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Abstract

FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS IN TENNESSEE AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS

by

Steven Lynn Scott

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences exist between the superintendents and the school board chairpersons of Tennessee in regard to the perceived functions and responsibilities of each group. The study also attempted to determine if factors such as age, size of the school district, educational level of the superintendent and the board member, years of service as superintendent or as a board member, the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus school board appointed superintendent status had any effect on the perceived functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards in Tennessee.

The total population of 139 superintendents and 139 school board chairpersons in Tennessee were surveyed over a five week period. The analysis of the data showed there was a significant difference in the perceptions of superintendents and school board chairpersons in the areas of Administration, Finance, Personnel, and a combination of all four Areas of Governance. The demographic factors that affect superintendents perceptions significantly were found in two demographic areas: educational level and elected versus appointed superintendent status. The demographic factors that affect school board chairpersons perceptions significantly were found in two demographic areas: the existence of written policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board and elected versus appointed superintendent status.

Conclusions of the study indicated the percentages of superintendents and school board chairpersons in Tennessee are very similar in regard age, sex, size of school systems, years in office, length of time the superintendent has served in the present system, systems with policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus appointed superintendent status. Superintendents and school board chairpersons were most different in educational level. Superintendents differed significantly with school board chairpersons in three of the
four Areas of Governance (i.e., Administration, Finance, and Personnel) as well as the total combined areas. Additionally, further research should be conducted to develop an evaluation instrument for the school board to use in evaluating themselves and the superintendent in relation to the functions and responsibilities of each group.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Former Secretary of Education, Terrell H. Bell has said, "There is no governing body in all of our American society that is of more critical importance to the future of this nation than the local school board" (Crum & Nelson, 1983, p.10). In the United States, the public schools are almost universally conducted under the direction and control of school boards. The source of power and duties exercised by school boards is the state, not the school district (Reeves, 1954). Reeves continued by saying, "the board is usually vested with the authority, responsibility and functions that, under state law, make it independent as a governing body and sovereign in performing its legal functions" (p. 4). Responsibility for the quality of education in a community rests largely on the school board (Reeves, 1954).

Textbooks and journals in school administration are almost unanimous in contending that it is the function of the school board to legislate and of the superintendent to execute (Griffiths, 1966). In other words the board establishes policy and the superintendent administers policy. This type of reasoning has given rise to the concept of the superintendent as the executive officer of the school board (Griffiths, 1966). The superintendent
performs almost all executive and administrative duties and responsibilities for the board by authority delegated to him by the board (Reeves, 1954, p. 152). It is the board's responsibility to make certain that the schools are administered, not necessarily to administer them itself. Who it is that administers the schools is very important in determining their efficiency. Fully qualified and capable administrators can perform the multitude of executive and administrative actions required far better than a board whose members are laymen in education (Reeves, 1954).

According to Mayer & Wilson (1972), the superintendent-school board relationship is the single most important relationship in the school district. In almost every case, the superintendent must assume the responsibility for maintaining a positive relationship with the school board. Most school board members serve only on a part-time basis. The superintendent also owes the school board honesty and integrity. This is the essential ingredient to a relationship based on mutual trust and respect. A breakdown of trust and respect can occur between the superintendent and the board, particularly if confusion or disagreement exists about the prerogatives and responsibilities of either group (Hoover & Slezak, 1978).

There is a need for the superintendent, as well as the board, to have a better understanding of the executive responsibilities delegated to the superintendent (American
Association School Administrators, 1956). The effective school board and its superintendent must recognize this relationship as basic to efficient school administration. The obstacle that causes trouble is the failure of both the superintendent and the school board to define their respective responsibilities. If each superintendent and board member acquaints himself with the proper functions of the school board and of superintendents, much confusion can be avoided. Too many superintendents, as well as board members, fail to see that poor relationships between the superintendent and boards are due to a failure to accept all aspects of the partnership concept (1956). The American Association of School Administrators, (1956), reported that poor relationships between the board and the superintendent cause distress and discord in the community, insecurity and indecision in the staff, and poor support of the schools. In such situations the air is filled with criticism of the schools and hostile rumors. Morale is low and service to the students suffers (1956).

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

School boards and superintendents sometimes disagree in regard to their functions and responsibilities. Educational literature implies that school boards and superintendents sometimes want to assume the same responsibilities that lead to conflict and a breakdown in communication between the two
groups. If superintendents and school boards are going to provide the quality of leadership necessary to meet the challenges facing their school systems, they must be knowledgeable of their functions and the differences in their respective responsibilities.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences exist between the superintendents and the school board chairpersons of Tennessee, in regard to the perceived functions and responsibilities of each group. The study also attempted to determine if factors such as age, size of the school district, educational level of the superintendent and the board member, years of service as superintendent or as a board member, the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus school board appointed superintendent status had any effect on the perceived functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards in Tennessee.

**Significance of the Study**

In the history of public education there has been no greater need for mutual cooperation and understanding between the superintendent and the school board than the present time (Dykes, 1965). White, (1972), in her study of school board superintendent relationships found that 21
percent of the responding school districts reported problems concerning the relationships that existed between their board and superintendent. She also reported that the majority of these problems pertained to the need to distinguish clearly between board functions and administrative responsibilities. Goldhammer, (1964), has said little research has been completed on how school board members view their particular functions with respect to the superintendent of schools. Carolyn Mullins (1975, p. 29), in her call for additional research in the area of school board-superintendent relationships, stated:

"The evidence over the past couple of years is rather scary. It would seem that the relationships between the boards of education and the superintendents are becoming more precarious than has been the case for some time. I don't know whether that which appears to be a growing mutual distrust is the result of phenomena beyond the purview of the school field..., but I do know that we better get this thing into the open before it causes real trouble".

The need for further study of the important functions and responsibilities of the school boards and the superintendent is apparent. Research indicates that conflicts do exist in the functions and responsibilities that board members hold for themselves and superintendents and those perceptions that superintendents, in turn, hold
for themselves and board members. Further, both research and the literature indicate that when the superintendent and the school board fail to identify their proper functions and responsibilities, and then act accordingly, problems are certain to arise.

Limitations

There are two limitations to this study:

1. A forced response questionnaire limits the type of responses.

2. The results of this study conducted in Tennessee are not necessarily an accurate representation of conditions elsewhere.

Research Assumptions

1. It was assumed the views of the chairperson of the school board reflected a consensus of the views of the total board.

2. It was assumed the questionnaire and the demographic data sheet were appropriate instruments for the purpose of the study.

3. It was assumed that all respondents answered the questionnaire honestly.

Research Questions Relative to the Study

In order to analyze the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board as perceived by superintendents and school board chairpersons, this study
sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the school superintendents' perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in selected tasks and decisions in the school district?

2. What are the school board chairpersons' perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in selected tasks and decisions in the school district?

3. Is there a statistically significant difference in the distribution of responses of superintendents and school board chairpersons on the perceived functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board?

4. Do any of the following independent variables appear to effect the perceptions of the superintendent?
   a. Age
   b. Size of the school district
   c. Formal education completed
   d. Number of years served as superintendent
   e. Existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board
   f. Elected versus school board appointed superintendent status

5. Do any of the following independent variables appear to effect the perceptions of the school board
chairpersons?

a. Age
b. Size of the school district
c. Formal education completed
d. Number of years served as a school board member
e. Existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board
f. Elected versus school board appointed superintendent status

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions were used in order that this study have consistency of meaning.

Functions

The appropriate or assigned duties, responsibilities, missions or tasks of an individual, office or organization (Good, 1959, p. 253)

Responsibilities

The obligations that an individual assumes when accepting a general work assignment or job. To perform properly the functions and duties that have been assigned (Good, 1959, p. 498)

School Board

The school district agency created by the state, but generally popularly elected, on which the statutes of the state place the responsibility for conducting the local
School Board Chairperson

The elected presiding officer of the school board

Superintendent

The superintendent is the chief administrative officer in a school system, whose primary role is to provide the best possible education in his/her community (Educational Policies Commission, 1965, p. 2)

School District

The area that is under the supervision of a given school board (Good, 1959, p. 192)

Size of the School District

The number of students enrolled in a school district during the 1991-92 school year

Hypotheses

Where appropriate, a null hypotheses was used to address a research question. Using null hypotheses provided improved statistical accuracy as Best (1981) stated:

"Rejecting a null or negative hypotheses provides a stronger test of logic. Evidence that is inconsistent with a particular negative hypotheses provides a stronger basis for its rejection" (p.270).

The following null hypotheses were formulated:

Hₐ There will be no statistically significant difference between the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board as perceived by the
superintendent and the school board chairperson.

H₂ Superintendents of different ages will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H₃ Superintendents of different size school districts will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H₄ Superintendents with different levels of education will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H₅ Superintendents with different numbers of years served in office will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H₆ There will be no significant difference in the superintendent's perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards considering the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and school board.

H₇ Superintendents from systems where the superintendents are elected versus those from systems where superintendents are school board appointed will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and
responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H6 School board chairpersons of different ages will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H9 School board chairpersons of different size school districts will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H10 School board chairpersons with different levels of education will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H11 School board chairpersons with different numbers of years served in office will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

H12 There will be no significant difference in the school board chairperson's perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards considering the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and school board.

H13 School board chairpersons from systems where the superintendents are elected versus those from systems where superintendents are school board appointed will not differ
significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

**Procedures**

The following procedures were utilized in the development of this study:

1. A review of current literature was conducted.
2. Letters were sent to the Tennessee Association of School Superintendents (TOSS) and to the Tennessee School Boards Association (TSBA) explaining the purpose of the study.
3. The data were collected through a questionnaire mailed to the 139 superintendents and 139 school board chairpersons in Tennessee. The questionnaire was researcher designed, utilizing questions from a questionnaire developed by Marline M. Seder.
4. Data from the questionnaires were entered into the computer and the statistical calculations were completed.
5. Null hypotheses were tested and the results of the study were compiled.
6. Findings and conclusions for the study were developed from the compiled results.
7. The study was concluded with recommendations for the future.

**Organization of the Study**

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter 1
contained an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the limitations, the assumptions, the research questions relative to the study, the definitions of the terms, the hypotheses, the procedures, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 presented a review of related literature.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology by which the study was conducted.

Chapter 4 contains the data analysis.

Chapter 5 includes the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature relevant to the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards in the operation of a school system. This chapter is divided into six sections: Historical Development of the School Board, Historical Development of the Superintendency, Functions and Responsibilities of the School Board, Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent, School Board-Superintendent Relationships, and Summary.

Historical Development of the School Board

The American school board is a distinctively indigenous innovation. It has evolved from its initial function of supervising the religious orthodoxy of the local schoolmasters to a policy-making body for the vast educational enterprises that are found in the larger school districts of the United States (Goldhammer, 1964).

