

ATTITUDES ON EDUCATIONAL CONCEPTS  
OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
AND SUPERINTENDENTS AND  
SUPERINTENDENT  
JOB STRESS

By

PAMELA CANADA BECK

Bachelor of Arts  
Oklahoma Baptist University  
Shawnee, Oklahoma  
1978

Master of Education  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma  
1982

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1987

Thesis  
1987D  
B393a  
cop. 2



ATTITUDES ON EDUCATIONAL CONCEPTS  
OF OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS  
AND SUPERINTENDENTS AND  
SUPERINTENDENT  
JOB STRESS

Thesis Approved:

*Arnold L. Bass*

Thesis Adviser

*Kenneth H. Clair*

*Donald J. Smith*

*Permon J. Joice*

*Norman N. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

## PREFACE

To my major adviser, Dr. Gerald Bass, I would like to express my sincere appreciation for his patience, encouragement, and unwavering confidence. Appreciation is also extended to the members of my committee, Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Dr. Thomas Smith, and Dr. Vernon Troxel, who so willingly shared of their expert advice and experience.

A special note of thanks to my friend and graduate school colleague, Ann Davis, who drove us hundreds of miles to Stillwater each week while she let me sleep. Her dedication and inspiration were invaluable.

Finally, to my husband and mentor, Dr. Wesley Beck, I wish to express my gratitude and admiration. Without his wisdom, support, and personal sacrifice, this program could not have been completed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Problem . . . . .	3
Hypotheses. . . . .	4
Significance of the Study . . . . .	4
Purpose of the Study. . . . .	5
Limitations . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
Summary . . . . .	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	9
Historical Perspectives . . . . .	9
Board Member Qualifications . . . . .	16
Board Member Functions. . . . .	19
Board Member-Superintendent Relationships . . . . .	21
The Dynamics of Managerial Stress . . . . .	25
III. METHODOLOGY. . . . .	30
Research Questions. . . . .	31
Population and Sample . . . . .	31
Instrumentation . . . . .	34
Administering, Scoring & Processing Data. . . . .	36
Summary . . . . .	42
IV. DATA ANALYSIS. . . . .	43
Findings. . . . .	43
Demographic Data. . . . .	53
Summary . . . . .	64
V. SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	66
Summary . . . . .	66
Observations. . . . .	69
Conclusions . . . . .	70
Recommendations . . . . .	73

Chapter	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	75
APPENDIXES. . . . .	79
APPENDIX A - MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY . . . . .	80
APPENDIX B - OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD ATTITUDINAL SURVEY. . . . .	85
APPENDIX C - OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD ATTITUDINAL SURVEY SCORING KEY . . . . .	90
APPENDIX D - CORRESPONDENCE. . . . .	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Summary of Data Concerning The Population and Stratified Random Sample. . . . .	33
II. Range of Responses for Subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory . . . . .	41
III. Summary of Returned Questionnaires and Usable Returns By District Size . . . . .	45
IV. Mean Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey Scores . . . . .	47
V. Two-Way ANOVA Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey Scores By School District Size . . . . .	48
VI. Total Sample Mean Board Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey Discrepancy Scores and Maslach Burnout Inventory Subscale Scores . . . . .	50
VII. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey Discrepancy Scores and Mean Maslach Burnout Inventory Scores. . . . .	51
VIII. Board Member Age. . . . .	54
IX. Board Member Gender . . . . .	54
X. Board Member Race . . . . .	55
XI. Board Member Educational Level. . . . .	56
XII. Board Member Hometown Size. . . . .	57
XIII. Board Member Income (In Thousands). . . . .	58
XIV. Board Member Occupation . . . . .	58
XV. Board Member Years Living In Community . . . . .	59

Table	Page
XVI. Board Members Having Children In Schools. . . . .	59
XVII. Superintendent Gender . . . . .	60
XVIII. Superintendent Race . . . . .	61
XIX. Superintendent Age. . . . .	61
XX. Superintendent Degrees Received . . . . .	62
XXI. Superintendent Years Service. . . . .	63
XXII. Mean Number of Superintendents During Past Ten Years . . . . .	64

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In the best-run school systems, board of education members and superintendents share energies, expectations, and mutual goals (Bennett, 1984). This compatible relationship is achieved when there exists a congruence of attitudes between superintendents and board of education members regarding educational issues. However, attitudinal incongruence between superintendents and board of education members is reportedly widespread, including even disagreement over the legitimacy of their intended roles (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, & Usdan, 1975).

Most analysts agree that the primary responsibility of the board of education is to make policy (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983) and the primary role of the superintendent is to administer that policy (American Association of School Administrators, 1982). However, results of a nationwide survey by Alvey (1985) indicate that school board members and superintendents are experiencing a "tug-o-war" in trying to capture more power in administrative and policy-making functions. School board members have expressed a desire for more administrative authority and superintendents have appeared reluctant to abdicate any of their responsibilities

in that area. Instead of pursuing legitimate policy-making activities, school board members are reportedly seeking to enter the administrative arena. Although boards of education are generally empowered to act only as a unit (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983), board members individually attempt to handle complaints and personnel matters and in so doing, they undermine the superintendent's authority and prestige (Kindred, 1976).

"The question always seems to be one of power" between board members and superintendents, and "it is the full-time job holder whose position has the underlying insecurities attached, not the part-time boardsman" (Blumberg, 1985a, p. 83). Board of education members appear to have little to lose in their quest for increasing scope of administrative authority. School superintendents are likely to lose a great deal in this struggle to delineate respective roles.

As Kerr (1964) found in his study, school boards serve to "legitimatize" policies of school administrators to the public, not to represent the public to the school during the decision-making process. Zeigler and Tucker (1977) argued that the educational program, the foundation of educational policy-making, was the first area to be delegated by the board to the superintendent. The superintendent's technical knowledge has led to board members' habitual deference of educational policy formation to that expertise (Cistone, 1975). It has been found, then, that school board members exercise administrative functions in personnel, curricular,

administrative, and fiscal areas, while superintendents are dominating all other phases of the policy-making process (Alvey, 1985).

This misinterpretation of respective duties may emerge from the differences in attitudes on educational concepts by board members and superintendents. Attitudinal discrepancies might create conflict among board members and superintendents, resulting in high levels of managerial stress.

#### Problem

The relationship between superintendents and school board members is marked by severe conflict (Blumberg, 1985a; Cuban, 1985). Conflict creates high levels of job stress among top level managers, which reduces productivity and contributes to major health-related disorders (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Research on board member-superintendent relationships indicates that individual school board member's attitudes are one of the major problems superintendents face in trying to fulfill their role expectations as chief school officers (Barnard, 1968; Gross, 1958).

In reviewing the literature, one finds a lack of information to assist the practicing superintendent in identifying the causes of superintendent-board member conflict. No evidence was found to indicate the manner in which differences in attitudes on educational concepts

affect superintendent-board member relationships. There was also no indication of the manner in which differences in attitudes on educational concepts between superintendents and board members impact levels of superintendent job stress.

### Hypotheses

The null forms of the basic hypotheses for testing are as follow.

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes on educational concepts of board of education members and of superintendents in the State of Oklahoma.
2. There is no significant difference by school district size between attitudes on educational concepts of board of education members and of superintendents in the State of Oklahoma.
3. There is no significant relationship between the discrepancy scores of board of education members and superintendents on educational concepts and the level of superintendent job stress in the State of Oklahoma.

### Significance of The Study

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, and Snoek (1964) argued that individuals in work organizations occupy positions which are associated with sets of activities that include interactions with others. These activities and interactions determine the role of the individual who occupies a position. Because

the occupant's behavior is dependent upon interaction, role expectations for appropriate behavior are determined predominantly by demands, expectations, and attitudes of others within the organization. Conflict emerges when the attitudes and expectations of the occupant are incompatible with those of the others in the role set. Conflict, therefore, is a major source of tension and psychological stress among occupants within an organization. In 1972, Hall's studies provided evidence of the effects of uncertainty and role-related conflict in producing managerial job dissatisfaction, turnover, and tension.

