working relationship, the school board and the superintendent should review their respective roles annually.

2. School boards and superintendents should work to enact legislation that recognizes the superintendent's position as a legal entity and delineates their duties in the educational system.

3. School boards and superintendents should work to provide quality in-service programs for all board members and superintendents. These programs should be for orientation purposes and provided on a continual basis.

4. Other states should mandate in-service education for all school board members on a continuing basis.

### Recommendations for Further Study

Suggestions for further research based on the data collected and analyzed in this study include:

1. A follow-up study should be made in five years to determine if similar results and patterns would be found.
2. A similar study should be made with a much expanded questionnaire.
3. A comprehensive study should be made of a limited number of school boards where superintendent turnover historically runs high.
4. A similar study should be done that would incorporate individual board satisfaction with the current superintendent and the degree of job satisfaction experienced by the current superintendent.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvey, Donald T. and Kenneth E. Underwood. "When Boards and Superintendents Clash, It's Over the Balance of School Power." American School Board Journal. October, 1985, pp. 21-25.

American Association of School Administrators and National School Boards Association. Selecting a Superintendent. Arlington, Va., 1979.

Bart, Mary J.S. 1980 "The Role and Function of Boards of Education and School Superintendents as Reflected in the Perceptions of Members Both Groups in Selected School Districts in Arizona." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona

Behner, David C. 1979. "Perceptions of the Superintendents's Role Expectancies by Selected Ohio Superintendents, Board of Education Presidents and Educational Administration Professors." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron.

Blumberg, Arthur. 1985. The School Superintendent. New York: Teachers College Press

Burbank, Natt B. The Superintendent of Schools: His Headaches and Rewards. Danville: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Cowan, Robert L. "The local School District Superintency: A Puzzling Administrative Role." Educational Administration Quarterly, 23: 49-69. August, 1987.

Callahan, Raymond E. 1962. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Roald F., et al. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus: Bell and Howell, 1980.

Cuban, Larry. "Conflict and Leadership in the Superintendency." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1985, pp.28-30.

Dykes, Archie R. School Board and Superintendent: Their Effective Working Relationships. Danville: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1965.

Edwards, Newton. The Courts and the Public Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Goldhammer, Keith. The School Board. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1974.

Griffiths, Daniel E. The School Superintendent. New York: Library of Education, 1966.

Gross, Neal, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Hess, Fritz. "Part I: Causes of Executive Dismissal." School Administrator. April, 1986, pp. 14-18.

Hicks, Claude E. "Role Perceptions of Florida School Board Members and District Superintendents." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 1976.

Hodgin, Duane E. "Leadership Behavior of First and Second Year Indiana School Superintendents as Perceived by Indiana School Board Presidents and Superintendents." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Miami University, 1986.

Houston Poston, August 16, 1987.

Jongeward, Ray E. "Board/Administrator Relations. Keys To School Boardsmanship". National Institute of Education, 1984.

Kemerer, Frank. Texas Teachers Guide to School Law. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. Cambridge: Harper and Row, 1984.

Koerner, James D. Who Controls American Education? A Guide to Laymen. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

- Littleton, Duard Mark. "A Descriptive Study of the Role of the Superintendent as Viewed by School Board Members in Texas." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1983.
- National School Boards Association. What Do We Know About School Boards? Research Report, 1975.
- Neiman, Lionel J. and James W. Hughes. "The Problem of the Concept of Role - a Resurvey of the Literature." Social Forces. pp. 141-149, 1951.
- Pennsylvania School Boards Association. PSBA Commission to Strengthen the Working Relationships of School Boards and Superintendents. A Special Report. p. 1-35, 1977.
- Relic, Peter D. September. "Board That Try To Administer School Policy Are Courting Complete Chaos," American School Board Journal. pp. 25-26, 1986.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.
- Smith, James L. "The Relationship Between Perceptions of Superintendents and Board of Education Chairmen in Assessing the Role of the Superintendent of Schools in Iowa." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1975.
- Sweet, John M. "The Role of the Public School Superintendent as Perceived by Public School Board Presidents and School Superintendents in South Dakota." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1987.
- Texas Education Agency. Texas School Directory, 1986-87. Austin: Agency Printing Office, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Texas School Law Bulletin. Austin: Agency Printing Office. 1986.
- Tippett, Michael Edward. "The Role of the Public School Superintendent as Perceived by Superintendents and Board of Education Members." Dissertation Abstracts International. 42:2955-A (West Virginia University), 1981.
- Tope, Donald E., and others. The Social Sciences View School Administration. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965.