The public school system of the United States originated in New England. In most of colonial New England, particularly in Massachusetts, the people were generally of a common religious faith; and it was not unnatural that they should entrust their local governments with functions then usually delegated to the church (Reeves, 1954).
Massachusetts was the first colony to take steps to establish schools. It followed that since the town meeting was the principal political governmental unit at work in the early towns, it seemed only natural that they would assume control of the schools. Many of these town governments often granted parcels of land for school buildings or for support of schools. These early schools were public in the sense that they existed by the authority of town governments, they were partly supported by the town, all parents had the right to send their children to the schools, and the town officials or selectmen inspected and supervised the schools. The early schools were not supported entirely through public funds; therefore, they were not free of charge to everyone (Butts & Cremin, 1955).

Some of the poorer children were allowed to attend free of charge, but for the most part, those who could not pay the tuition charged by the schools were educated in some other way. The Massachusetts General Court grew dissatisfied with this arrangement (1955). According to Bendier (1969), when the voluntary education system was no longer reliable the colony's leaders adopted a form of compulsory education in 1642. The system provided for by the law of 1642 soon appeared to be dysfunctional, as it was not extensive enough nor reliable enough to fulfill the purposes of the law. Therefore, it was necessary to adopt another piece of legislation to correct the deficiencies of
the law of 1642 (Bendier, 1969).

In 1647, the colony enacted a more encompassing far-reaching law. This law was called the "Old Deluder law, named for Satan, who had for so long deluded men into foregoing a proper knowledge of the Scriptures" (p.22). The law ordered that:

1. Every town having 50 householders should at once appoint a teacher of reading and writing, and provide for his wages in such manner as the town might determine; and

2. Every town having 100 householders must provide a (Latin) grammar school to fit youths for the university, under a penalty for failure to do so (Butts & Cremin, 1955, p. 103).

The Massachusetts law enacted in 1647 made the maintenance of a school in each town mandatory and left to the selectmen the decision as to the means to be used for its support. The public schools were made a function of town government. Policies and administrative matters were determined in town meetings or by the selectmen of the town, who performed both legislative and administrative functions for the schools and other town agencies (Reeves, 1954).

As governmental affairs grew in complexity and the population increased, the responsibilities of the selectmen became increasingly heavy. In an attempt to solve their dilemma, the selectmen appointed temporary committees to act
for them in educational matters. At first, these committees were appointed for specific functions, such as securing a school house or choosing a headmaster, but the demands of education were such as eventually to require appointment of committees to oversee the general operation of the schools on a continuing basis. Thus, the permanent school committee came into being (Dykes, 1965).

As the town gradually increased in size, its pattern of government also changed, since communities became too large for the town meeting to be both a governing body and a chief administrative agency for the schools. The transition from a form of complete popular control to a governing body selected by the people of the community to administer their schools was accomplished through gradual stages. As the educational function was extended and became increasingly more complex, there was a tendency to separate the educational function from other responsibilities of the community and create it as a completely independent branch of government (Goldhammer, 1964).

In 1789, Boston passed a school law that set the pattern in which virtually all states and cities and towns eventually adopted. The new law provided for the creation of a separate school committee of twelve members to be elected by the people. This effort was led by Sam Adams. Adams was worried about the elitist tendencies he saw in the Boston schools, so he worked to establish a system that
would provide for more democratic control of the public schools (Cistone, 1975).

After the Civil War, the population continued to grow and the problems of operating and administering the public schools increased correspondingly. In an effort to cope with the problem, school boards responded in two ways: They hired full time superintendents, and they enlarged the membership to the board; but despite that fact, in many instances they were unwilling to give over any real authority. The result was that superintendents became increasingly unhappy over their situation and finally engaged in a showdown struggle with school boards in 1895 (Cistone, 1975).

As a result of the efforts of George Strayer, professor of education and head of the department of educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University, the question of whether local boards of education should either be abolished or be stripped of much of their power was settled in 1938. Strayer advocated that the Board of Education should have full responsibility for all necessary services of the school system. He stated, "the board should be governed in its actions by the advice of the experts", but he added," the final authority must rest with the lay board. The schools belong to the people" (Cistone, 1975, p.41).

As a duly elected or appointed body, the school board
operates as an agency of the state and derives its power primarily from statutory law. Constitutional and statutory provisions define the degree and the range of powers of the board. Goldhammer, (1964), summarizes five levels of control over the independent actions of local school boards. These levels of authority are: (1) the state constitution, (2) legislative enactments, (3) rules and regulations of the state board of education, (4) decisions of the courts, and (5) societal demands.

Kinn (1980), in his study, summarized the historical development of the school board by stating:

"Boards began to realize, as did the selectman, that they could not handle the legislative, administrative, and supervisory duties of operating the schools. To lighten their educational duties, boards used the standing committee approach to governing schools. The disadvantages of the standing committee approach to the governance of schools outweighed the advantages of managing school systems. The seeking and finding of new ways to manage schools has had an effect on the responsibilities of boards in the management of schools. Boards today do not share the responsibilities of their earlier counterparts" (p. 22).

**Historical Development of the Superintendency**

The superintendency evolved out of attempts by lay citizens to exercise authority over the schools. In their
efforts to meet the increasing responsibilities of supervising and administering the schools, school committees turned to the designation of a committee member to oversee the schools. The person so designated became the executive officer of the school committee and was given specific duties to perform (Dykes, 1965).

The first school superintendent was appointed in Buffalo, New York, in 1837, the same year that Horace Mann assumed the duties as secretary to the Massachusetts State Board of Education (Brubacher, 1966).

Reller (1935) cites a report presented to the Boston committee listing the reasons why a superintendent should be employed. The report stated:

"There is now no one whose duty it is to find the best and most economical plans for school houses... There is no one to look out for the best teacher, when a vacancy occurs or in preparation for a vacancy. There is no one to find out what is the most successful teaching in all the schools, and to point it out for the benefit of all; or to aid, advise or cooperate with any teacher who is pursuing, or who may wish to pursue, an improved but untried plan of instruction and discipline. There is no one to make, from the wisdom of the most experienced, suggestions to those who are aiming at perfection; to know, by comparison, the deficiencies of teachers, and to point out the means of
supplying them. There is no one to see that proper and sufficient philosophical apparatus is supplied, and that it is properly and economically made, used and kept. There is no one whose special duty it is to see whether the best course of studies is pursued, or to assess improvement from the experience of the best schools elsewhere. There is no one to see whether the schools are adapted to the population, and all classes of children brought into them. There is no one to see that repairs are immediately made and supplies furnished, when necessary. There is no one to see that all important business is duly brought before the meetings of the board. There is no one to supervise the transfer of children from school to school, and from one set of schools to another. There is no one to oversee the organization of new schools. There is no one to collect documents appertaining to the Boston and other analogous schools, and to give full information in regard to them. There is no one to instruct strangers in regard to them. There is no one to say what libraries should be in the schools, for teachers or pupils. There is now no individual or body to exercise the complete supervision of the schools which is needed, or to examine them as thoroughly as they require" (pp. 39-40).

Gilland (1938) reported two reasons why boards sought
professional leadership and the employment of superintendents:

1. "The members of the boards of education were engaged in business pursuits and could not spare the time from their private enterprises; and

2. The growth in the complexity and intensity of the problems of administration and supervision has rendered the solutions of the problems beyond the capabilities of lay boards of education" (pp. 8-9).

Griffiths (1966) categorized the historical development of the superintendency into three stages: During the first period, (1837-1910), the superintendent was essentially instruction-oriented. During the second period, (1910-1945), the superintendent was essentially a businessman more interested in the budget than in instruction. During the third period, (1945-1966), the superintendent had entered a period wherein his position is viewed as that of a professional school administrator.

Callahan (1966) suggests the position of superintendent evolved through four stages. In the first phase, (1865-1910), he identified the superintendent as a scholar-educator and an educational leader. In the second phase, (1910-1929), the superintendent was thought of as a business manager, concerned with an efficient school operation. In the third phase, (1929-1945), the superintendent was characterized as an educational statesman in a democratic
school. In the fourth phase, (1945-1966), superintendents were viewed as applied social scientists and educational realists.

The early superintendents, sometimes known as school managers, had a relatively minor role in the operation of schools. However, as the efficiency of the position became more apparent, more important functions and responsibilities were delegated to the superintendent.

According to Callahan (1962), during the early part of the 20th century, education followed the industrial revolution and the superintendency found itself based on economy and efficiency.

Iannacconne (1970, p.60) concluded that, in the early 1900's, the businessman began to use his political power to gain control of the school boards. As a result, the philosophy of the new boards emphasized managerial operations in education and the superintendents' duties tended to move from one with clerical emphasis to one with managerial emphasis.

The post World War II period fostered a new development of the superintendency. This transitional period emphasized the superintendent as a school administrator. The national organizations of school administrators and the Kellogg Foundation combined with universities to inaugurate an intensive examination of the superintendency. The "Sputnik", government grants, the teacher organization
movement, the civil rights movement, and an intense public interest in education all combined to create a new setting for education and the position of superintendent (Griffiths, 1966).

A full-time superintendent now serves in virtually every school district that has enough schools to justify the position. The superintendent's problems are more complex than at any time in the past. Great technological and scientific advances, several wars, rural depopulation and urban growth, the population explosion, the explosion of minorities in the schools, and the widespread demand for equal opportunity are a few of the changes that have brought people to re-examine the values and practices of the superintendency. Cuban (1985) insists that the current superintendent must be a politician, manager, and instructional leader. A review of the day-to-day interactions and the personal characteristics necessary for this demanding position substantiated the ambiguous nature of the role and responsibilities of the superintendent.

The Educational Policies Commission (1965) made the following remarks about the superintendency:

1. "All decisions which are to affect an entire school system should have the benefit of the knowledge and experience of the person with the most comprehensive view of the total system. The school superintendent is uniquely qualified to
provide that advice.

2. The superintendent should be more than an educational leader. The mutual impact of school and society are today so profound that a person concerned with the institutions and processes of education must be concerned, too, with the strategies and policies of the American society. He must be concerned because these strategies and policies affect the schools" (pp. 15-17).

In summary, the superintendency has evolved from a position of low status with limited responsibilities to one of the most important positions in education. The development of the superintendency was impaired by the reluctance of school boards to assign them duties and responsibilities. The literature suggests that some of the factors that impaired the development of the superintendency may be prevalent today affecting the working relationships of the board and superintendent.