It is evident in the literature that superintendents as occupants within an organization must share similar attitudes and expectations with their board of education members or risk the hazards of job stress. If that is indeed true, by determining the differences in attitudes on educational concepts among superintendents and board of education members, superintendents will be able to identify potential sources of conflict. Through this identification process, superintendents might be able to modify their attitudinal perceptions and/or leadership style to achieve congruence with board members or seek another position.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the responses of superintendents and board of education members on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey, indicating their

attitudes toward educational concepts. The data were then analyzed to see if there was a difference between attitudes on educational concepts for superintendents and for board of education members according to school district size. Finally, the data were studied to see if there was a significant relationship between discrepancy scores for board of education members and superintendents and the level of superintendent job stress as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

#### Limitations

This study was limited to the population of superintendents and board of education members in the independent school districts in the State of Oklahoma. In Oklahoma, independent school districts are those political subdivisions created to be fiscally independent agencies which operate a K-12 public school system, governed by a locally-elected board of education.

The use of the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey has not been field tested as a correlational instrument. It was designed to measure Oklahoma school board members' attitudes toward educational concepts. Additional information on the two instruments used in this study is provided in Chapter III.

Both the nature of the study, superintendent-school board conflict, and the sensitivity of some of the items on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey may contribute

to a limited return of instruments. In addition, there is a tendency among respondents to provide "expected" responses to an instrument.

### Definition of Terms

#### Board of education member

A board of education member is one of the elected directors who collectively constitute the governing board of an independent school district. In Oklahoma, such members are elected to a five-year term of office. The terms "school board members" and "board of education members" are used interchangeably in this study.

#### Superintendent

The superintendent is the chief executive officer charged with the administrative duties of operating an independent school district. The superintendent must be certified by the State of Oklahoma and hired by the local board of education.

#### Conflict

The state which arises from incompatible goals, scarcity of resources, and misperceptions; participants seek to achieve gains at the expense of others who are seen as competitors or combatants (Cuban, 1985, p. 30).

## Job stress

According to Maslach and Jackson (1981), job stress is a syndrome of burnout resulting in emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and negative personal attitudes created by intense interaction with other people in the job setting. The consequence of job stress is a factor in job turnover, absenteeism, and low morale.

### Summary

This chapter has provided an introduction to the problem of identifying attitudinal differences between superintendents and school board members and the impact of such differences on levels of superintendent job stress. Chapter II will provide a review of the relevant literature including an historical perspective of the roles of superintendents and board of education members, board member qualifications and functions, the nature of board member-superintendent relationships, and the dynamics of managerial stress. An overview of the methodology is provided in Chapter III. Included in that overview are descriptions of the instruments and a detailed plan for the collection, tabulation, and analysis of data. Chapter IV reports the data and analysis, while the final chapter provides a summary as well as the researcher's conclusions and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Historical Perspectives

The American boards of education exemplify democratic foundations reflective of local control grounded in state statutes. From the time the Pilgrims landed in the New World the people of this nation have struggled to provide schooling for their youth (National School Boards Association, 1982). As early as 1642, the Massachusetts General Court articulated its desire that all citizens should become literate so that they could understand the Bible and colonial laws. The Massachusetts School Ordinance of 1642 historically embedded the notion that the responsibility for education was the "townsmen's." The Ordinance decreed as follows:

This court, taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and masters in training up their children in learning and labor, . . . do hereupon order and decree that in every town the chosen men appointed for managing the prudent affairs of the same shall henceforth stand charged with the care of the redress of evil, so as they shall be sufficiently punished by fines for the neglect thereof upon presentment of the grand jury, or any other information or complaint in any court within this jurisdiction; and for this end they, or the greater number of them, shall have

the power to take account from time to time of all parents and masters, and of their children, concerning their calling and employment of their children (Campbell et al., 1975, p. 584).

The control of education was both an administrative and legislative function of the townsmen. They made "policies" as townsmen or through town meetings, determining such school-related issues as levies, teachers and wages, the length of the school year, and housing (Reeves, 1954). The Massachusetts School Ordinance of 1647 further ordered:

1. That every town having fifty householders should at once appoint a teacher of reading and writing, and provide for his wages in such a manner as the town might determine; and,
2. That every town having one hundred householders must provide a grammar school to fit youths for the university, under a penalty for failure to do so (Ashby, 1968, p. 8).

The ordinances passed in Massachusetts became models for other colonial legislatures and provided means for tax assessments and mandatory attendance policies that implied, "an educated citizenry is imperative if representative democracy is to survive" (Campbell et al., 1975, p. 168).

Historian Stanley Schultz called the education act of 1789 passed in Massachusetts "the first comprehensive state school law in the new nation" (Campbell et al., 1975, p. 11). The law specified that every town was to support an elementary school and that larger towns were to support a grammar school, certify teachers, and authorize a special committee of citizens to oversee school operations. The law was later amended to make selection of a school committee a mandatory local function.

The school committees were charged with locating places to hold classes, finding willing schoolmasters who could read and write, providing food and lodging for schoolmasters, and keeping the schoolhouses in repair (National School Boards Association, 1982). They were also responsible for determining whether the schoolmasters were competent or whether they should be fired. The committeemen acted as truant officers for parents who did not send their children to school. These duties of the committeemen were time-consuming and became more difficult as city and school populations continued to grow.

In 1789, Boston created a separate school committee of twelve members who were elected by the people in order to provide a more democratic system for public school control (Campbell et al., 1975). Sam Adams, a leading advocate for democratic school governance, was concerned about the elitist tendencies of appointed committeemen and led the struggle for elected officials. Eventually, all cities and states followed Boston's example.

As school systems continued to grow they became more bureaucratic and the need for the appointment of a superintendent was inevitable. In 1837, Massachusetts created a state board of education and appointed Horace Mann as its full-time secretary (Callahan, 1974). Mann traveled all across Europe observing schools and returned to America to report that the English school system was the worst system he had encountered. He further recommended that the

American schools follow Prussia's example by employing a professional to supervise the schools instead of allowing the fragmented system provided by elected committeemen.

Mann created this transformation of leadership by encouraging fellow reformers to run for office on the school committee. They won and change was set into motion. The new committee decided to give students a written examination to measure skills as opposed to the traditional oral examination. The results of the examination were so appalling that Mann reported, "it spread the city in a general and deep feeling of sorrow and mortification," and it would be "sad indeed if these findings should die away without producing reform" (Callahan, 1974, p. 22).

The committee, with Mann's prompting, determined that the administrative organization of the schools was responsible for the poor performance by the students and the generally poor state of the schools (Callahan, 1974). They wanted to keep the elected school committee; however, they also saw that having twelve bosses created fragmented and often chaotic leadership. They sought to add elements of permanence and systematic labor by appointing an official whose duty it would be to:

. . . watch over the schools; to know the exact condition of every one, in all particulars; to bring the lagging forward; to suffer no defects; to become prescriptive; no abuses to be indurated by time; to acquire and to impart such information as shall bring all our schools to that degree of excellence which our citizens not only have a right to demand, but without which they have no right, in justice to themselves and to their children, to

satisfied. This should be his business--his whole business; and he should be adequately paid. Although chosen annually, like our masters, his tenure of office, like theirs, would be permanent. If he discharged the duties of his office acceptably; and if he did not, another should be chosen in his stead (National School Boards Association, 1982, p. 23).

With the rapid growth of cities and schools, the management function could no longer be adequately supervised by part-time elected committeemen, and the office of the school superintendent emerged (Campbell et al., 1975). Although this position became commonplace in many large urban areas, superintendents had no real authority except that delegated by boards. In fact, many school boards dealt with population expansion by hiring superintendents and simultaneously increasing board membership. Superintendents were becoming frustrated with the board members' unwillingness to relinquish any real authority (Callahan, 1974).

Superintendents during the late 1800's began openly questioning board members' authority. These administrators viewed themselves as experts and wanted to drive out the "gutter politicians" (board members) in an effort to improve the quality of education and to preserve American democracy (Callahan, 1974). John D. Philbrick, a graduate of Dartmouth and the Boston school superintendent for 21 years, prepared a report on city school systems in 1885. He openly criticized school boards as having members who used the office as a "steppingstone to coveted political places" (Callahan, 1974, p. 26).

Joseph Mayer Rice, a physician studying in Germany, became interested in education and returned to the United States to observe over 1200 teachers in 36 cities (Callahan, 1974). He contended that education was in miserable shape because of the operation of schools by school boards primarily for their own selfish or political gain. He wanted the control of the schools to be turned over to competent educators. Rice felt that the only way American schools could be salvaged was to elect a good school board who would hire a competent superintendent with "a sufficient amount of independent power to enable him to improve the schools in any manner that may to him seem fit" (Callahan, 1974, p. 19).