Weber, Clarence A. What the People Ought to Know About School Administration. Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Wiles, Jon and other. Principals of School Administration. Columbus: Bell and Howell: Columbus, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. Joseph Bondi. The School Board Primer: A guide for School Board Members. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1985.

Zachary, Fred M. . "A Study of the Role of the Superintendent As Viewed by Superintendents in Texas". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1988.

Ziegler, L. Harmon, M. Kent Jennings, and G. Wayne Peak. Governing American Schools. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1974.



APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO BOARD MEMBERS



# *East Texas School Study Council*

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Commerce, Texas 75428

BETTER SCHOOLS THROUGH  
RESEARCH  
COOPERATION  
INFORMATION

October 30, 1987

Dear School Board Member:

You have been selected to participate in an important research study-- "A Comparative Study of the Superintendent's Role in Working With Board Members in Texas Schools." The study is sponsored by the East Texas School Study Council and has been endorsed by the Texas Association of School Boards and by the Texas Association of School Administrators. Your board president and district superintendent have been notified that all board members in your district have been selected to participate in this project.

This research project, which involves 125 Texas school districts randomly selected within three school size categories, will attempt to identify the role of the superintendent as viewed by school board members, and to determine if those views have changed from a study completed prior to House Bill 72. Each board member is asked to complete and return the enclosed survey form. The survey will require only 20 minutes to complete. Your participation is vital as the views of the entire board are important. For data to represent the views of the board at least five members must respond.

The superintendent and school board members are important individuals in the decision-making process of public schools. Many times the roles are not clearly defined and the superintendent/board relationship suffers, which may negatively impact the educational process. This study should help clarify the role of the superintendent in working with boards in decision-making.

Please complete the survey instrument and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Your immediate completion and prompt return is valuable to this study.

The data collected in this project will be confidential and reported in a professional manner. For each district where five or more board members respond, a profile will be constructed and returned for the board's information.

Sincerely,

Keith Lutz  
Research Assistant

Lynn Turner  
Director

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO BOARD MEMBERS



*East Texas School Study Council*  
 EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
 Commerce, Texas 75428

BETTER SCHOOLS THROUGH  
 RESEARCH  
 COOPERATION  
 INFORMATION

November 27, 1987

Dear School Board Member:

About two weeks ago you were sent a letter soliciting your participation in the research study--"A Comparative Study of the Superintendent's Role in Working With Board Members In Texas Schools." To this date, your completed questionnaire has not been received. As one of the several board members randomly selected for this study, it is extremely important to receive your views to insure the validity of the study. The executive directors of both Texas Association of School Boards and Texas Association of School Administrators have endorsed the study.

The research project will identify the role of the superintendent as viewed by school board members and determine if those views have changed from a study completed prior to H.B. 72. In order for the results to be truly representative of the opinions of Texas school Board members and your board in particular, it is important that you return your questionnaire.

The data collected in this project will be confidential and reported in a professional manner. For each district with five or more board members responding, a specific profile for that district will be constructed and returned for the board's information. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Keith W. Lutz  
 Research Assistant

APPENDIX C

SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO THE BOARD



*East Texas School Study Council*  
 EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
 Commerce, Texas 75428

BETTER SCHOOLS THROUGH  
 RESEARCH  
 COOPERATION  
 INFORMATION

12-9-87

Dear Board Member:

About ten days ago you were sent a second request to participate in the research study -- "A Comparative Study of the Superintendent's Role in Working With Board Members In Texas Schools." To this date, your completed questionnaire has not been received.

We have received four (4) responses from your particular school board. Five responses are needed in order for your district to be included in the study. Five or more responses are all that is needed for your board to receive an individual board profile. I hope you will take just a few minutes to complete one of the survey forms sent to you earlier and return it as soon as possible. Remember- just one more response is needed from your board to be included in this study.

Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Keith W. Lutz

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO BOARD MEMBERS WHERE  
NO SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER OCCURRED

# SCHOOL BOARD - SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

## Background Information

1. How many years have you served as a board member? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How many students are enrolled in your school district? (please check one)
  - ☐ 1. 1,000 or less
  - ☐ 2. 1,001 to 10,000
  - ☐ 3. 10,001 or more
3. How many years of formal education have you completed? (please check one)
  - ☐ 1. Some High School
  - ☐ 2. High School Diploma
  - ☐ 3. Some college, but no degree
  - ☐ 4. Bachelor's degree
  - ☐ 5. Master's degree
  - ☐ 6. Earned doctorate

## Instructions

In school districts throughout the State of Texas, many functions or tasks are typically performed by the school board - superintendency team. Although the board has final authority, both parties usually have some degree of involvement in the process of performing the task. In some districts a task may only be done by the board or superintendent. To what degree does the school board - superintendency team in your district work together in performing the following tasks?

For each item select only one response. The choices are as follows:

1. This is a function or task that is performed by the school board alone.
2. This is a function or task that is performed by the school board with some input from the superintendent.
3. This is a function or task that is performed jointly by the school board and superintendent.
4. This is a function or task that is performed by the superintendent with some input from the school board.
5. This is a function or task that is performed by the superintendent alone.



## BUDGETING AND FINANCE

	School Board Alone	School Board/Some Supt.	Board and Supt. Jointly	Supt./Some Board Input	Superintendent Alone
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Establishes the annual budget.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Establishes the annual tax rate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Maintains fiscal accountability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Submits federal grant proposals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Establishes salary considerations for district personnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Administers expenditures within the budget.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Maintains control over the budget and amendments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## CURRICULUM AND STUDENT PERSONNEL

10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Decides on student suspensions of 10 or more days.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## PERSONNEL

16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Selects teachers for the district.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Selects non-professional personnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Selects coaches.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# **SCHOOL FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS**

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. Oversees a construction program   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Selects the architect for a desired building program.                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. Determines community use of school facilities.                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 27. Informs the community of board positions and actions.                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. Considers citizen complaints.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance.                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
WHERE A SUPERINTENDENT CHANGE  
OCCURRED DURING THE PAST YEAR

**SCHOOL BOARD - SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIP  
QUESTIONNAIRE**  
Background Information

1. How many years have you served as a board member? \_\_\_\_\_
2. How many students are enrolled in your school district? (please check one)  
\_\_\_\_\_ 1. 1,000 or less  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. 1,001 to 10,000  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. 10,001 or more
3. How many years of formal education have you completed? (please check one)  
\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Some High School  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. High School Diploma  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Some college, but no degree  
\_\_\_\_\_ 4. Bachelor's degree  
\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Master's degree  
\_\_\_\_\_ 6. Earned doctorate
4. According to Texas Education Agency information, there has been a change in superintendents in your school district from the 1986-87 school year to this current year. Which of the following best describes the reason for the superintendent turnover?  
\_\_\_\_\_ 1. The former superintendent retired from the position.  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. The former superintendent left by his/her choice to accept a different position.  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. The former superintendent resigned his/her position under pressure from the school board.  
\_\_\_\_\_ 4. The former superintendent's contract was not renewed by the school board.

**Instructions**

In school districts throughout the State of Texas, many functions or tasks are typically performed by the school board - superintendency team. Although the board has final authority, both parties usually have some degree of involvement in the process of performing the task. In some districts a task may only be done by the board or superintendent. To what degree does the school board - superintendency team in your district work together in performing the following tasks?

For each item select only one response. The choices are as follows:

1. This is a function or task that is performed by the school board alone.
2. This is a function or task that is performed by the school board with some input from the superintendent.
3. This is a function or task that is performed jointly by the school board and superintendent.
4. This is a function or task that is performed by the superintendent with some input from the school board.
5. This is a function or task that is performed by the superintendent alone.

	School Board Alone	School Board/Some Supt.	Board and Supt. Jointly	Supt./Some Board input	Superintendent Alone
<b>BUDGETING AND FINANCE</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1. Establishes the annual budge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Establishes the annual tax rate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Maintains fiscal accountability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Submits federal grant proposals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Establishes salary considerations for district personnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Administers expenditures within the budget.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Maintains control over the budget and amendments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>CURRICULUM AND STUDENT PERSONNEL</b>					
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 11. Approves program development, modification, or termination. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district.      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt.                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. Decides on student suspensions of 10 or more days.          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students.               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

#### PERSONNEL

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent.       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Selects teachers for the district.                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. Selects non-professional personnel.                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. Selects coaches.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. Determines professional development requirements within the district. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel.                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

#### SCHOOL FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. Oversees a construction program   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Selects the architect for a desired building program.                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. Determines community use of school facilities.                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 27. Informs the community of board positions and actions.                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. Considers citizen complaints.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance.                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

APPENDIX F

LETTERS OF ENDORSEMENT FROM TEXAS SCHOOL BOARDS  
ASSOCIATION AND THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF  
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

## TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS

POST OFFICE BOX 400 • AUSTIN, TEXAS 78767 • 512/476-9116



October 22, 1987

Dear Superintendent/School Board Member:

After reviewing the proposed research project "A Comparative Study of the Superintendent's Role in Working With Board Members in Texas Schools", the Texas Association of School Boards is pleased to endorse the project.