**Functions and Responsibilities of the School Board**

The state legislatures, limited only by the Constitution of the United States, are supreme in having authority to control the educational policies of the states. Each legislature may delegate authority to anyone it desires. The school board has been created to administer and supervise schools, and in these duties school board powers are delegated or implied and a wide discretion vested in the
board to carry out these powers (Messick, 1975).

Martin (1987) suggested that Americans decided that the public education of children was too important and too personal to leave in the hands of professionals exclusively. School boards, therefore, serve as a court of appeal and as a pressure valve for parents who are dissatisfied with teachers and administrators.

Cunningham (1962) implied that much of the professional literature relative to governing school board operations suggests that boards are policy making bodies and administrators are policy advisers as well as implementers of school board decisions. To discover that much of the school board operation is administrative decision making and not policy formulating should not be surprising because school boards are legally obligated to make these decisions.

An abundance of literature is available regarding the functions and responsibilities of school boards. A survey of the literature leaves the impression of disagreement among authors and organizations as to what the responsibilities of school boards should be.

The American Association of School Administrators (1980) summarizes the school board's responsibilities as follows:

1. To delegate to the superintendent responsibility for all administrative functions, except those specifically reserved through board policy for the
board chairperson.

2. To support the superintendent fully in all decisions that conform to professional standards and board policy.

3. To hold the superintendent responsible for the administration of the school through regular constructive written and oral evaluations of the superintendent's work.

4. To provide the superintendent with a comprehensive employment contract.

5. To give the superintendent the benefit of the board's counsel in matters related to individual board members' expertise, familiarity with the local school system, and community interests.

6. To hold all board meetings with the superintendent or a designee present.

7. To consult with the superintendent on all matters, as they arise, that concern the school system and on which the board may take action.

8. To develop a plan for board-superintendent communications.

9. To channel communications with school employees that require action through the superintendent, and to refer all applications, complaints, and other communications, oral or written, first to the
superintendent in order to assure that the district processes such communications in an effective, coordinated fashion and is responsive to students and patrons.

10. To take action on matters only after hearing the recommendation of the superintendent.

11. To establish a policy on the effective management of complaints.

12. To provide the superintendent with sufficient administrative help, especially in the area of monitoring teaching and learning" (pp. 1-4).

Goldhammer (1964) suggests five major areas of school board responsibility. He also suggests that if a school district is efficiently organized these five areas must by addressed.

1. The determination of major goals--A clear statement of goals is not an academic exercise; it is a statement of the criteria upon which the schools will be evaluated. These goals give direction to the administrative staff who must implement the statement of goals established by the school board.

2. General formulation of operating policies--Policies relating to matters that are of concern both to the curricular and noncurricular aspects of the school district should be determined by the school board.

3. The selection of key personnel--Legally, the school
board is responsible for the employment of all personnel within the school district. The board's primary responsibility should be the selection of the superintendent.

4. Resource procurement and allocation--An understanding of the financial structure of the school district, of the financial needs of the school district, and manner in which the financial and other resources of the school district are allocated and distributed is a major responsibility of the school board.

5. Evaluation--The school board should not determine the curriculum, but it should constantly have evaluations of the curriculum and of all other phases of the school district. This should be done to determine the extent to which the interests of the community needs of education are being met.

Morphet (1974) cites the responsibilities of the school board as:

"1. The selection for chief administrator, the superintendent of schools.

2. The establishment of policies and procedures in accord with which the educational services are administered and a range of programs are developed.

3. The establishment of policies relating to planning improvements and to accountability.

4. The adoption of the budget and the enactment of
provisions for the financing of the schools.

5. The acquisition and development of necessary property and the provision of supplies.

6. The adoption of policies regarding and the appointment of necessary personnel to staff the varied services.

7. The appraisal of the work of the schools and adoption of plans for development" (pp. 311-312).

Belcastro (1980) suggested that the school board is primarily a policy-forming and evaluation-making group, the school board's chief responsibilities include:

"1. The development and improvement of the educational program.

2. The selection of the chief administrative officer and the provision for the professional and non-professional staffs.

3. The provision for finances and facilities.

4. The maintenance of good relations between the school and the community.

5. The evaluation of the entire school system through monitoring of all aspects of the school operation" (p. 381).

According to Reeder (1944) the source of powers and responsibilities exercised by school boards is the state, not the school district. Reeder further states, "school boards should regard themselves as agents of the state for
carrying out the educational policies determined by the laws of the state" (p. 16).

The power and responsibility for the administering of schools in the State of Tennessee is granted to the local school boards and superintendents by statute 49-1-102. The statute reads:

"The system of public education shall be administered from the state level by (1) the commissioner of education, and (2) the state board of education. There shall be a local public school system operated in each county. There may be a local public school system operated in a municipality or special school district. Any local public school system shall be administered by (1) a local board of education, and (2) a superintendent or director" (p.4).

Tennessee Code Annotated 49-2-203 enumerates the specific duties and responsibilities of school boards in Tennessee. The duties and responsibilities include:

"1. To elect principals, supervisors, teachers, aides, attendance officers, clerical assistants, and other employees authorized by this title, and to fix salaries for such authorized positions according to the provisions of this title; and to make written contracts with all employees.

2. To manage and control all public schools
established or that may be established under its jurisdiction.

3. To employ janitors, engineers, and such other persons as may be necessary to care for the school property, and to fix their compensation.

4. To purchase all supplies, furniture, fixtures, and materials of every kind through the executive committee.

5. To order warrants drawn on the county trustee on account of the elementary and high school funds, respectively.

6. To visit the schools whenever, in the judgment of the board, such visits are necessary.

7. To dismiss teachers, principals, supervisors, and other employees, upon sufficient proof of improper conduct, inefficient service, or neglect of duty; provided, that no one shall be dismissed without first having been given in writing due notice of the charge or charges and an opportunity for defense.

8. To suspend or dismiss pupils when the progress or efficiency of the school makes it necessary.

9. To have enumerated the scholastic population of the local school district in May of every odd-numbered year.

10. To provide proper record books for the
superintendent, and should the appropriate local legislative body fail or refuse to provide a suitable office and sufficient equipment for the superintendent, the local board of education may provide the same out of the elementary and high school funds in proportion to their gross annual amounts.

11. To require the superintendent and chairman of the local board to prepare a budget on forms furnished by the commissioner of education, and when the budget has been approved by the local board, to submit same to the appropriate legislative body.

12. To prepare, or have prepared a copy of the minutes of each meeting of the board of education, and to mail a copy of such minutes, no more than thirty (30) days after the board meeting or at the time they are mailed to or otherwise provided to members of the board, if such is earlier, to the president of each local education association.

13. To adopt and enforce, in accordance with guidelines prescribed by the state board of education pursuant to 49-6-3112, minimum standards and policies governing student attendance, subject to availability of funds.

14. To develop and implement an evaluation plan for all certified employees in accordance with the
guidelines and criteria of the state board of education, and submit such plan to the state commissioner of education for approval" (pp. 21-23).

Carroll, Cunningham, Danzberger, Kitst, McCloud, and Usdan (1987) suggests that to become contributing members of effective school boards, those who seek election or appointment to school boards need orientation to the complex roles and responsibilities facing school boards.

Nelson and Crum (1983) stated:
"members of the 16,000 district school boards in the United States have and awesome responsibility to regain public confidence in education and to prepare our nation's youth to cope with the fast moving, high technology and information society as they become worthy and responsible citizens. School boards control the key to attainment of a high quality education. They have the power and responsibility to establish the policies, set the priorities, and provide the incentive essential to cultivating excellence in the public schools of America" (p. 10).

Relic (1986, p. 26) advocated that school boards should be more involved in meeting their responsibilities. The National School Boards Association's Blueprint for Educational Excellence put it this way: "It is the local school board that has the most important influence and
control over a community's educational program. Through its policy process, the school board defines both quality and quantity of a community's educational commitment.

Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent

The operation of the schools within the school districts is, by law, the responsibility of the school board. The superintendent is elected by the people or appointed by the board to administer and operate the schools under its direction (American Association of School Administrators, 1956).

A review of the literature suggests that the functions and responsibilities of the superintendency are vague and varied based on the views of the author or organization. The responsibilities of superintendents vary from state to state and from school district to school district.

Griffiths (1966) categorized the responsibilities of the superintendent into four parts:

1. Improving educational opportunity--All aspects of the instructional program are included in this part, such questions as what shall be taught and how it shall be taught are considered here.

2. Obtaining and developing personnel--The divisions of the job concerned with recruitment, selection, placement, and promotion of personnel. 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 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" (p. 126).

The American Association of School Administrators
(1968) outlines the responsibilities of the superintendent
as:

"1. To serve as the board's chief executive officer

2. To be the boards' professional adviser in all
   matters and recommend appropriate school policies
   for its consideration

3. To implement and execute all policies adopted by
   the board

4. To keep the board fully and accurately informed
   about the school program

5. To interpret the needs of the school system

6. To present his professional recommendations on all
   problems and issues considered by the board"
7. To devote a large share of his time to the improvement of instruction
8. To be aware of advances and improvements in educational programs
9. To develop and maintain an adequate school-community relations program
10. To be actively involved in community activities
11. To nominate candidates for appointment to the school staff
12. To recommend for purchase equipment, books, and supplies that are required for the purposes and needs of the school system
13. To prepare and present to the board for its consideration an annual budget that is adequate to serve the needs of the school system
14. To operate the school district within the confines of the established budget" (p. 16).

In Tennessee, Tennessee Code Annotated (1988) 49-2-301 section (f) authorized the board of education to assign its superintendent the following duties:

"1. To act for the board in seeing that the laws relating to the schools, and rules of the state and the local board of education are faithfully executed.
2. To attend all meetings of the board of education and to serve as a member of the executive committee
of the board, without additional compensation.

3. To keep in a well bound book, furnished by the board, a complete and accurate record of the proceedings of all meetings of the board and of its official acts.

4. To keep in well bound books, furnished by the board and arranged according to the regulations prescribed by the commissioner of education, a detailed and accurate account of all receipts and disbursements of the public school funds.

5. To issue, within ten (10) days, all warrants authorized by the board of education for expenditures for public school funds.

6. To make such recommendations to the board of education as he deems for the best interest of the public schools, but in no case shall he have a vote on any question coming before the board.

7. To have general supervision of all schools, and to visit the schools from time to time, and advise with the teachers and members of the board of education as to their condition and improvement.

8. To require the use of the state course of study for all the public schools and the system of promoting pupils through the several grades thereof in accordance with regulations of the commissioner of education, as approved by the state board.
9. To sign all certificates and diplomas of pupils who complete the courses of study prescribed for the elementary and high schools.

10. To recommend to the board of education, supervisors, teachers, teacher aides, clerical assistants, and other employees in the schools.

11. To recommend to the board salaries for teachers in accordance with the salary schedule and the salaries and wages of all other employees nominated by him.