The Department of the Superintendence of the National Education Association responded to Rice by appointing the Committee of Fifteen to make recommendations based on Rice's findings (Callahan, 1974). The Committee also criticized school boards in the famous Draper Report.

It is not in doubt. All who have had any contact with the subject are familiar with it. It is administration by boards or committees, the members of which are not competent to manage professional matters and develop an expert teaching-force. Yet, they assume, and in most cases honestly, the knowledge of the most experienced. They override and degrade a superintendent when they have the power to do so, until he becomes their mere factotum. For the sake of harmony and the continuance of his position, he concedes, surrenders, and acquiesces in their acts, while the continually increasing teacher-force becomes weaker and weaker and the work poorer and poorer. If he refuses to do this, they precipitate an open rupture and turn him out of his position. Then they cloud the issues and shift the

responsibility from one to another. There are exceptions, of course, but these do not change the rule (Callahan, 1974 p. 30).

These criticisms did not go unchallenged. William George Bruce, founder and editor of the American School Board Journal, took exception to the Draper Report and, in one of his first editorials, accused superintendents of wanting to eliminate school boards in an unprecedented "Czar Movement."

The school superintendents of the United States gave expression at their meeting held in Cleveland last month on the organization of the city school systems. The Committee of Fifteen submitted a report through Professor Draper, of Illinois, which, in substance, calls for smaller school boards and enlarged powers for superintendents, the school board to consist of a few harmless gentlemen with merely sufficient ability to audit salary accounts and a superintendent who shall have the arbitrary power to govern the entire school system.

A feeble attempt was made by some of the superintendents to combat the report, evidently only with a view to obviate the appearance of one-sidedness, or to dispel a "cut and dried" flavor. However, they were unanimous on all the essential points and the superintendent of schools was then and there in line of promotion to be made the Czar of the American Public Schools. It seems incredible that a large body of intelligent men can assemble and deliberate in so selfish a manner, and with such utter disregard for the thousands of well meaning men who everywhere serve on boards of education, and who have loyally supported every measure in the interest of true education. They have been the mainspring of the wonderful development of the public school system.

We do not mean to underestimate the school-master's labors, but we do question the propriety of attempting to legislate out of existence the very men who have made them, and to abrogate powers to superintendents which do not belong to them, and to relegate the school boards to the function of a mere clerk. The public is not prepared for the "one man power"

idea, and we predict that it never will be (Blumberg, 1985a, pp. 23-24).

Superintendents, armed with the Draper Report, and board members, standing guard with editorials by Bruce, continued the struggle over the distinction of educational roles. Draper urged superintendents to "take up fight, to overcome the evil-disposed persons and make for righteousness," while Bruce cried for school board members to become more "magnanimous in carrying out their 'sacred trust'" (Callahan, 1974, p. 33). After 1895, signs appeared indicating that the superintendent was emerging as an educational leader with specific responsibilities for hiring teachers, selecting textbooks, and generally controlling the educational program, while there was a marked reduction in board size and separation of school governance from other local governing bodies (Campbell et al., 1975).

Superintendents and board of education members have a history of conflict in the struggle to determine their respective responsibilities for school district governance. While the superintendency in America is more than a century old, attempts to increase the professional qualifications of the position have only occurred during the past 60 years (Campbell et al., 1975). Qualifications for school board membership, however, have seen few changes over the decades.

#### Board Member Qualifications

There are over 90,000 American citizens serving on boards of education. The "average" board member profile has

remained somewhat constant during the past six decades. In 1927, Counts commented on the overrepresentation of upper-middle-class board members, who he feared would favor educational policies that "maintained that status quo at the expense of the working class" (p. 109).

The overrepresentation of the upper-middle-class board member still exists among American school boards today. The typical board member is a male college graduate, is white and middle-aged, holds a professional or managerial job, earns an income exceeding \$40,000, and was elected to his post (Alvey, Underwood, & Fortune, 1986). The qualifications for board member service are few and seem to have little effect upon creating the typical class of board membership. Qualifications typically include that the member should be of "reputable character," a resident of the district, and not a school employee (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983). Requirements for education of board members are as minimal as the qualifications and not adequate in relation to the tasks they are asked to perform (Thomas, 1985).

Board members do not know the difference between policy and administration; they consider single issues instead of looking at the total school picture; they use their membership as steppingstones to higher elected offices; they do not do their homework before meetings; they use the board meetings as platforms for their own agendas; they get too involved with personnel decisions; or worst of all, they interfere with the orderly operations of the schools" (Thomas, 1985, p. 31).

New board members in Oklahoma are now required to attend a two-day orientation workshop or its equivalent

(Oklahoma, 1986). While these sessions are not required to include formal evaluation for measuring comprehension or retention of subject matter (Ficklen, 1985), failure to comply could lead to removal from the board. The two-day workshop would not fulfill the requirements for the preparation for board members as described by Cunningham (1983).

First, I believe persons elected or appointed to school boards should have an extended period for learning about their new responsibilities before they formally assume those duties. Six months to a full year should be devoted to becoming informed about the scope of board responsibility, including its legal, moral, ethical, and substantive dimensions. Board members report over and over again that they were not prepared for the job. They say, "I didn't know enough," "I had no idea that there was so much involved," or "I feel inadequate, not up to the task" (Cunningham, 1983, p. 493).

Board members lack the leadership and planning skills needed to run a district because they have not had the necessary "corporate" training (Mahon & Jackson, 1985). By comparing boards of education with boards of large corporations, Mahon found that corporations had board members who were perpetually being trained in management, planning, and leadership skills. On the contrary, boards of education were managing multi-million-dollar businesses with no sense of urgency in acquiring appropriate training. "Baptism by fire, that's how many new school board members learn the ins and outs of board service" (Ficklen, 1985, p. 35).

Typically, board members find themselves ill-prepared to meet the assorted demands of the various publics to whom they must listen (Cistone, 1978). Instead of relying on the experience of other board members or of the superintendent, new board members tend to make their decisions strictly based on what they knew prior to assuming membership on the board.

New board members sometimes have great difficulty making a decision; they sometimes become immediate experts and begin changing things without any sense of history and sufficient factual information; they often have great difficulty differentiating between policy making and administrative roles; frequently they have great difficulty making a distinction between their legal role as board members (at legally called meetings) and their role as citizens (outside of board meetings); they sometimes become the district's ward heelers--telling everyone to call them with problems and rumors, and promising to take care of all expressed needs of every caller. Inexperienced board members often demand a great deal of information they don't know how to use once it's assembled . . . they don't know or use appropriate lines of communication; they lean toward trial-and-error problem solving; they tend to deal only with the present while neglecting the past and ignoring the future (Herman, 1980, p. 37).

#### Board Member Functions

The United States Constitution reserves to the states the power to establish and control public education. Boards of education, then, "are corporate bodies that derive their authority to organize and operate a school district from the state" (Blumberg, 1985a, p. 75). Board of education members are collectively "responsible for the district, its

policies, its budget and its program" (p. 75). As noted previously, a number of authorities consider policymaking to be the primary responsibility of the board (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983).

While the word "policy" is usually associated with descriptions of formalized, transcribed board resolutions, some boards refer to policy as rules, regulations, guidelines, or procedures (National School Boards Association, 1982). A joint definition of policy was developed by the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators.

Policies are statements which set forth the purposes and prescribe in general terms the organization and program of a school system. They create a framework within which a superintendent and his staff can discharge their assigned duties with positive direction. They tell what is wanted. They may also tell why and how much (National School Boards Association, 1982, p. 64).

The National School Boards Association (1982) also outlined what educational policies are not.

1. Policies are not detailed descriptions for operating a school system or running a particular program.
2. Policies are not a codification of practices.
3. Policies are not restatements or paraphrases of state law or regulations and guidelines issued by federal or state governments.
4. Policies are not the same as board decisions.
5. Policies are not board bylaws.
6. Policies are not job descriptions (pp. 65-66).

The National School Boards Association (1982) further recommended that boards develop and organize a process for policy-making and include the following steps:

1. Recognize the need for policy.
2. Assemble facts.
3. Get recommendations.
4. Discuss, debate, and decide on substance.
5. Draft the policy.
6. Hold a first reading, give notice.
7. Hold a second reading, adopt.
8. Decide whether to review.
9. Disseminate.
10. Enforce, evaluate, revise (pp. 68-70).