I encourage you to assist East Texas State University in the collection of data for this study, which could provide an important vehicle for better communication between boards and superintendents.

Sincerely,

Orbry D. Holden  
Executive Director



# Texas Association of School Administrators

1101 Trinity Street Austin, Texas 78701-1994 (512) 477-6361

John D. Horn  
President  
Mesquite

George M. Cawson  
President-Elect  
Harris County

Wayne Blevins  
Vice President  
Abilene

C. Lee Meyer  
Past President  
Texas Academic Deans/Ch

November 11, 1987

A.N. "Tony" Rico  
Weslaco (I)

Gilbert J. Mitrovich  
Ingleside (II)

Ron McMichael  
Bay City (III)

Robert H. Williams, Jr.  
La Porte (IV)

Robert P. Brezina  
Vidor (V)

Bill Shaver  
Belville (VI)

Jerry Whitaker  
Cushing (VII)

Walter R. Sears  
Mt. Vernon (VIII)

Don Windham  
Electra (IX)

Don Whitt  
Wylie (X)

Gordon Cockerham  
Bullerton (XI)

Joe M. Pittle  
Belton (XII)

Robert Spoonmore  
Pflugerville (XIII)

Terry Harlow  
Albany (XIV)

Carland E. Davis  
Crocketts Co. (XV)

Roy Pennington  
Dumas (XVI)

Dean Andrews  
Potts (XVII)

Joe Baresal  
Midland (XVIII)

Allen Boyd  
San Elizario (XIX)

Thomas E. Moseley  
Ft. Sam Houston (XX)

To The Person Addressed:

I would like to ask for your participation in a research project that should prove beneficial to all superintendents and board members in Texas.

Dr. Lynn Turner, director of the East Texas School Study Council, and Keith Lutz, research assistant, are conducting a study of the superintendent's role in working with board members. The purpose of the study is to examine the role of the superintendent in the decision making process of public schools. The results of the study will assist in providing guidance to school boards in superintendent selection criteria, evaluation criteria and inservice needs, as well as providing a vehicle for better communications between superintendents and board members.

We hope that you will participate in this research effort by completing the enclosed survey. Thank you in advance for your assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

*Johnny L. Veselka*  
Johnny L. Veselka  
Executive Director



Johnny L. Veselka  
Executive Director

APPENDIX G

LETTER OF PERMISSION FOR USE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

**WINNSBORO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT**

207 E. Pine St.  
WINNSBORO, TEXAS 75401  
Phone 342-6091

NOLAN SUITER  
SUPERINTENDENT

October 19, 1987

Mr. Keith Lutz  
Dept. of Ed. Administration  
East Texas State University  
Commerce, TX 75428

Dear Mr. Lutz:

Your study concerning superintendents that have been dismissed sounds quite interesting. I am very interested in reading of the results upon completion.

Please feel free to utilize the questionnaire developed for my 1983 study. I sincerely hope that it assists you in obtaining the data that you need.

Good luck and best wishes,

  
Mark Littleton

APPENDIX H

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

The Role of the Superintendent as Viewed  
by School Board members in Texas  
Frequency Table  
N=482

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
1. Establishes the annual budget	4	40	257	160	20	1
2. Establishes the annual tax rate	63	131	233	44	9	2
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue	27	106	278	39	4	28
4. Maintains fiscal accountability	7	19	163	189	99	5
5. Submits federal grant proposals	1	10	55	128	275	13
6. Establishes salary considerations for district personnel	5	59	206	148	61	3
7. Establishes fringe benefits for district personnel	15	54	225	141	44	3
8. Administers expenditures within the budget	1	10	61	166	241	3
9. Maintains control over budget and amendments	23	50	141	155	106	7
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	20	53	199	152	55	3