12. To assign teachers and teacher aides to the end that the best interests of the schools may be promoted thereby, pending the meeting and approval by the board of education.

13. To require all teachers to submit to him for record their certificates, or authority to teach, given by the state board of education, and to keep a complete record of same.

14. To file all contracts entered into with teachers and employees of the board of education, before they begin their services in the public schools.

15. To furnish to teachers or principals the names of pupils belonging to their respective schools, the list to be taken from the census enumeration or other reliable records on file in his office.

16. To issue certificates relative to the employment of
minors who are enrolled as students in his district.

17. To prepare reports of attendance to be assembled by the county superintendent, provided the county superintendent shall report to the commissioner of education any failure on the part of any principal or superintendent of any school system within the county to make such reports.

18. To report to the county trustee and the commissioner of education, on or before the first day of July of each year, the attendance.

19. To make a written report, quarterly, to the appropriate local legislative body, for the board of education, of all receipts and expenditures of the public school funds, which accounts shall contain full information concerning the conditions, progress, and needs of the schools of the school system and which shall be audited by the appropriate fiscal officer and local legislative body.

20. To be present at all quarterly and annual settlements of the county trustee with the county executive covering all school funds arising from state apportionments, county levies, and all other sources, and report his acts to his board of education.
21. To report to the local legislative body and the commissioner of education, whenever it shall appear to him that any portion of the school fund has been, or is in danger of being, misappropriated or in any way illegally disposed of or not collected.

22. To make reports to the commissioner of education when requested by him.

23. To prepare, annually, a budget for the schools in his school system, to submit the same to the board of education for its approval and to present it to the county or other appropriate local legislative body for adoption as provided for by charter or private legislative act.

24. To give his full time and attention to the duties of his position.

25. To deliver to his successor all records and official papers belonging to the position and in case of his refusal to deliver such records and files on demand of his successor, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

26. To file with the commissioner of education a copy of the budget adopted by the county or other appropriate local legislative body within ten days after its adoption.

27. To furnish to the commissioner of education a list of the teachers elected by the board of education
and their respective salaries, on forms furnished by the commissioner.

28. To grant any certified employee, or any other person considered as a professional employee, access at any reasonable time to his/her personnel file or files, whether maintained by his/her principal, supervisor, superintendent, board of education, or any other official of the school system.

29. To give any certified and/or professional employee, on request and on payment of reasonable compensation, a copy of specified documents in his/her personnel file.

30. To establish a procedure whereby an updated copy of the rules, regulations and minimum standards of the state board of education shall be kept on file in an easily accessible place in each school library during normal school hours.

31. To perform such other official duties as may be prescribed by law" (pp. 28-30).

Effective July 1, 1992, Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-2-301, subsection (f), was amended by adding thereto the following new subdivisions:

"1. Employ, transfer, suspend, non-renew and dismiss all personnel within the approved budget, except as provided in Section 49-2-203(a)(1) and Part 5 of
2. All persons who are employed in a position for which no teaching license is required shall be hired on a year to year contract. The superintendent shall provide a person who is employed in such a position fifteen (15) days' notice of nonrenewal of the contract before the end of the contract period.

3. The superintendent may dismiss any employed under his jurisdiction for incompetence, inefficient, insubordination, improper conduct or neglect of duty, provided that no one shall be dismissed without first having been given in writing, due notice of the charge or charges and an opportunity for defense.

4. All actions of the superintendent or their designees shall be consistent with the existing board policies, rules, contracts and regulations (p. 11).

Smith (1986) focused on the question: What is the ideal division of responsibility between a school board and superintendent? Smith addresses the question by saying the board is responsible for the what, and the superintendent is responsible for the how. Smith also suggested that when all is said and done, the proper division of responsibility between the board and the superintendent is a matter of
opinion. When both sides agree on who handles what, everything's fine. But when agreement disappears, trouble is not far behind. Disagreement over the school board-superintendent responsibilities is a thorn in the flesh of public education.

In summary, the responsibilities of the superintendent are in a state of constant change, including his relationship with the school board. His role must enhance the decisions of the school board and help them to become aware of the rapidly changing educational needs of the school district. The Education Policies Commission (1965) summarized the responsibilities of the superintendent when it said:

"The superintendent has many responsibilities, but all are focused on a single goal: to provide the best possible education in his community. This means creating the conditions in which other people can get things done and above all in which the teachers in the classroom can perform to the best of their abilities" (p. 3).

**School Board-Superintendent Relationships**

At the core of any good school system, one expects to find a school board and superintendent who have established a good working relationship. This relationship is at the center of all that happens or does not happen in the school district. There is little likelihood of sustaining a good program, staff morale or any positive attributes in a school
district where the superintendent and the school board have not achieved a proper and effective relationship (Ellena, 1973).

The conclusions drawn from a nationwide study of school board members and superintendents by Alvey and Underwood (1985), showed a rift exists between how board members and superintendents perceive their respective roles and responsibilities. Their study findings suggested that a school system runs smoothly only when the board and the superintendent understand and agree on their respective roles and responsibilities.

According to McGonagil (1987), strong interdependence between school boards and superintendents makes role conflict inevitable. McGonagil also stated, "discussion of trust and communication between the school board and the superintendent leads naturally to the definition of roles" (p. 68). Luehe (1989) described a smooth running school board/superintendent relationship as taking plenty of maintenance. Board members and superintendents have to work at their relationship, making adjustments and fine tuning directions when necessary. Salmon (1982) indicated that dominant authority by the school board or superintendent is not cast in stone; it varies from school district to school district, from time to time, and from issue to issue.

In a 1989 study of school board chairpersons, Feistritzer (1989) had the following findings:
1. Budget—Seventy-three percent of the chairpersons said the board had primary responsibility for the overall district budget.

2. Textbooks and instruction—Approximately one-half of the chairpersons said teachers had primary responsibility for selecting textbooks and deciding how subjects would be taught.

3. Personnel—More than half of the chairpersons agreed that boards not only do, but should, have the responsibility for hiring and firing principals and teachers.

Hentges (1985), in his study, found that superintendents and school boards share in the balance of power. Superintendents dominate in a majority of cases when decisions involve internal policy issues, (those matters generally seen as confined to the school system itself and where the expertise of the professional is greatest.) School boards successfully resist superintendant dominance when external policy issues are under consideration.

Lieberman (1977) contends that the larger the school system the more likely the board will be controlled by the superintendent. School board control over the superintendent in small school districts is very likely. Board members in small districts are more familiar with issues and individuals and are less subject to bureaucratic control. As the size of the district increases, the control
exercised by the board decreases.

According to Downey and Trotter, (1989) "school boards now, in greater numbers than ever before, refuse to honor that hallowed line separating governance and management, policy and administration." As never before, school boards are willing to invade the superintendent's domain. Shannon (1989) reported that conflict between the school board and the superintendent is much more than disagreement. Disagreement flows naturally because of the different backgrounds and roles of the people involved. The superintendent has been involved in dealing with professional school issues, whereas school board members are from a variety of walks of life without any expertise in the administration of education. When disagreement becomes a persistent state, it escalates into conflict. When conflict becomes public knowledge, people take sides, and progress is paralyzed.

Fortune, Kecugh, Underwood, and Yock (1990) revealed in their nationwide survey of school board members that the longer the superintendent has served in the school district, the more critical the board members are of the job the superintendent is doing. Another finding was that however long a superintendent's tenure was, it was usually longer than the school board members' tenure. It was clear from the survey that many superintendents survive their positions long after the school boards that hired them have gone.
Taylor (1988, p. 88-89) in his study concluded: "There were two themes with regard to school board-superintendent relationships. One group viewed the school board and the superintendent as a team, working together and having overlapping responsibilities". The other group of researchers viewed the school board and the superintendent as two separate entities, each with defined responsibilities that overlapped only occasionally. This dichotomy of the role responsibility tends to create uncertainty in the relationship between the school boards and superintendents".

McBride (1976, p. 101), in his study of school board presidents and superintendents in Texas, had the following findings:

1. If the superintendent and the board president differed markedly in age, it was quite likely that their perceptions of the superintendent's role would differ.

2. A characteristic as determined by the study was that the superintendents have more formal education in wealthier school districts.

Based on the data and findings of the study of superintendents and school board members in Minnesota, Kinn (1980, p. 224-225) had the following conclusions:

1. "A lack of role consensus exists between superintendents and school board members in Minnesota regarding the role of the
2. A lack of consensus exists between superintendents and school board members in Minnesota regarding the perceived role of the school board.

3. Years served as superintendent, age of the superintendent, number of years of formal education completed, the existence or non-existence of clearly written board policies enumerating the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board did not affect the role perceptions superintendents hold for themselves.

4. The role perceptions school board members hold for the superintendent were slightly affected by each of the following: the number of years served on the school board, the existence or non-existence of clearly written board policies enumerating the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent and school board, and the number of years of formal education completed.

5. The number of students enrolled in the district had the most effect on the role perceptions school board members hold for the superintendent".

Alvey's national survey and Seder's (1991) study of Connecticut school board members and superintendents concluded: Both national and Connecticut school board members and superintendents perceive the superintendent
should assume more responsibility in the four Areas of Governance than board members.

Paschal (1971) found that conflict existed between school board chairmen and superintendents in North Carolina over their respective role definitions.

Rentala, (1973) in her Illinois study, found that there was a lack of consensus between board presidents and superintendents regarding the perceived role of superintendents. The superintendents were in agreement regarding the perceived role of the superintendent. The board presidents were in substantial disagreement regarding the role of the superintendent, and superintendents were in disagreement with the proper role of the school boards.

In summary, the current literature has indicated that the responsibilities of school boards and superintendents is definitive. However, studies have shown that school boards and superintendents find themselves in disagreement over their respective responsibilities in many cases. This disagreement often leads to conflict between the school board and the superintendent.

Summary

Chapter II provided a review of selected literature that was related to the problem being addressed by this study.

The first part of the chapter dealt with the historical development of the school board. From the time the
selectmen inspected and supervised the schools in colonial Massachusetts until the present, the school board has revived and expanded to become an important and integral part of our American school system and is indispensable to the achievement of excellence in our schools.

The second part of the chapter dealt with the historical development of the superintendency. From the time the first superintendent's job was created in Buffalo in 1837, the superintendency has progressed into a position regarded as a professional administrator and chief executive officer of the school district.

The third and fourth parts of this chapter dealt with the functions and responsibilities of the school board and the superintendent. Evidence from the literature has shown that many school boards and superintendents do not perform their functions and responsibilities either according to law or established tradition. Many school boards assume the administrative functions that are the responsibility of the superintendent and his staff. These circumstances exist because many school districts do not have written policy differentiating responsibilities to be performed by the superintendent from those responsibilities that are reserved for the school board.