William E. Dickinson, who founded the National School Boards Association's Educational Policies Service described policy development as:

A process during which a school board brings forth its own ideas (or receives the ideas from a professional staff); then checks them, weighs them, ponders them, gets agreement on them, and finally puts them into writing for all the community to see and know (National School Boards Association, 1982, p. 68).

#### Board Member-Superintendent Relationships

It appears there is a great deal of confusion as to the respective roles of the superintendent and the board of education member. The superintendency is a political role and the politics of superintendent-board member relationships have always existed (Blumberg, 1985b; Campbell et al., 1975; Iannacone & Lutz, 1970; Wiles, Wiles, & Bondi, 1981). "A governmental unit with an elected governing board making policies cannot exist in a democracy without politics" (Iannacone & Lutz, 1970, p. 16). It is through the exercise of power by community leaders that

school superintendents and boards of education face the political realities of school governance (McCarthy & Ramsey, 1971).

The status of the superintendent is based on technical expertise, and the board of education obtains its authority through statute. Even though the board usually consists of a collection of amateurs, the board is able to ask questions of the professional and create a system for evaluation. The system sometimes breaks down because the superintendent is vulnerable to short-term demands.

The bind goes something like this: We have an expert by definition, if nothing else who cannot exercise his expertise on matters of any real substance without getting approval from a number of nonexperts (the school board) who are influenced by a host of other nonexperts (the community) (Blumberg, 1985a, p. 77).

While superintendents and board of education members seek to define their relationship and delineate their respective roles, "board members and superintendents assign greater responsibility to their own position than to the other" (Cistone, 1975, p. 116). The research seems to indicate that the ideal role descriptions of superintendents and board members do not match the real assignment of functions. Instead of pursuing legitimate policy-making activities, school board members are entering the administrative arena (Blumberg, 1985b). Furthermore, boards are empowered to act only as a unit (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983). Board members, however, attempt to individually handle complaints and personnel matters; these activities

undermine the superintendent's authority and prestige (Kindred, 1976).

Cistone (1975) found that in the past when a superintendent and board members would engage in a struggle for authority, the superintendent most often would lose the struggle and the job. Through the years, superintendents have developed skills for avoidance of such clashes. Today, chief school officers have become practiced politicians in educating and persuading board members behind the scenes where controversial issues are resolved and never brought to the forefront of public attention at monthly open meetings (McCarthy & Ramsey, 1971). In fact, many superintendents put a great deal of effort into avoiding confrontation and pressure the local school board into a state of "static-equilibrium" (Iannacone & Lutz, 1970).

Zeigler and Jennings (1974), however, found boards seldom oppose their superintendents and have virtually quit governing their school districts because of a lack of expertise. Kerr (1964) said that boards are relatively ignorant of school matters and so they serve only to legitimize administrative policy formulation. Tucker and Zeigler (1980) proposed that low public participation and high reliance on superintendents were characteristics of most school boards.

In the present technological era, school boards seem ill-equipped to face issues that are too complex for them to understand (Zeigler & Tucker, 1977) and are not prepared to

serve as effective policy-makers (Clark, 1981). Furthermore, as Kerr (1964) found in his study, school boards serve to legitimize policies of school administrators to the public and not to represent the public to the school in policy-making.

Tucker and Zeigler (1980) argued that the educational program is the foundation of educational policy-making, and yet it is the first area to be delegated by the board to the superintendent. The superintendent's technical knowledge prompts board members' habitual deference of educational policy formation to expertise (Cistone, 1975). We find, then, school board members exercising administrative functions in personnel, curriculum, administrative and fiscal areas, while superintendents are dominating all other phases of the policy-making process (Alvey, 1985).

Katz (1985) reported that boards tend to be either corporate or familial. They either behave like large corporations in a formal, systematic manner or they act like a group of family elders. He further contended that schools would run smoothly only when the superintendent and board are appropriately matched. When the board and the superintendent are mismatched, friction and conflict result (Katz, 1985). As a result of being mismatched, the internal dynamics of board of education-superintendent relationships are marked by severe conflict and board politics as a game of numbers with board members casting 3-2, 1-4 votes for or against the superintendent (Clark, 1981).

If board members and school superintendents could understand the causes of their mutual dissatisfaction, they might be able to facilitate more compatible working conditions (Katz, 1985). The business of operating a school district is so complex that board members and superintendents cannot afford to allow their working relationship to deteriorate (Campbell et al., 1975). However, if board members and superintendents continue to struggle in the quest for authority and power, as has historically been the pattern of their relationship, then schools will continue to serve as arenas of conflict and stress, with superintendents succumbing to board whims (Blumberg, 1985a).

#### The Dynamics of Managerial Stress

Evidence suggests that managerial occupations in complex organizations are a source of stress (Buck, 1972; Corlett & Richardson, 1981; Marshall & Cooper, 1979). Growler and Legge (1975) defined stress as the discrepancy between an individual's internal or external demands and that person's ability to respond to those demands. When discrepancies emerge between demands and responses, physiological changes occur. Stress is fundamentally a psychological phenomenon which is manifested through physiological changes. Kiev and Kohn (1979) characterized stress as pressure, conflict, and uncertainty over the control of events. Maslach and Jackson (1981)

conceptualized stress as burnout, which they defined as follows.

1. A syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment.
2. A progressive loss of idealism, energy, and purpose.
3. A state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion.
4. A syndrome of inappropriate attitudes toward client and self.
5. A state of exhaustion, irritability and fatigue that decreases worker effectiveness.
6. To deplete oneself, to exhaust one's mental and physical resources.
7. To wear oneself out doing what one has to do.
8. A malaise of the spirit.
9. To become debilitated, weakened, because of extreme demands.
10. A pervasive mood of anxiety giving way to depression and despair (pp. 30-31).

Cooper and Marshall (1978) studied sources of managerial and white collar stress and found that the main problems contributing to managerial stress were role ambiguity, role conflict, and responsibility. Role ambiguity occurs when the individual does not possess adequate information about the work role and there is a lack of explained expectations by superordinates. Role conflict emerges when an individual is receiving signals from two or more entities and is unable to perform based on the ambiguity of expectations. Responsibility for people involves spending more time interacting with others and, as a consequence, more time is spent trying to meet deadlines during "off" hours (French & Caplan, 1970).

Stress can be caused by too little or too much work, pressures on time, long hours, and having too many decisions to make. Poor mental health is directly correlated with poor working conditions, such as time pressures and long hours. In determining the frequency of occurrence of stress in top management, four contributing factors were found.

1. Heavy workload, pressures, unrealistic deadlines.
2. Disparity between what to do on the job and what is expected.
3. The general "political climate of the organization."
4. Lack of feedback on performance (Kiev & Kohn, 1979, p. 23).

Lack of participation in the decision-making process and a lack of superordinate support are other potential sources of stress (Brook, 1973). Another major source lies in the nature of superordinate-subordinate relationships. Stress can not only be caused by office politics and competitiveness, but it also can be caused by a lack of social support in difficult situations (Lazarus, 1966). Mistrust by persons with whom one works creates high role ambiguity and inadequate communications resulting in low job satisfaction and feelings of job-related threat (Buck, 1972; French & Caplan, 1970; Kahn et al., 1964).

When the manager is threatened, specific reactions such as the arousal of disturbing thoughts, images, negative feelings (anxiety, fear, depression), and physiological responses occur (Cooper & Marshall, 1978). An individual will select a coping response to overcome the stressor.

Short-run coping modes may include the use of alcohol, overeating, smoking, and/or repression, all of which avoid confrontation with the actual problem.

Researchers found, when using medical evidence to link certain occupations to the list of coronary-prone jobs, that it is actually possible to work oneself to death (Cooper & Marshall, 1975). Friedman and Rosenmann (1974), in their studies of emotional activities associated with coronary heart disease, divided individuals into Type A, Type B, and Type C behaviors. The Type A behavior pattern was closely associated with coronary heart disease and was specifically characterized by:

1. An intense, sustained drive to achieve self-selected but usually poorly defined goals.
2. Profound inclination and eagerness to compete.
3. Persistent desire for recognition and advancement.
4. Continuous involvement in multiple and diverse functions constantly subject to time restrictions (deadlines).
5. Habitual propensity to accelerate the rate of execution of many physical and mental tasks.
6. Extraordinary mental and physical alertness (p. 10).

Type B behavior patterns were more relaxed and "laid back," while Type C personalities were governed by chronic anxiety and insecurity.