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination	37	48	169	169	55	4
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district	7	37	127	194	113	4
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt	12	19	84	190	172	5
14. Decides on student suspensions of ten or more days	35	47	104	92	200	4
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students	30	48	104	84	212	4
16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent	6	42	139	183	111	1
17. Selects teachers	3	21	78	148	229	3
18. Selects non-professional personnel	2	14	41	99	324	2
19. Selects coaches	7	45	141	150	137	2
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district	6	19	95	189	169	4
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel	7	24	51	117	281	2
22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space	3	15	125	192	144	3

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
23. Oversees a construction program	6	18	148	181	123	6
24. Selects the architect for a desired building program	56	87	231	80	23	5
25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program	7	31	167	173	91	8
26. Determines community use of school facilities	22	77	194	130	52	7
27. Informs the community of board positions and actions	18	28	163	122	144	7
28. Considers citizen complaints	12	23	247	131	66	3
29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance	7	10	154	197	111	3

APPENDIX I

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE  
(LITTLETON STUDY)



The Role of the Superintendent  
as Viewed by School Board  
Members in Texas  
(Littleton Study - 1983)  
N=251

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
1. Establishes the annual budget	2	29	70	132	17	1
2. Establishes the annual tax rate	28	87	75	50	9	2
3. Determines the amount of a bond issue	21	84	100	21	12	13
4. Maintains fiscal accountability	3	27	61	87	70	3
5. Submits federal grant proposal	1	12	7	90	130	11
6. Establishes salary considerations for district personnel	8	68	73	78	22	2
7. Establishes fringe benefits for district personnel	13	73	93	56	14	2
8. Administers expenditures within the budget	5	13	22	87	123	1
9. Maintains control over budget and amendments	14	47	38	89	59	4
10. Establishes the educational philosophy of the district	14	42	78	89	27	1

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
11. Approves program development, modification, or termination	11	48	70	94	28	0
12. Evaluates the performance of programs in the district	2	26	56	97	67	3
13. Decides on the textbooks to adopt	5	28	41	105	66	6
14. Decides on student suspensions of ten or more days	38	75	43	35	58	2
15. Decides on expulsions of disruptive students	39	66	39	33	70	4
16. Selects administrative personnel other than the superintendent	9	57	40	102	41	2
17. Selects teachers	4	35	30	86	96	0
18. Selects non-professional personnel	3	22	17	55	154	0
19. Selects coaches	6	63	41	81	56	4
20. Determines professional development requirements within the district	4	26	47	91	82	1
21. Evaluates the performance of administrative personnel	17	22	26	69	114	3
22. Determines the instructional space requirements and adequacy of existing space	0	23	47	104	77	0

Task	Board	Board with input	shared	Supt. with input	Supt.	No Resp.
23. Oversees a construction program	1	33	48	101	62	6
24. Selects the architect for a desired building program	33	90	72	45	7	4
25. Establishes educational specifications for the architect in a building program	7	38	68	90	43	5
26. Determines community use of school facilities	19	70	71	65	25	1
27. Informs the community of board positions and actions	10	22	79	63	73	4
28. Considers citizen complaints	8	35	118	49	35	6
29. Determines the extent of needed school building maintenance	1	20	61	109	58	2

## VITA

Keith William Lutz was born in Reeder, North Dakota, on January 15, 1947, the son of Vera Richardson Lutz and William Lutz. After graduating from Scranton High School, Scranton, North Dakota, in 1965, he enrolled at Dickinson State College, Dickinson, North Dakota. He received the Bachelor of Science degree with a major in physical education and a minor in biology in May 1969 from Dickinson State College. He taught life and physical sciences, and coached three sports for the Taylor Public School, Taylor, North Dakota, for two years following his graduation from college. In June 1971, he enrolled in the Graduate School of North Dakota State University and was awarded the Master of Science degree in July of 1973. He was employed as the high school principal of the Taylor High School from 1971 to 1974, at which time he was promoted to superintendent. In the summer of 1976 he was appointed to the superintendent's position of the Elgin Public School, Elgin, North Dakota, and continued in that position until June, 1986. In the summer of 1986, he entered the Graduate School of East Texas State University and was awarded the Doctor of Education degree with a major in Educational Administration in May of 1988. He is married to JoAnn M. Lutz, and has two sons, Kevin William and David Keith.

Permanent address: 109 Briarwood  
Commerce, Texas 75428