The fifth part of the chapter dealt with the school board-superintendent relationship. This was identified by virtually all researchers as the critical relationship in
governing schools. The literature surveyed showed there is a dubious relationship between the school board and the superintendent.

The next chapter outlines the methods and procedures used in this study to collect and analyze the perception data of the school board chairperson and superintendent.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

Chapter 3 contains information on research design, population selection, instrument development, instrument validity and reliability, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Research Design

To accomplish the purpose of this study, descriptive research was utilized. Best (1981) described this type of research as follows:

"Descriptive research describes what is. It involves the description, recording, analysis, and interpretation of conditions that exist. It involves some type of comparison or contrast and attempts to discover relationships between existing nonmanipulated variables" (p. 25).

The primary purpose of the study was to determine if differences exist between the superintendents and the school board chairpersons of Tennessee, in regard to the perceived functions and responsibilities of each group. Additionally, the study attempted to determine if elected versus appointed superintendent status, size of the school district, years of service as superintendent or as a board chairperson, educational level of the superintendent and the
board chairperson, age of the superintendent and the board chairperson had any effect on the perceived functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards in Tennessee.

The method used to obtain the perceptions of the superintendents and school board chairpersons was a questionnaire that was completed by each responding superintendent and school board chairperson in Tennessee. The procedures for the development and use of the questionnaire and for the processing of the returned questionnaire data are described in the following sections of this chapter.

Population

The population for this study consisted of all superintendents and school board chairpersons in Tennessee. This research required the identification of two samples; one of superintendents and the other of school board chairpersons. Because the researcher was interested in obtaining the largest sample size, (Borg and Gall, 1983), all 139 superintendents and 139 school board chairpersons in the state of Tennessee in 1992 were contacted to complete the instrument.

Instrument Development

The review of the literature and related research studies revealed a study concerning the responsibilities of
school boards and superintendents in Connecticut by Marlene Seder entitled *Separation of Responsibilities Between School Board Members and Superintendents*. After reviewing the questionnaire and requesting permission from Seder to use the instrument, the questionnaire developed by Seder was selected as the instrument for this study to determine the functions and responsibilities of school boards and superintendents in Tennessee as perceived by superintendents and school board chairpersons. Seder's instrument was chosen because it has been adequately tested for validity and reliability.

The instrument contained two parts: the Areas of Governance Inventory and the supplementary independent variable (demographic) section.

Part one of the instrument, the Areas of Governance Inventory, collected data about the perceptions of superintendents and school board chairpersons on twenty-seven issues. A five-point Likert scale was used on each issue, ranging from a one that indicated total responsibility for a school board, to a three that indicated an equally shared responsibility, to a five, that indicated total responsibility for the superintendent. Both two and four are representative of unequal, but shared responsibility. Four is representative of perceptions that more responsibility is delegated to the superintendent. Two is representative of perceptions that more responsibility is
delegated to the school board (see Appendices D and E). According to Borg and Gall (1983) questionnaires that measure attitudes and opinions are commonly measured by Likert scales (p. 423).

Seder (1991) organized the statements concerning 27 issues under four Areas of Governance that will be used in this study:

1. Administration
2. Personnel
3. Financial Management
4. Curriculum

Each issue was assigned to one of the four Areas of Governance. Table One indicates the Areas of Governance into which each issue was assigned.

**TABLE 1**

**Issues by Areas of Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Governance</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 20, 24, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3, 5, 9, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>2, 4, 11, 17, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>8, 10, 15, 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part two of the instrument was devoted to collecting supplementary independent variable data on the
subjects: sex; age; number of students enrolled in the district; formal education completed; number of years served as superintendent or school board member; number of years superintendent has served in the present school district; existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board; and whether the superintendent is elected or appointed by the school board. Part two contained two different forms; one for the superintendent and one for the school board chairperson.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Seder verified the content validity of the instrument based upon the answers to the questions by a panel of ex-superintendents and ex-school board members in Connecticut who pretested the survey. According to Seder, all respondents stated that the directions were clear and that each issue was answerable for a school board member or superintendent.

Seder determined reliability using Cronbach's Alpha for each Area of Governance. Table Two reports the reliability for each Area of Governance.
TABLE 2
Reliability Results on the Areas of Governance Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Governance</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.6226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>.7463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>.6168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>.5874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.6433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Procedures

The names and office addresses of all Tennessee school superintendents were obtained from Ernestine McWherter, executive director, of the Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents, Nashville, Tennessee. The names and home addresses of the chairpersons of each school board in Tennessee were obtained from Dan Tollett, executive director, of the Tennessee School Boards Association, Nashville, Tennessee.

The data were collected by tabulating responses from a packet of materials sent to the home of each of the 139 school board chairpersons and to the office of the 139 school superintendents. Each packet included a cover letter from the researcher, a questionnaire, and a stamped self-addressed envelope.
The mailed questionnaire was identified by a number assigned to the superintendent's and school board chairperson's system. A master list of the system identification numbers was retained. The system identification numbering scheme was used to identify those superintendents or board chairpersons who should be contacted on subsequent occasions. The cover letters are shown in Appendix C.

Fifteen days after the initial questionnaire was mailed, a follow-up letter, a second copy of the questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped return envelope were mailed to those superintendents and school board chairpersons who had not responded. The follow up letters are shown in Appendix F.

Data Analysis

The returned questionnaires were organized and were examined for correctness and completeness.

Data from Part I and II of the questionnaire were coded for computer processing. The data were computer analyzed, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences-Personal Computer (SPSS-PC), (Norusis, 1980).

Frequencies and percentages were analyzed for the demographic data for superintendents and school board chairpersons. A series of t-tests were used to analyze the data. A t-test compared the means of all superintendents' responses with all school board chairpersons responses on
the total questionnaire. The null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. The instrument was then divided into the four Areas of Governance: Administration, Personnel, Financial Management and Curriculum. All superintendents responses were compared with all school board chairpersons responses on each Area of Governance to determine significant differences in the two groups perceptions regarding their functions and responsibilities. ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses to determine whether the demographic characteristics significantly affected superintendents and school board chairpersons perceptions in the four Areas of Governance of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

Tables were designed to present the tabulation of data from the questionnaires, to answer the research questions, and to test the null hypotheses of the study as stated in Chapter 1.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if differences exist between the superintendents and the school board chairpersons of Tennessee, in regard to the perceived functions and responsibilities of each group. The secondary purpose of the study was to determine if factors such as age, size of the school district, educational level of the superintendent and the board member, years of service as superintendent or as a board member, the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus school board appointed superintendent status has any effect on the perceived functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards in Tennessee.

The two independent groups used in the study were the superintendents and school board chairpersons. The responses to the survey instrument were compiled to determine if there were significant differences between responses from superintendents and school board chairpersons. Additionally, six demographic data items were compiled for both superintendents and school board chairpersons. These items were age, size of the school
district, educational level of the superintendent and the board member, years of service as superintendent or as a board member, the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus school board appointed superintendent status.

This chapter includes information regarding: the responses to the questionnaire, frequencies and percentages of respondent demographic data, findings related to the research questions, findings related to the null hypotheses, and summary.

Presentation of Data

Survey Responses

Of the 139 questionnaires mailed to each group of superintendents and school board chairpersons, 82% (n = 114) of the superintendents and 67% (n = 93) of the school board chairpersons responded. All returned responses were usable for the study other than the responses that were received too late to be included in the study. The selection of sample size table from Mendenhall, Ott, and Scheaffer, (1986), was used to determine the size needed to be representative of the given population (see Appendix G). From this table it was determined that a population sample of 114 superintendents represented a confidence level of 96% and 93 school board chairpersons represented a confidence level of 94% The response rates of 82% and 67% from
superintendents and school board chairpersons respectively did compare favorably to the response rates in similar studies reported in Chapter 2.

**Demographic Data**

Tables 3 through 10 report the compiled demographic data for the responding superintendents and school board chairpersons. The numbers and percentages of superintendents and chairpersons in various age ranges for the study are shown in Table 3. The mean age of superintendents and school board chairpersons were very close, however, the age distributions of superintendents were different from those of school board chairpersons. The average age of superintendents was 49.8 and the average age of school board chairpersons was 52.8. The largest numbers of superintendents were in the 40 to 49 years of age range (i.e., 48.2% for the study). The largest numbers of school board chairpersons were in the 50 to 59 years of age range (i.e., 35.5% for the study). There were over twice as many school board chairpersons over the age of 60 than superintendents (i.e., 10 superintendents and 24 school board chairpersons were over the age of 60 for the study).
Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sex distributions for superintendents and school board chairpersons are shown in Table 4. The sex distributions for superintendents and school board chairpersons were very similar. Both superintendents and school board chairpersons had high male percentages. The superintendents were 89.5% male and the chairpersons were 84.8% male.
Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses 114 93

The sizes of the school districts of the superintendents and school board chairpersons are shown in Table 5. The sizes of the school districts of superintendents and school board chairpersons were very similar. The largest percentage of both superintendents and chairpersons came from systems with an enrollment range of 1,000 to 4,999. The smallest percentage of both superintendents and chairpersons came from systems with an enrollment of less than 1,000.
Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by Size of the School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th></th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The years of experience of superintendents and school board chairpersons are shown in Table 6. The average years of experience of superintendents was 7.5 years and the average years of experience of school board chairpersons was 10.1 years. The years of experience range of 0 to 4 years contained the largest percentage of superintendents (i.e., 43.9% for the study). The years of experience range of 5 to 9 years contained the largest percentage of school board chairpersons (i.e., 35.3% for the study). The smallest
percentage of both superintendent and chairpersons had 25 or more years of experience (i.e., 1.8% for superintendents and 4.3% for chairpersons).

Table 6

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>50 43.9%</td>
<td>18 19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>32 28.1%</td>
<td>33 35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>11 9.6%</td>
<td>24 25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>13 11.4%</td>
<td>7  7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5  4.4%</td>
<td>6  6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or more</td>
<td>2  1.8%</td>
<td>4  4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The educational levels of superintendents and school
board chairpersons are shown in Table 7. The largest number of superintendents for the study had a Masters degree (i.e., 49.1%). The largest number of school board chairpersons for the study had a Bachelors degree (i.e., 40.2%). The smallest number of superintendents had a Specialist degree (i.e., 22.8%) and the smallest number of chairpersons had a Doctorate degree (i.e., 7.6%).

Table 7

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years the superintendent has served in
the present school district are shown in Table 8. The superintendents and school board chairpersons percentages in each range of years were very similar. The largest percentage from both superintendents and chairpersons were in the 0 to 4 years of experience (i.e., 57% of superintendents and 59.1% of chairpersons said their superintendent had served less than four years in their present school district). The average years in the present school district from superintendents was 5.9 years and the average years from chairpersons was 6.7 years.

Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by Number of Years Superintendent has Served in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Served</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Served</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existence of clearly defined written policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board are shown in Table 9. The responses from both superintendents and superintendents were very similar (i.e., 76.3% of the superintendents and 83.7% of the school board chairpersons indicated that their system had policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board).
Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by the Existence of Clearly Written Policies Defining the Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87 76.9</td>
<td>77 82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26 23.0</td>
<td>15 16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elected versus school board appointed superintendent status is shown in Table 10. The responses from both superintendents and superintendents were very similar (i.e., 56.1% of the superintendents and 58.7% of the school board chairpersons indicated that superintendents were elected in their district and 36.8% of the superintendents and 39.1% of the chairpersons indicated that superintendents were appointed by the school board in their district).
Table 10

Frequencies and Percentages for Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons by Elected Versus School Board Appointed Superintendent Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>School Board Chairpersons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings Related to Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

Data to answer the five research questions and to test the 13 null hypotheses were obtained from the questionnaires. Information about each question and null hypothesis will be presented in the tables to follow.

Research Question 1

What are the superintendents' perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in selected tasks and decisions in the school district?
The perceptions of superintendents, measured on a five-point scale, are shown in Table 11. The five points on the scale were:

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

The means are given for four Areas of Governance; Administration, Finance, Personnel, Curriculum, and Total Score. The mean scores are converted to conform with the scale on the survey questionnaire. This conversion was done by dividing the mean scores in each Area of Governance by the number of questions in the Area of Governance. The mean scores for superintendents for each Area of Governance fell in range three; the school board and the superintendent are equally responsible.
Table 11

Superintendents Mean Scores of the Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent and School Board in the 4 Areas of Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Converted Mean*</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The converted mean conforms with the scale of the survey questionnaire.

Research Question 2

What are the school board chairpersons' perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in selected tasks and decisions in the school district?

The perceptions of school board chairpersons are measured on a five-point scale, are shown in Table 12. The five points on the scale were:

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

The means were calculated for the four Areas of Governance: Administration, Finance, Personnel, Curriculum, and Total Score. The mean scores are converted to conform with the scale on the survey questionnaire. The mean scores for the school board chairpersons for the Areas of Administration, Personnel, Curriculum and Total Score fell in range three; the school board and the superintendent are equally responsible. The mean score for the school board chairpersons for the Area of Finance fell in range two; the school board is primarily responsible.
Table 12

School Board Chairpersons Mean Scores of the Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent and School Board in the 4 Areas of Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Converted Mean*</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The converted mean conforms with the scale of the survey questionnaire.

Research Question 3

Is there a statistically significant difference in the distribution of responses of superintendents and school board chairpersons on the perceived functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards?

Null Hypothesis 1

There will be no statistically significant difference between the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board as perceived by the
superintendents and school board chairpersons.

Research question 3 was answered and null hypothesis 1 was tested by using the t test of independent groups. The calculated t for each Area of Governance is shown in Table 13. An asterisk is shown after the Probability if the t value was greater than the critical t value. In order to reject the null hypothesis (i.e., at .05 level of significance for a two-tailed test) for each of the Areas of Governance, the calculated t values had to be greater than the critical t value. The majority of the calculated t values in Table 13 were greater than the critical t value. Thus, null hypothesis 1 was rejected, indicating there was a significant difference of the perceptions of the superintendents and school board chairpersons regarding the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board. The data indicated that superintendents felt they were more responsible than school boards for making decisions in the areas of Administration, Finance, Personnel, and in the total of all Areas of Governance. There was not a significant difference in the perceptions of responsibilities in the Curriculum area.
Table 13

Difference in Responses of Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons Regarding the Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent and School Board in the 4 Areas of Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

Research questions 4a thru f and 5a thru f were answered, and null hypotheses 2 thru 13 were tested, by using ANOVA. The calculated F for each Area of Governance by each independent variable for superintendents and school board chairpersons is shown in Tables 14 thru 25. An asterisk is shown after the Probability if the F ratio exceeded the critical F ratio. In order to reject the null
hypothesis (i.e., at .05 level of significance) for each of the Areas of Governance, the calculated F ratio had to exceed the critical F ratio. The majority of the calculated F ratios in Tables 14 thru 25 failed to exceed the critical F value. However, the F ratio for the independent variables including the superintendents perceptions in relation to educational level, and elected versus appointed superintendent status and the school board chairpersons perceptions in relation to existence of policies and elected versus appointed superintendent status did exceed the critical F value.

**Research Question 4a**

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the superintendent? a. Age

**Null Hypothesis 2**

Superintendents of different ages will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The superintendents perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to age are shown in Table 14. There were no significant differences in any of the four Areas of Governance or the total score for the age ranges 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and greater than 59 for superintendents. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 is retained.
# Table 14

Superintendents Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 or more</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.7906</td>
<td>.5020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.7810</td>
<td>.5073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.1374</td>
<td>.9374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.8560</td>
<td>.4665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.4922</td>
<td>.6887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Research Question 4b

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the superintendent? b. Size of the school district.

Null Hypothesis 3

Superintendents of different size school districts will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The superintendents perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to size of school district are shown in Table 15. There were no significant differences in any of the four Areas of Governance or the total score for the size of school district ranges less than 1,000, 1,000-4,999, 5,000-9,999, and 10,000 or more for superintendents. Therefore, null hypothesis 3 is retained.

Research Question 4c

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the superintendent? c. Formal education completed.

Null Hypothesis 4

Superintendents of different levels of education will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards. The superintendents perceptions of the
Table 15
Superintendents Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Size of School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>&lt;1,000</th>
<th>1,000-4,999</th>
<th>5,000-9,999</th>
<th>10,000 or more</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.2781</td>
<td>.8411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.7201</td>
<td>.5423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.9151</td>
<td>.4372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.9950</td>
<td>.3983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.5244</td>
<td>.6667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to educational level are shown in Table 16. There was a significant difference in the personnel Area of Governance and the total score. Superintendents with doctoral degrees differed significantly with superintendents with masters degrees and specialists degrees in the personnel Area of Governance and the total score. Therefore, null hypothesis 4 is rejected. Superintendents with a doctoral degree believed they should assume more responsibility for making decisions in personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than superintendents with a masters degree or a specialists degree.

Research Question 4d

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the superintendent? d. Number of years served as superintendent.

Null Hypothesis 5

Superintendents of different number of years served in office will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The superintendents perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to number of years of experience are shown in Table 17. There were no significant differences in any of
Table 16
Superintendents Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Masters Degree</th>
<th>Specialists Degree</th>
<th>Doctorate Degree</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.5289</td>
<td>.5909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.0610</td>
<td>.9409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>9.6161</td>
<td>.0002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.6916</td>
<td>.5030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.4531</td>
<td>.0147*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 17

Superintendents Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>&gt;24</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.9029</td>
<td>.4825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.9010</td>
<td>.4839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.6098</td>
<td>.1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.4938</td>
<td>.7802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.9720</td>
<td>.4403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
the four Areas of Governance or the total score for the years of experience ranges 0-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, greater than 24 for superintendents. Therefore, null hypothesis 5 is retained.

Research Question 4e

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the superintendent? e. Existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board

Null Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant difference in the superintendents perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards considering the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and school board.

The superintendents perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to the existence of board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board are shown in Table 18. There were no significant differences in any of the four Areas of Governance or the total score for systems with the policies and systems without the policies for superintendents. Therefore, null hypothesis 6 is retained.
Table 18

Superintendents' Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Existence of Clearly Written Board Policies Defining the Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Systems With Policies</th>
<th>Systems Without Policies</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.1195</td>
<td>.7303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.0256</td>
<td>.0851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.7400</td>
<td>.1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.3344</td>
<td>.5643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.4830</td>
<td>.0656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Research Question 4f

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the superintendent? f. Elected versus school board appointed superintendent status

Null Hypothesis 7

Superintendents from systems where the superintendents are elected versus school board appointed will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The superintendents perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to elected versus appointed superintendent status is shown in Table 19. There was a significant difference in the personnel Area of Governance and the total score. Superintendents that were elected differed significantly with superintendents who were school board appointed in the personnel Area of Governance and the total score. Therefore, null hypothesis 7 is rejected. Superintendents who were school board appointed assumed greater responsibility for making decisions in personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than superintendents who were elected.

Research Question 5a

Do any of the following independent variables appear to effect the perceptions of the school board chairperson? a. Age
Table 19

Superintendents Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Elected Versus Appointed Superintendent Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.9427</td>
<td>.0573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.7815</td>
<td>.1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>11.0702</td>
<td>.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.6853</td>
<td>.5062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.6328</td>
<td>.0125*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Null Hypothesis 8

School board chairpersons of different ages will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The school board chairpersons' perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to age are shown in Table 20. There were no significant differences in any of the four Areas of Governance or the total score for the age ranges 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and greater than 59 for chairpersons. Therefore, null hypothesis 8 is retained.

Research Question 5b

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the school board chairperson? b. Size of the school district.

Null Hypothesis 9

School board chairpersons of different size school districts will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The chairpersons' perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to size of school district are shown in Table 21. There were no significant differences in any of the four Areas of Governance or the total score for the size of school district ranges less than 1,000, 1,000-4,999, 5,000-
Table 20

School Board Chairpersons Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 or more</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.7987</td>
<td>.4985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.1851</td>
<td>.3203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.4204</td>
<td>.7389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.9365</td>
<td>.9906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.7320</td>
<td>.5366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 21

School Board Chairpersons Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Size of School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>&lt;1,000</th>
<th>1,000-4,999</th>
<th>5,000-9,999</th>
<th>10,000 or more</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.9831</td>
<td>.4054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.6506</td>
<td>.5847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.3097</td>
<td>.2778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.6922</td>
<td>.5593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.4067</td>
<td>.2484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
null hypothesis 9 is retained.

Research Question 5c

Do any of the following variables appear to affect the perceptions of the school board chairperson? c. Formal education completed.

Null Hypothesis 10

School board chairpersons of different levels of education will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The chairpersons' perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to educational level are shown in Table 22. There were no significant differences in any of the four Areas of Governance or the total score for the educational level ranges high school, some college, Bachelors degree, Masters degree, Doctorate degree, other for chairpersons. Therefore, null hypothesis 10 is retained.

Research Question 5d

Do any of the following variables appear to affect the perceptions of the school board chairperson? d. Number of years served as a school board member.