The consequences of job stress are detrimental to the manager, the client, and the total institution. Maslach and Pines (1979) suggested that burnout can lead to a deterioration in the quality of service given to clients.

It also is directly related to physical exhaustion, insomnia, increased use of alcohol and drugs, and marital and family problems. Friedman and Rosenmann (1974) found that managers suffer from physical ailments such as ulcers and coronary heart disease which are closely linked to emotional and occupational functions. Job stress is a major contributor to absenteeism, low morale, and frequent job turnover.

It is evident from the review of the literature that superintendents, as the top-level managers in school organizations, are subject to job stress and its consequences. When superintendents and their board members do not share similar attitudes toward education, there exists a greater chance of role conflict, a lack of participation in decision-making, and increased demands on the superintendents' time. The results of job stress will likely negatively impact managerial and organizational efficiency.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research study was to examine the relationship between responses of board of education members and of superintendents on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey indicating their attitudes toward educational concepts. Further analysis was done to examine the relationship of board of education members' and superintendents' responses according to school district size. The study examined if there was a significant relationship between discrepancy scores for board of education members and superintendents and the level of superintendent job stress indicated by the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Finally, demographic data were collected for board of education members and superintendents in the sample.

This chapter contains descriptions of the population and the sample, data collection procedures, instrumentation, and the statistical procedures used in data analysis.

### Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Is there a significant difference between the attitudes on educational concepts of board of education members and of superintendents in the State of Oklahoma?
2. Is there a significant difference by school district size between attitudes on educational concepts by board of education members and of superintendents in the State of Oklahoma?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the discrepancy scores of board of education members and superintendents on educational concepts and the level of superintendent job stress in the State of Oklahoma?

### Population and Sample

The population for this study includes all of the school board members and superintendents serving independent school districts in the State of Oklahoma. The Oklahoma Educational Directory 1985-86 (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1985) was used to identify the 456 independent school districts in the state.

A stratified random sample was determined to be appropriate to this study. Gay (1981) described stratified sampling as:

. . . the process of selecting a sample so that identified groups in the population are represented proportionally to their existence in the population (p. 185).

The purpose of stratification is to define strata of school district size in order to allow the data to be analyzed in a manner so as to determine if there are significant differences based on district size in attitudes on educational issues, in the level of job stress of superintendents, or in the relationship of attitudes to job stress.

Data from the Oklahoma Educational Directory 1985-86 (Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1985) were used to define three strata for the sample. Small districts are those Oklahoma independent school districts which employ less than 25 teachers. Medium districts are those districts which employ less than 50 teachers, while large districts employ more than 50 teachers. Table I provides a summary of this information as well as the number of districts identified by the sampling process described below.

The first step in the sampling process was to identify the independent school districts of those superintendents and board of education members who comprise the sample. A table of random numbers (Jaccard, 1983) was used to select 27 school districts from each of the three strata, based on district size. The sample, then, comprises the 81 superintendents who serve in those districts and the districts' board of education members. While the number of board members in the sample was expected to be 405, based upon the typical board size of five members, the actual number in the sample could vary due to vacant board seats,

occasioned by death or resignation, or to statutory exceptions to the standard board membership.

TABLE I  
SUMMARY OF DATA CONCERNING THE POPULATION  
AND STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLE

	School District Size			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
Total Number of Oklahoma Independent School Districts	146	158	152	456
Percent of Total Independent Oklahoma School Districts	32	34	33	100
Number of Oklahoma Independent School Districts Selected in Sampling Process	27	27	27	81
Expected Number of Superintendents in the Sample	27	27	27	81
Maximum Number of Board of Education Members in the Sample	135	135	135	405

## Instrumentation

The first instrument used in this study was the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey. This 52-item, four-page survey was designed by Dr. Gary Green, an associate professor at the University of Oklahoma, to measure Oklahoma school board members' attitudes toward educational concepts. The second instrument used was the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). This 22-item inventory was designed to obtain respondents' frequency and intensity levels of job stress as measured by three components of the burnout syndrome: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment.

### Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey

The Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey (OSBAS) was developed in 1986 to measure board of education members' attitudes regarding educational concepts. The content validity of the instrument was established by a panel of three University of Oklahoma experts under the direction of Dr. Gary Green. The three panelists have all had public school administrative experience as school superintendents. The items were drawn from a review of the literature concerning the relative roles of school board members and superintendents and from the panelists' professional experiences. The panelists analyzed each item to determine

if respondents' attitudes were appropriately measured relative to each concept being considered.

The Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey is composed of a series of 16 demographic questions and 52 short, descriptive statements regarding educational concepts. This instrument offers a means to determine attitudes toward: (a) administrative policy, (b) extra-curricular activities, (c) teacher tenure, (d) negotiations, (e) merit pay, (f) basics, (g) teacher competencies, (h) staff development, (i) administrative leadership, (j) vocational education, (k) discipline, (l) grade promotional policies, and (m) graduation standards. The respondents' attitudes toward these concepts are determined by the responses on a four-point frequency scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, and (4) strongly agree.

#### Maslach Burnout Inventory

Circumstances in which a worker must deal directly with people about problematic issues create strong emotional feelings which are likely to be present in an organization. It is this sort of chronic emotional job stress that is believed to induce burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Items for the Maslach Burnout Inventory were designed to measure aspects of job stress resulting from such burnout.

An interview format was used during exploratory research preparatory to development of the instrument. The

attitudes and feeling which characterized burnout in workers were evident among people who provided services for others. Items from the exploratory research were then developed into statements which could be rated by the respondents.

The 22-item Maslach Burnout Inventory consists of statements about personal feelings or attitudes of occupants who provide service, care, or treatment for others within an organization. The term "recipients" is used in the items to refer to the people served by the occupant. Each statement is rated on two dimensions: frequency and intensity. The frequency scale is labeled at each point and ranges from 0 ("never") to 6 ("every day"). The intensity scale ranges from 0 ("never") to 7 ("major, very strong"). Because people have varying beliefs about burnout, the test form is labeled Human Services Survey, rather than Maslach Burnout Inventory, to minimize the reactive effect of such personal beliefs (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

#### Administration, Scoring, and Processing of Data

##### Administration

All superintendents in the sample were mailed a personal letter requesting their participation in a study to determine differences in attitudes toward educational concepts between superintendents and board of education members in the State of Oklahoma, and levels of

superintendent job stress resulting from attitudinal differences. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix D. A packet containing five green-colored copies and one pink-colored copy of the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey and one copy of the Maslach Burnout Inventory was enclosed with the letter. The superintendent was asked to place the item "OSU Graduate Research Questionnaire" on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled board of education meeting. The superintendent was asked to independently complete the Maslach Burnout Inventory prior to the board of education meeting. The letter contained directions for the superintendent and the board of education members to complete the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey at a specified time during the board of education meeting. Upon completion of the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey, the superintendent was to place all copies of the instruments, including the Maslach Burnout Inventory, in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope for return mailing to the researcher.

On August 15, 1986, packets were mailed to the first 51 school district superintendents selected in the sample. These 51 school districts would have provided a sufficient sample size had there been a substantial return. On September 1, 1986, a letter was mailed to each of these superintendents selected to participate in the study. The purpose of the letter was to remind superintendents of the request for their participation in the study prior to and

during the September board meeting. A copy of the letter is contained in Appendix D.

On September 15, 1986, the researcher telephoned the superintendents from the small districts who had not returned the data. At that time there was a lower rate of return for the small districts than for the medium or large districts.

Due to the low rate of return of data, packets were prepared for the remaining 30 districts of the stratified random sample. On September 19, 1986, these packets containing the introductory letter explaining the study, copies of the two instruments, and self-addressed stamped envelopes were mailed to the additional 30 (10 small, 10 medium, and 10 large) randomly-selected school districts.

On September 29, 1986, the 30 superintendents in the second group were contacted by telephone and personally invited to participate in the study during the October board of education meetings. All superintendents in the first group who had not returned the survey were also telephoned at that time.

On October 10, 1986, a total of 37 (8 small, 14 medium, and 15 large) district packets had been returned. On that date, a second complete packet containing handwritten notes, copies of the instruments, and a self-addressed stamped envelope was sent to each of the superintendents from whom a packet had not yet been returned.

## Scoring

The Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey was scored in two ways. The first method of scoring was based on a "yes" or "no" answer key developed by the panel of experts from the University of Oklahoma College of Education, under the direction of Dr. Gary Green. The panelists, using a review of current literature regarding educational concepts and their professional experience, determined the "yes" or "no" answer key for the survey instrument. This scoring is illustrated by the key in Appendix C. For the purpose of this study, total points were calculated for each of the superintendents and board of education members on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey. A mean discrepancy score was computed between superintendents and board of education members. The second method of scoring obtained a discrepancy score between responses of each superintendent and his individual board of education members in individual schools districts. A minimum of two board of education members' scores were required for calculation of discrepancy scores for responses of superintendents and of their board of education members.

The researcher determined a reliability coefficient to be significant (.16) at the .05 level using Spearman-Brown formula.

Each of the three subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory was scored on two dimensions: frequency and intensity. The emotional exhaustion subscale assessed

feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by the respondents' work. The depersonalization subscale measured an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients. The personal accomplishment subscale assessed respondents' feelings of competence and successful achievement of working with people.

Reported reliability coefficients for the subscales were as follows: .90 (frequency) and .87 (intensity) for emotional exhaustion, .79 (frequency) and .76 (intensity) for depersonalization, and .71 (frequency) and .73 (intensity) for personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Convergent validity was demonstrated with independently correlated behavior ratings, correlation of the presence of certain job characteristics, and with measures of various outcomes which have been hypothesized to be related to burnout. The six subscales are measured on continuums from high to medium to low. The ranges for each continuum are shown in Table II.

### Processing

Demographic data were collected from the superintendents' responses in conjunction with the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey provided demographic data for board of education members. The items were calculated by the researcher to determine the frequency and percent of sample by response code.

TABLE II  
RANGE OF RESPONSES FOR SUBSCALES OF  
MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

Variable	High	Moderate	Low
EEF	30 or over	18 to 29	0 to 17
EEI	40 or over	26 to 39	0 to 25
DPF	12 or over	6 to 11	0 to 5
DPI	15 or over	7 to 14	0 to 6
PAF	0 to 33	34 to 39	40 or over
PAI	0 to 36	37 to 43	44 or over

The correlational method of data analysis was used to indicate the degree of relationship between two variables and to suggest a cause-effect relationship. The two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a frequently used procedure for measuring three or more independent samples and is referred to as being contingency-based for computing cell frequencies (Huck, Corimer, & Bounds, 1974). Therefore, this statistical technique was used to determine the relationship between superintendent-board member attitudes toward educational concepts according to school district size.

The ANOVA was calculated with the OSBAS total scores as the dependent variable, with school district size and board

member-superintendent discrepancy scores being the independent variables. The OSBAS and the MBI questionnaires were grouped by district and scored. A total score on the OSBAS was calculated using the scoring key shown in Appendix C.

Total scores on the OSBAS were calculated for the superintendent and each board of education member for each district. Discrepancy scores (D) between board members and superintendents were calculated for each district and then correlated with the superintendents' MBI scores. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the relationship between attitudinal discrepancies and superintendent job stress and was measured against the .05 confidence level.

All the data were entered into the HP/3000 Spring-Release computer at the Northeastern State University computer center. The analysis utilized the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).

#### Summary

Chapter III has described and reported the methodology used in selecting the sample from the population, the administration, scoring, and processing of data, and the instrumentation used for data collection. Chapter IV is designed to present the analysis of these data.

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a detailed description of the statistical treatment of the data and a statement of the results. A comparison will be made of the scores of superintendents and board of education members on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey. The discrepancy scores of board of education members and superintendents will also be computed by school district size. The relationship of discrepancy scores between board of education members and superintendents on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey and the scores of superintendents on the Maslach Burnout Inventory will be examined. Finally, demographic data for board of education members and superintendents in the State of Oklahoma will also be described.

#### Findings

The 456 independent school districts in the State of Oklahoma were divided into three strata based on the number of teaching personnel in each district. Schools in the first stratum had 1-24 teachers each, those in the second stratum had 25-50 teachers each, and those in the third

stratum had 51 or more teachers each. The sample population included 27 superintendents and a maximum of 135 school board members from each of the three district strata.

The first mailing consisted of 51 packets with 306 copies of the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey and 51 copies of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. These packets were mailed to the first 51 superintendents in the sample. The second mailing, consisting of 30 packets with 180 copies of the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey and 30 copies of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, was sent to the remaining superintendents in the sample.

Of the 81 superintendents and 405 board of education members surveyed, 37 superintendents and 130 board of education members responded. Thus, as indicated in Table III, 46% of the administrators and 32% of the board of education members chose to participate in the study.

Questionnaires in which item responses were missing or were uninterpretable were not included in the analyses. It was determined that 60 out of the 167 questionnaires (36%) contained one or more unusable or uninterpretable item responses leaving 107 questionnaires for the analyses. As reported in Table III, 33 usable returns were available from the 81 school superintendents with 74 usable returns received from the 405 board members.

In order to examine the relationship between attitudes on educational concepts by superintendents and their board of education members, it was necessary to use only those

districts in which at least one superintendent and a minimum of two board of education members responded with interpretable data. If a school district did not have at least one superintendent and two board of education members' complete responses, the district could not be used. As a result, a total of 28 complete districts were used in these analyses.

TABLE III  
SUMMARY OF RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES AND  
USABLE RETURNS BY DISTRICT SIZE

Superintendents	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Number in Sample	27	27	27	81
Number Returned	8	14	15	37
% Returned	30%	51%	55%	46%
Number Usable	7	12	14	33
% Usable	26%	44%	52%	41%
Board Members	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Number in Sample	135	135	135	405
Number Returned	26	46	58	130
% Returned	19%	34%	43%	32%
Number Usable	16	24	34	74
% Usable	9%	18%	25%	18%

### Testing Hypothesis I

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes on educational concepts of board of education members and of superintendents in the State of Oklahoma.

The first hypothesis tested the difference between board of education members' and superintendents' attitudes toward educational concepts. Mean scores on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey were calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between board of education members and superintendents in this study. Mean scores were calculated using the answer key shown in Appendix C. The range of possible scores was from 0-208 for this instrument. Table IV illustrates the mean score for board of education members and for superintendents on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey.

The mean score for superintendent respondents (83.91) and the mean score for board of education member respondents (84.77) on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey revealed similar attitudes among board of education members and superintendents on educational concepts as measured by the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey in the State of Oklahoma.

2. There is no significant difference by school district size between attitudes on educational concepts by board of education members and superintendents in the State of Oklahoma.

TABLE IV  
MEAN OSBAS SCORES

Respondents	Mean Score	N
Board Members	84.77	28
Superintendents	83.91	74

### Testing Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis addressed the question of interaction between discrepancy scores for superintendents and board of education members on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey according to school district size. The researcher predicted that small school districts would yield greater discrepancy scores between board of education members and superintendents than in the medium or large school districts.

A two-way ANOVA was calculated to determine the significance of the main effects of discrepancy scores between board members and superintendents and school district size. Both the main effects and interaction effect are reported in Table V.

TABLE V  
TWO-WAY ANOVA FOR OSBAS SCORES  
BY SCHOOL DISTRICT SIZE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	Sign of F
Main Effects	162.33	3	54.11	1.10	.35
Role	20.79	1	20.79	.42	.52
Size	145.40	2	72.70	1.48	.23
Role x Size	2.63	2	1.31	.03	.97
Explained	165.00	5	33.00	.67	.65
Residual	4955.78	101	49.07		
Totals	5120.73	106	48.31		

The two-way ANOVA revealed that:

1. Neither of the main effects between board member and superintendent scores on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey was significant at the .05 confidence level. Thus, hypothesis I was not rejected.

2. The interaction effect between board member and superintendent scores on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey and school district size was not significant at the .05 confidence level. Thus, hypothesis II was not rejected.

### Testing Hypothesis III

3. There is no significant relationship between the discrepancy scores of board of education members and of superintendents on educational concepts and the level of superintendent job stress in the State of Oklahoma.

The third hypothesis addressed the research question in the study which examined the relationship between discrepancy scores on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey among board of education members and superintendents and levels of superintendent job stress as scored on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The researcher predicted that the greater the degree of discrepancy between the scores of board of education members and of superintendents on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey, the higher the level of superintendent job stress as measured on the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

Total scores on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey were calculated for each board of education member and superintendent for each district using the scoring key found in Appendix D. Discrepancy scores (D) between board of education members and superintendents were calculated for each district. To determine discrepancy scores for each district, each board of education member's score was subtracted by the superintendent's score and board members' score differences for each district were averaged. Discrepancy scores for the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey were then correlated with the

superintendents' Maslach Burnout Inventory scores. The total sample mean discrepancy score by mean Maslach Burnout Inventory scores on the six subscales are reported in Table VI.