Null Hypothesis 11

School board chairpersons of different number of years served in office will not differ significantly in their
Table 22

School Board Chairpersons Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Bachelors Degree</th>
<th>Masters Degree</th>
<th>Doctorate Degree</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.0943</td>
<td>.3708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.0899</td>
<td>.3720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.3864</td>
<td>.8566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.0447</td>
<td>.0805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.7621</td>
<td>.5804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The chairpersons' perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to number of years of experience are shown in Table 23. There were no significant differences in any of the four Areas of Governance or the total score for the years of experience ranges 0-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, greater than 24 for superintendents. Therefore, null hypothesis 11 is retained.

Research Question 5e

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the school board chairperson? e. Existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board

Null Hypothesis 12

There will be no significant difference in the school board chairpersons perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards considering the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and school board.

The chairpersons perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to the existence of board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the
### Table 23

School Board Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Converted Means by Years of Experience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>20 -24</td>
<td>&gt;24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.0729</td>
<td>.3825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.9257</td>
<td>.0987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.4486</td>
<td>.8129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.4445</td>
<td>.8161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.8671</td>
<td>.5081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 24

School Board Chairpersons Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Existence of Clearly Written Board Policies Defining the Functions and Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Converted Means by Existence of Policies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems With Policies</td>
<td>Systems Without Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>6.1402</td>
<td>.0154*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.6484</td>
<td>.1072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.1788</td>
<td>.6736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.3237</td>
<td>.1310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.9125</td>
<td>.0519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
school board are shown in Table 24. There was a significant difference in the administration Area of Governance.

Chairpersons from systems with policies differed significantly with chairpersons from systems without policies in the administration Area of Governance. Therefore, null hypothesis 12 is rejected. Chairpersons from systems without policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board felt they were more responsible for making decisions in the area of Administration than chairpersons from systems with the policies.

Research Question 5f

Do any of the following variables appear to effect the perceptions of the school board chairperson? f. Elected versus school board appointed superintendent status

Null Hypothesis 13

School board chairpersons from systems where the superintendents are elected versus school board appointed will not differ significantly in their perceptions of the functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards.

The chairpersons perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in relation to elected versus appointed superintendent status is shown in Table 25. There was a significant difference in the personnel Area of Governance and the total score.
Table 25

School Board Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Responsibilities of the Superintendent and the School Board in Relation to Elected Versus Appointed Superintendent Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>School Board Appointed</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.5162</td>
<td>.0874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.4129</td>
<td>.2490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>15.9101</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.0355</td>
<td>.1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>6.7792</td>
<td>.0021*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Chairpersons from systems that appointed superintendents differed significantly with chairpersons from systems with elected superintendents in the personnel Area of Governance and the total score. Therefore, null hypothesis 13 is rejected. Chairpersons from systems with elected superintendents felt they were more responsible for making decisions for personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than chairpersons from systems with school board appointed superintendents.

**Summary**

The responses to the questionnaire were analyzed both from the number of responses and the contents of the response. The demographic data (i.e., age, sex, size of the school district, educational level, time superintendent has served in the present school district, existence of written board policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus appointed superintendent status) for superintendents and school board chairpersons for the study were similar except for their education level.

The analysis of the data for research question 1 and 2 showed the means of the perceptions of the superintendents and school board chairpersons for the four Areas of Governance fell in the range three; the school board and the superintendent are equally responsible. However, the means for the chairpersons in the area of finance fell in range
two; the school board is primarily responsible.

The analysis of the data for research question 3 and null hypothesis 1 showed there was a significant difference in the perceptions of superintendents and school board chairpersons in the area of administration, finance, personnel, and total score. Null hypothesis 1 was rejected.

In summary to the questions and null hypotheses of whether demographic factors affect the perceptions of superintendents, the demographic factors that affect superintendents perceptions significantly were found in two demographic factors: Educational level and elected versus appointed superintendent status. Of the two significant demographic variables, the Areas of Governance that repeatedly affect superintendents' perceptions are Personnel and Total score.

In summary to the questions and null hypotheses of whether demographic factors affect the perceptions of chairpersons, the demographic factors that affect chairpersons perceptions significantly were found in two demographic areas: The existence of written policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board and elected versus appointed superintendent status. Of the two significant demographic variables, the Areas of Governance that affect chairpersons perceptions are Administration, Personnel and Total score. Null hypotheses 4, 7, 12, and 13 were rejected.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to determine if differences exist between the superintendents and the school board chairpersons of Tennessee, in regard to the perceived functions and responsibilities of each group. The study also attempted to determine if factors such as age, size of the school district, educational level of the superintendent and the school board member, years of service as superintendent or as a board member, the existence of clearly written board policies defining the functions and responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus school board appointed superintendent status has any effect on the perceived functions and responsibilities of superintendents and school boards in Tennessee.

A review of literature indicated that there was a vague working relationship between school boards and superintendents. The rapid rise to prominence of the superintendents weakening of control of local school boards has created an unsteady relationship. Due to the lack of definition of responsibilities on the federal, state and local levels, school board members and their superintendents must communicate effectively to each other their functions
and responsibilities.

Superintendents and school board chairpersons from 139 public school systems in Tennessee were surveyed over a five week period using a questionnaire that contained eight demographic items and 27 issues on which school boards and superintendents are expected to make decisions. Responses were received from 88% of the superintendents and 67% of the school board chairpersons. The responses were keyed into the computer and statistical calculations were performed using SPSS/PC+ software.

The results were tabulated and analyzed and where appropriate null hypotheses were tested. Findings and conclusions were compiled from the results. The study was concluded with recommendations for further research.

Findings

The following findings are based upon the data reported in Chapter Three and Four of this study.

1. The percentages of Tennessee superintendents and school board chairpersons are very similar regarding such demographic factors as: age, sex, size of the school systems, years in office, length of time the superintendent has served in the present system, systems with policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board, and elected versus appointed superintendent status.

2. Tennessee superintendents and school board
chairpersons are most different regarding education level.

3. Superintendents and school board chairpersons are significantly different in their perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in three of the four Areas of Governance (i.e., different in the areas of administration, finance, and personnel). The two groups are significantly different when the four areas are combined for the total score.

4. Superintendents perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board were affected by two demographic characteristics; educational level and elected versus school board appointed superintendent status. The Areas of Governance that were affected by educational level and elected versus appointed school board appointed superintendent status were personnel and the total score. Superintendents with doctoral degrees assumed more responsibility for making decisions in personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than superintendents with masters degree or a specialists degree. Superintendents who were school board appointed assumed greater responsibility for making decisions in personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than superintendents who were elected.

5. School board chairpersons perceptions of the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board were affected by two demographic characteristics; the
existence of board policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board and elected versus school board appointed superintendent status. The Area of Governance that was affected by existence of board policies was administration and the Areas of Governance that were affected by elected versus school board appointed superintendent status were personnel and the total score. Chairpersons from systems without policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board felt they were more responsible for making decisions in the area of Administration than chairpersons from systems with the policies. Chairpersons from systems with elected superintendents felt they were more responsible for making decisions for personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than chairpersons from systems with school board appointed superintendents.

Conclusions

Based on the data and the findings of this study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Superintendents and school board chairpersons believe that each group should have the responsibility to make decisions in the areas of Administration, Finance, Personnel and for all four Areas of Governance; however, superintendents believe slightly stronger that they should be more responsible for making decisions in these areas.

2. Age of superintendents is not a significant factor
as to how they perceive their responsibilities and the school boards responsibilities.

3. Size of the school district does not determine how superintendents perceive their responsibilities and the school boards responsibilities.

4. Years of experience does not determine how superintendents perceive their responsibilities and the school boards responsibilities.

5. Superintendents with a doctoral degree assume more responsibility for making decisions in personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than superintendents with a masters or specialists degrees.

6. The existence of written board policies does not determine how superintendents and the school board chairperson perceive their responsibilities.

7. Superintendents from systems that are school board appointed believe they should assume greater responsibility for making decisions in personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than superintendents from systems that are elected.

8. The age of school board chairpersons is not a significant factor as to how they perceive the school boards responsibilities and the superintendents responsibilities.

9. The size of the school district is not a factor as to how chairpersons and superintendents perceive their responsibilities.
10. Years of experience does not determine how chairpersons perceive the school boards responsibilities and the superintendents responsibilities.

11. Educational level of chairpersons is not a factor as to how they perceive the school boards responsibilities and the superintendents responsibilities.

12. Chairpersons from systems without policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board are more responsible for making decisions in the area of Administration than chairpersons from systems with the policies.

13. Chairpersons from systems with elected superintendents are more responsible for making decisions in personnel matters and in the total score of all Areas of Governance than chairpersons from systems with school board appointed superintendents.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Research similar to that presented in this study should be conducted with other groups such as central administrative staff, building administrators and faculty.

2. Considering the differences found in the perceived responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board in the areas of administration, finance, and personnel; it is recommended that workshops be established by the
professional organizations to address these issues.

3. Research should be conducted to develop an evaluation instrument for the board to use in evaluating themselves and the superintendent regarding the responsibilities of each group.

4. Research on school board chairpersons' and superintendents' perceptions regarding the responsibilities of each group in each of the states will provide more definitive information. Comparing board chairpersons' and superintendents' perceptions across states or regions of the United States can provide a better understanding of the perceptions of school boards and superintendents regarding responsibility.

5. Superintendent preparation and training programs should include school board-superintendent relationships and include defining the responsibilities of each group.

6. School Board member preparation and training programs should include school board-superintendent relationships and include defining the responsibilities of each group.

7. All Tennessee school boards should adopt clearly written board policies defining the responsibilities of the superintendent and the school board.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE QUESTIONNAIRE
April 21, 1991

Dr. Marlene M. Seder
20 Tanglewood Drive
Norwich, CT. 06360

Dear Dr. Seder:

I am a doctoral graduate student in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at East Tennessee State University. I plan to study the responsibilities of school boards and superintendents as perceived by the superintendent and school board president in the state of Tennessee.

Your permission is requested to use the questionnaire from your 1968 research entitled "Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire," in a proposal I am submitting for my Doctoral Dissertation. I would also like to request any validity and reliability information you may be able to furnish regarding the questionnaire.

Your approval of this request is most important to the study. I assure you that proper acknowledgements will be given to you in the study and a copy of my dissertation will be forwarded to you upon completion.

Sincerely,

Lynn Scott

Lynn Scott
511 Jobe Road
Elizabethton, Tn.
37643
(615)543-1130
APPENDIX B

LETTER GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE QUESTIONNAIRE
May 12, 1992

Lynn Scott
511 Jobe Road
Elizabethton, TN 37643

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am delighted you chose to further the study of the responsibilities of superintendents and school board members. You have my permission to use the questionnaire I used in my research entitled, "Separation of Responsibilities Between School Board Members and Superintendents."