TABLE VI  
TOTAL SAMPLE MEAN BOARD OSBAS DISCREPANCY  
SCORES AND MEAN MBI SUBSCALE SCORES

	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
EEF	13.71	7.38	28
EEI	21.18	13.37	28
DPF	6.96	3.67	28
DPI	11.86	7.94	28
PAF	37.43	8.43	28
PAI	41.50	9.56	28
D	6.10	4.94	28

When comparing the mean scores of superintendents on each subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory to the ranges reported in Table II, the two mean scores for emotional exhaustion are in the low range. The mean scores for both

depersonalization and personal accomplishment fall within the moderate range.

In order to determine whether relationships existed for each of the six subscale variables on the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was performed to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship between the discrepancy scores (D) on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey and each of the Maslach Burnout Inventory subscale scores. The results of the correlations are reported in Table VII.

TABLE VII  
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN  
OSBAS DISCREPANCY SCORES  
AND MEAN MBI SCORES

	r	Significance	N
EEF with D	.07	.71	28
EEI with D	-.02	.94	28
DPF with D	.05	.78	28
DPI with D	-.06	.75	28
PAF with D	-.06	.77	28
PAI with D	-.13	.50	28

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation revealed that:

1. The correlation between discrepancy scores among board members and superintendents regarding educational concepts and the frequency of feelings of emotional exhaustion by superintendents was .07 and was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

2. The correlation between discrepancy scores among board members and superintendents regarding educational concepts and the intensity of feelings of emotional exhaustion by superintendents was -.02 and not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

3. The correlation between discrepancy scores among board members and superintendents and the frequency of feelings of depersonalization by superintendents was .05 and not significant at the .05 confidence level.

4. The correlation between discrepancy scores among board members and superintendents and the intensity of feelings of depersonalization by superintendents was -.06 and not significant at the .05 confidence level.

5. The correlation between discrepancy scores among board members and superintendents and the frequency of feelings of personal accomplishment by superintendents was -.06 and was not significant at the .05 confidence level.

6. The correlation between discrepancy scores among board members and superintendents and the intensity of feelings of personal accomplishment by superintendents was -.13 and was not significant at the .05 confidence level.

## Demographic Data

Both data-gathering instruments contained sections which asked questions about the social, economic, and educational status of the respondents. Those factors investigated for board members were: age, gender, occupation, ethnic origin, educational level, marital status, number of children in school, number of years on board of education, service as board president, number of years in the community, family income, and the population size of board members' hometowns.

Those factors investigated for superintendents were: age, gender, ethnic origin, educational level, marital status, number of children in school, months on the job, and religious preference. The tables which follow represent selected findings of the demographic sections of the survey instruments.

### Board of Education Members

Alvey et al. (1986) characterized the average board of education member to be a 44-year-old white male. Forty-five percent of the board members in this study were found to be between the ages of 40 and 49 (Table VIII), with only 1% of the sample being under 29 years of age and 2% over 70 years.

This study further reported 88% of the population of board of education members are male, with 12% female (Table IX). The predominant male gender of board of education members is typical of other organizations in the public and

private sectors which are dominated by males in the upper levels of organizational authority. Nationwide there is a disproportionate number of male board of education members, according to Zeigler and Jennings (1974).

TABLE VIII

## BOARD MEMBER AGE

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
20-29	1	1
30-39	21	29
40-49	33	45
50-59	13	18
60-69	4	5
70-79	2	2
Totals	74	100

TABLE IX

## BOARD MEMBER GENDER

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Male	65	88
Female	9	12
Totals	74	100

Eighty-eight percent of the sample board of education members in the State of Oklahoma are Caucasian (Table X). Reportedly 11% are Native American. This higher population of Native Americans may be a result of the larger concentrations of this ethnic group in the State of Oklahoma as compared to the rest of the nation.

Contrary to the findings of Zeigler and Jennings (1974) that 72% of the board of education members in the nation hold college degrees, 31% of board members in this study did not complete elementary school (Table XI). Only 1% of the board of education members completed elementary school, while 16% graduated from high school and 13% graduated from college. The unusually high percentage of board of education members who did not complete elementary school may be a result of the proportionately large number who grew up in small, rural communities in the State of Oklahoma.

TABLE X  
BOARD MEMBER RACE

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Caucasian	66	89
Black	0	0
Hispanic	1	1
Native American	8	11
Asian American	0	0
Totals	74	100

The data indicate that 83% of the board members grew up in small, rural towns, while only 17% grew up in suburban and/or urban communities (Table XII). Income of 22 of the 74 board of education members was in the range of \$30,000 to \$40,000 (Table XIII). While the average income of board members in this study concurs with Alvey's (1986) findings, occupationally and educationally, board members in the State of Oklahoma are dissimilar to the "typical" American board member.

TABLE XI  
BOARD MEMBER EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Did not Complete Elementary School	23	31
Completed Elementary School	1	1
Graduated From High School	10	14
Some College	16	21
Graduated From College	13	18
Graduate or Professional School	8	11
Technical or Trade School	3	4
Totals	74	100

The "typical" board member in the nation holds a managerial or professional job, however only 16% of the respondents in this study are white-collar workers. As indicated in Table XIV, farmers comprise the largest occupational group for Oklahoma board members.

TABLE XII  
BOARD MEMBER HOMETOWN SIZE

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Rural	61	83
Suburban	6	8
Urban	7	9
Totals	74	100
Small	61	82
Medium	11	15
Large	2	3
Totals	74	100

In Oklahoma, there is strong evidence that board members have a greater chance of being an elected official if they are long-standing residents of their communities, 40 to 50 years of age, are engaged in an agricultural occupation, are white males, and have children in the schools. Table XV reports that over half of the respondents have lived in the same community for more than 30 years.

TABLE XIII  
BOARD MEMBER INCOME  
(IN THOUSANDS)

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
10-15	5	7
15-20	2	3
20-25	5	7
25-30	13	17
30-40	22	30
40-50	13	17
50-60	4	6
Above 60	10	13
Totals	74	100

TABLE XIV  
BOARD MEMBER OCCUPATION

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Farmer	19	26
White-Collar	12	16
Blue-Collar	12	16
Retired	1	2
Self	11	15
Other	19	25
Totals	74	100

TABLE XV  
BOARD MEMBER YEARS LIVING IN COMMUNITY

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
0-05	1	1
06-11	12	16
12-17	9	12
18-23	6	8
24-29	8	11
Over 30	66	51
Totals	74	100

Typically, board of education members have or have had children in the public schools. This study reports in Table XVI that 100% of the respondent board of education members have children in the public schools.

TABLE XVI  
BOARD MEMBERS HAVING CHILDREN IN SCHOOL

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Yes	74	100
No	0	0
Totals	74	100

### Superintendents

As with board of education members, superintendents in the nation are predominantly male. Table XVII reports 100% of the superintendents surveyed to be of the male gender.

Characteristic of the superintendency in the nation is a predominance of Caucasians. Table XVIII reports 97% of the superintendent respondents in this study are Caucasian with 4% reportedly Native American.

As cited earlier, Blumberg (1985a) reported the average age of the superintendents in the nation to be around 44 years of age. Table XIX reports 68% of the superintendents who responded to be between 40 and 50 years of age.

TABLE XVII  
SUPERINTENDENT GENDER

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Male	28	100
Female	0	0
Totals	28	100

TABLE XVIII  
SUPERINTENDENT RACE

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
Asian, Asian American	0	0
Black	0	0
Latin, Mexican, Mexican American	0	0
Native American American Indian	1	4
White, Caucasian	27	96
Totals	28	100

TABLE XIX  
SUPERINTENDENT AGE

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
30-39	3	10
40-49	19	68
50-59	5	19
Over 60	1	3
Totals	28	100

Due the certification requirements for the position of superintendent in the State of Oklahoma, superintendents must have completed some postgraduate work. Therefore, it is not surprising that Table XX indicates that 64% have earned no more than a master of education degree, while 29% have earned specialist or doctoral degrees.

The majority of superintendents in this study report having served in their present position for 1 to 3 years (Table XXI). This is normally the tenure for the position of superintendent of schools across the nation (Blumberg, 1985a).