The questionnaire is enclosed. Good luck in your research.

Sincerely,

Marlene Seder, Ph.D.

MS/ft
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTERS SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS
AND SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS
Dear Superintendent,

I am currently researching the topic "Functions and Responsibilities of Superintendents and School Boards in Tennessee." It is my intent to survey all Tennessee Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons to determine their perceptions of the Superintendents and School Boards responsibilities.

Please help by ensuring that the survey is completed and returned in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Note that the questionnaire is coded to allow tracking of returns, each questionnaire will be held confidential.

Your answers on the enclosed questionnaire are important to the study. Your judgement should be based on your own perceptions, experience, and preference.

Thank you in advance for sharing your response.

Sincerely,

Lynn Scott
Doctoral student
East Tennessee State University.
Dear Board Chairperson,

I am currently researching the topic "Functions and Responsibilities of Superintendents and School Boards in Tennessee." It is my intent to survey all Tennessee Superintendents and School Board Chairpersons to determine their perceptions of the Superintendents and School Boards responsibilities.

Please help by ensuring that the survey is completed and returned in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Note that the questionnaire is coded to allow tracking of returns, each questionnaire will be held confidential.

Your answers on the enclosed questionnaire are important to the study. Your judgement should be based on your own perceptions, experience, and preference.

Thank you in advance for sharing your response.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lynn Scott
Doctoral student
East Tennessee State University.
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS
TENNESSEE SURVEY OF SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS

AND SUPERINTENDENTS

PART I - RESPONSIBILITY SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: LISTED ARE 27 ISSUES ON WHICH SCHOOL BOARDS AND SUPERINTENDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MAKE DECISIONS. FOR EACH ISSUE, PLEASE INDICATE WHO IN YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM ACTUALLY DECIDES ON THAT ISSUE. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ANSWER BY CIRCLING A NUMBER FROM ONE TO FIVE. NOTE: CONSIDER THE NEW STATE LAWS AS THEY EFFECT YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM WHEN RESPONDING TO THE ISSUES INVOLVING PERSONNEL.

1. The school board is **totally** responsible.
2. The school board is **primarily** responsible.
3. The school board and the superintendent are **equally** responsible.
4. The superintendent is **primarily** responsible.
5. The superintendent is **totally** responsible.

Example:

Issue. Setting school attendance boundaries

The circled answer in this sample question indicates that the superintendent is **primarily** responsible for setting attendance boundaries in the school system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accept or reject a request from a specific non-school group to use school facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decide how to spend $100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hire legal counsel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establish line-item budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Negotiate for the school system at upcoming employee contract talks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide orientation for new school board members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Talk to the press after a drug search at a school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Decide which courses to cut from the curriculum to meet budget demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Appoint a deputy superintendent
10. Select textbooks for use in the school system
11. Authorize specific expenditures from allocated funds
12. Appoint people to serve on citizen advisory committees
13. Determine what items will be included on the school board agenda
14. Determine which school building to close due to declining enrollment
15. Determine the grade organization of the school system
16. Transfer a principal from one school to another
17. Award contracts to vendors
18. Decide which extracurricular activities the schools will offer
19. Appoint a principal
20. Decide individual school bus routes
21. Promote a teacher to be assistant principal
22. Transfer a student from one school to another
23. Fire the school system's budget director
24. Decide which staff members report directly to the school board
25. Appoint a basketball coach
26. Set school attendance limits
27. Decide where to deposit school system funds

ADAPTED FROM SEDER (1991) WITH PERMISSION
PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF AND YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM.

1. YOUR AGE: _____

2. YOUR SEX: _____ MALE  _____ FEMALE

3. WHAT IS THE STUDENT ENROLLMENT OF YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM?  
   (Check one.)
   _____ fewer than 1,000  _____ 5,000 to 9,999
   _____ 1,000 to 4,999  _____ 10,000 or more

4. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN A SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS?  
   _____ YEARS

5. HOW MANY YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED?  
   (Check one.)
   _____ BACHELOR'S DEGREE  _____ SPECIALIST'S DEGREE
   _____ MASTER'S DEGREE  _____ DOCTORATE DEGREE

6. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU SERVED AS SUPERINTENDENT IN YOUR PRESENT SCHOOL SYSTEM?  
   _____ YEARS

7. DOES YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM HAVE CLEARLY DEFINED BOARD POLICIES DEFINING THE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AND THE SCHOOL BOARD?  
   (Check one.)
   _____ YES  _____ NO

8. HOW DOES THE SUPERINTENDENT IN YOUR SYSTEM GAIN OFFICE?  
   (Check one.)
   _____ ELECTED  _____ APPOINTED BY THE BOARD
   _____ OTHER

PLEASE SEND THE COMPLETED SURVEY IN THE RETURN ENVELOPE PROVIDED. 
THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. 
LYNN SCOTT  511 JOBE ROAD  ELIZABETHTON, TENNESSEE  37643
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS
TENNESSEE SURVEY OF SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS
AND SUPERINTENDENTS

PART I - RESPONSIBILITY SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: LISTED ARE 27 ISSUES ON WHICH SCHOOL BOARDS AND SUPERINTENDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MAKE DECISIONS. FOR EACH ISSUE, PLEASE INDICATE WHO IN YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM ACTUALLY DECIDES ON THAT ISSUE. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR ANSWER BY CIRCLING A NUMBER FROM ONE TO FIVE. NOTE: CONSIDER THE NEW STATE LAWS AS THEY EFFECT YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM WHEN RESPONDING TO THE ISSUES INVOLVING PERSONNEL.

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

Example:

Issue. Setting school attendance boundaries 1 2 3 4 5

The circled answer in this sample question indicates that the superintendent is primarily responsible for setting attendance boundaries in the school system

ISSUE

1. Accept or reject a request from a specific non-school group to use school facilities 1 2 3 4 5
2. Decide how to spend $100,000. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Hire legal counsel 1 2 3 4 5
4. Establish line-item budgets 1 2 3 4 5
5. Negotiate for the school system at upcoming employee contract talks 1 2 3 4 5
6. Provide orientation for new school board members 1 2 3 4 5
7. Talk to the press after a drug search at a school 1 2 3 4 5
8. Decide which courses to cut from the curriculum to meet budget demands 1 2 3 4 5
9. Appoint a deputy superintendent
10. Select textbooks for use in the school system
11. Authorize specific expenditures from allocated funds
12. Appoint people to serve on citizen advisory committees
13. Determine what items will be included on the school board agenda
14. Determine which school building to close due to declining enrollment
15. Determine the grade organization of the school system
16. Transfer a principal from one school to another
17. Award contracts to vendors
18. Decide which extracurricular activities the schools will offer
19. Appoint a principal
20. Decide individual school bus routes
21. Promote a teacher to be assistant principal
22. Transfer a student from one school to another
23. Fire the school system's budget director
24. Decide which staff members report directly to the school board
25. Appoint a basketball coach
26. Set school attendance limits
27. Decide where to deposit school system funds

ADAPTED FROM SEDER (1991) WITH PERMISSION
PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF AND YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM.

1. YOUR AGE: _____

2. YOUR SEX: _____ MALE _____ FEMALE

3. WHAT IS THE STUDENT ENROLLMENT OF YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM? (Check one.)
   _____ fewer than 1,000  _____ 5,000 to 9,999
   _____ 1,000 to 4,999  _____ 10,000 or more

4. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER? _____ YEARS

5. HOW MANY YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION HAVE YOU COMPLETED? (Check one.)
   _____ HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA  _____ MASTER'S DEGREE
   _____ SOME COLLEGE, BUT NO DEGREE  _____ DOCTORATE DEGREE
   _____ BACHELOR'S DEGREE  _____ OTHER

6. HOW MANY YEARS HAS YOUR PRESENT SUPERINTENDENT SERVED IN YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM? _____ YEARS

7. DOES YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM HAVE CLEARLY DEFINED BOARD POLICIES DEFINING THE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AND THE SCHOOL BOARD? (Check one.)
   _____ YES  _____ NO

8. HOW DOES THE SUPERINTENDENT IN YOUR SYSTEM GAIN OFFICE? (Check one.)
   _____ ELECTED  _____ APPOINTED BY THE BOARD
   _____ OTHER

PLEASE SEND THE COMPLETED SURVEY IN THE RETURN ENVELOPE PROVIDED. THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.
APPENDIX F

FOLLOW UP LETTERS SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRPERSONS
Dear Superintendent,

A few weeks ago you received a questionnaire from me regarding responsibilities of school boards and superintendents in Tennessee. The returns of the questionnaires from superintendents have been excellent; however, I have not received your questionnaire. It is important that your system be included in the study.

Please take five minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible in the stamped envelope provided. I assure you each questionnaire will be held confidential.

Thank you in advance for sharing your response.

Sincerely,

Lynn Scott
Doctoral student
East Tennessee State University
Dear Board Chairperson,

A few weeks ago you received a questionnaire from me regarding responsibilities of school boards and superintendents in Tennessee. The returns of the questionnaires from board chairpersons have been excellent; however, I have not received your questionnaire. It is important that your system be included in the study.

Please take five minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible in the stamped envelope provided. I assure you each questionnaire will be held confidential.

Thank you in advance for sharing your response.

Sincerely,

Lynn Scott
Doctoral student
East Tennessee State University
APPENDIX G

TABLE DETERMINING SAMPLE SIZE
### Selection of Sample Size

Confidence Level = 95%

\[ N = \frac{n_{pq}}{(N-1)\times \frac{s^2}{n_{pq}}} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N (Sample Size)</th>
<th>Degree of Accuracy (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITA
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Steven Lynn Scott

Personal Data:  
Date of Birth:  December 17, 1948  
Place of Birth:  Elizabethton, Tennessee  
Age:  43  
Wife:  Sharon Scott  
Children:  Steven Scott

Educational Data:  
Happy Valley High School, Elizabethton, Tennessee, 1966  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; Geography, B.S., 1973  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; Educational Administration, M.A., 1975  
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, Ed.D., 1992

Professional Experience:  
Teacher, Gap Creek Elementary School; Elizabethton, Tennessee, 1973-1975  
Guidance Counselor, Happy Valley High School; Elizabethton, Tennessee, 1975-1981  
Guidance Counselor, Cloudland High School; Roan Mountain, Tennessee, 1983-1984  
Director of Vocational and Adult Education, Elizabethton High School; Elizabethton, Tennessee, 1985-1992

Professional Licenses:  
Secondary Teacher, Secondary Guidance Counselor, Secondary Principal, Secondary Supervisor of Instruction, Supervisor of Attendance, Vocational Director, Superintendent

Parents:  
Vera A. Scott  
Sam L. Scott (deceased)