TABLE XX  
SUPERINTENDENT DEGREES RECEIVED

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
MA/MS	18	64
PhD	2	7
EdD	6	22
Other	2	7
Totals	28	100

TABLE XXI  
SUPERINTENDENT YEARS SERVICE

Response Code	Frequency	% of Sample
1-3	14	50
4-7	8	29
5-10	4	14
11-15	2	7
Totals	28	100

Additional analysis was conducted by the researcher to determine if the responding districts in the survey yielded a higher proportion of superintendent turnover than in nonresponding districts. The researcher calculated the number of persons who had served as superintendent in each district during the past 10 years using directory data from the Oklahoma State Department of Education. It was determined from this analysis that those districts which did respond to the survey instruments had a higher rate of turnover of superintendents during the past ten years (Table XXII).

TABLE XXII  
 MEAN NUMBER OF SUPERINTENDENTS  
 DURING THE PAST TEN YEARS

District Size	Responding	Nonresponding
Small	2.33	1.95
Medium	2.44	2.16
Large	2.50	1.88

#### Summary

The analyses of the data which were performed in this study have been presented in Chapter IV. The scores of the superintendents and board of education members on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey were not significantly different, even when considering school district size. Moreover, the scores indicated substantial agreement among superintendents and board members regarding attitudes toward educational concepts.

The relationships of discrepancy scores between board of education members and superintendents on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey and the subscale scores of superintendents on the Maslach Burnout Inventory were not significant. The three hypotheses in this study were therefore not supported at the .05 level.

Additionally, data reported in this chapter indicated similar gender, age, and ethnic characteristics of superintendents and board of education members in the State of Oklahoma and those in the nation. However, educational levels and occupations of board members were markedly different from the national norm.

Chapter V will contain a summary of the analyses presented in this chapter, conclusions from the study, and recommendations for further research.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

This research study was designed to determine if there were differences in attitudes toward educational concepts between board of education members and superintendents in the State of Oklahoma. Furthermore, the study focused on the relationship between attitudinal discrepancies among board of education members and superintendents to see if those differences were related to levels of superintendent job stress.

A total sample of 81 superintendents and a maximum of 405 board of education members was drawn from the population of superintendents and board members in the 456 independent school districts in the State of Oklahoma. The design of the study involved the identification of respondents from three strata of district size (small, medium, and large). The district sizes were calculated to provide an equal number of districts in each stratum, therefore providing a representative sampling from all of the 456 independent

school districts in the state during the 1985-86 school year.

Usable responses for the study were received from 74 board of education members and 33 superintendents. Since the study was designed to compare board of education members' and superintendents' attitudes toward educational concepts, it was necessary to have complete responses from the superintendent and a minimum of two board of education members in order for a district to be used in this study. Therefore, a total of 28 complete districts were available for the study.

Board of education members and superintendents simultaneously completed the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey during a specified time at their September or October 1986 board of education meetings. This instrument was designed to measure attitudes on educational concepts. The second instrument used in this study was the Maslach Burnout Inventory. This instrument was to be completed only by superintendents. The 22-item survey measured two levels of job stress on each of the three subscales which were emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

The Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey was used to collect demographic data on board of education members. The Maslach Burnout Inventory was used to collect demographic data for superintendents in this study.

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences of attitudes on educational concepts between board of education members and superintendents by school district size. A discrepancy score (D) was calculated with this test. The discrepancy score was correlated with the job stress subscale scores using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The probability level for the study was set at the .05 confidence level.

### Research Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes on educational concepts of board of education members and of superintendents in the State of Oklahoma. The data collected on differences in attitudes on educational concepts among board of education members and superintendents supported the hypothesis. It was found that there was no significant difference between attitudes of board of education members and superintendents toward educational concepts.

2. There is no significant difference by school district size between attitudes on educational concepts by board of education members and of superintendents in the State of Oklahoma. The second hypothesis examined the difference by school district size between attitudes on educational concepts of board of education members and superintendents. It was found that there was no significant

difference according to school district size of attitudes on educational concepts by board of education members and superintendents.

3. There is no significant relationship between the discrepancy scores of board of education members and superintendents on educational concepts and the level of superintendent job stress in the State of Oklahoma. The third hypothesis addressed the research question regarding the relationship between discrepancy scores on the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey among board of education members and superintendents and the level of superintendent job stress on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. It was found that there was no significant relationship among the discrepancy scores and any of the six subscale scores.

#### Observations

This study was initiated by the researcher because of an interest in the nature of superintendent-board of education relationships in the State of Oklahoma. Personal experience prompted the author to investigate the causes of frequent superintendent job turnover, "administrative" activities of board of education members, and the "politics" of superintendent-board member relationships.

A preliminary examination of the literature indicated that the nature of superintendent-board relationships was grounded in conflict (Blumberg, 1985a). In fact, superintendents were not failing at their jobs because they

were poor administrators; rather, they were failing because they were making the wrong political decisions.

Furthermore, adversarial relationships among superintendents and board of education members appeared to be the norm.

Since school superintendents are charged with administering the activities of the school district, the conflict which emerges between them and board of education members would appear to be detrimental to the effectiveness of the leader and of the institution itself.

The intent of this study was to examine the nature of this conflictual relationship and its implications for practicing school superintendents. Perhaps through the examination of attitudinal differences among board of education members and superintendents, the impetus for conflict could be determined and resolved. By understanding the foundation of this conflict, superintendents would be equipped to create an agenda for developing attitudinal congruence to minimize conflict and increase worker effectiveness. Through the reduction of conflict, superintendents would be able to reduce the levels of job-related stress which pose probable health hazards to them as top level managers.

#### Conclusions

If this sample is representative of the entire population of board of education members and superintendents in the State of Oklahoma, it is evident by the results of

this study that there is no significant difference between attitudes toward educational concepts by board of education members and superintendents as measured by the Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey. It further demonstrated that there is no significant relationship between attitudinal discrepancies by superintendents and board of education members and levels of superintendent job stress. Indeed, superintendents responding in this study indicated moderate to low levels of job stress as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

The demographic characteristics of board of education members in the State of Oklahoma revealed that a person is likely to be elected to a board seat if that person is male, white, and 40 to 50 years old; has children in the public schools; and is a long-time resident of the community. The data also showed that board of education members in the State of Oklahoma have not attained a high level of formal education, with 31% having not completed elementary school. There appears to be some irony in the fact that an overwhelming number of board of education members with relatively little formal education are making crucial decisions about the formal education of students in their school districts.

The findings of this study on superintendent-board of education member relationships contradict those reported in the research literature. The literature unquestionably illustrates this relationship as one of conflict. This

study, however, reported attitudes which are similar and therefore do not contribute to conflictual relationships. The contradictory findings of this study may be the result of any of a number of factors.

1. Superintendents and board of education members with similar attitudes may be more likely to complete and return the questionnaires, whereas those with dissimilar attitudes would be less likely to participate.

2. The Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey may not adequately measure attitudes toward educational concepts or those attitudes least likely to be shared by superintendents and board members.

3. With the advent of teacher master contracts and union negotiations, board of education members and superintendents have come together to confront united teaching organizations. The probability of similar attitudes may result from the attainment of like goals in the negotiations process.

4. Recent national attention, bringing education to the forefront of political issues, may have created congruence in attitudes toward educational concepts among superintendents and board of education members in the State of Oklahoma.

5. Superintendents exhibiting low to moderate levels of job stress may be more likely to participate in a study about superintendent-board member relationships and/or to

engage in such activity at open meetings of the board of education.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations for further research are made so that the nature of board member-superintendent conflictual relationships may be determined.

1. What are the perceptions of specific role functions by superintendents and board of education members? There is a great deal of confusion as to the perception of roles. What are the legitimate functions of board of education members and superintendents for school districts in the State of Oklahoma? What are the perceived functions of each?

2. What is the relationship of specific demographic characteristics of board of education members to the perception and function of roles? Do older board members perceive their roles differently than do younger board members? Do female board members perceive the role of a board member differently than do male board members? Do board members with higher incomes differ in perceptions with those of lower incomes? Do more formally educated board members perceive the role differently than do less formally educated members?

3. On what issues should superintendents have decision-making authority? What issues should be the prerogative of the board of education? As the literature

suggested, board of education members are to make policy and superintendents are to administer that policy.

4. Would a different instrument more accurately measure discrepancies in attitudes or beliefs on education concepts of superintendents and board of education members in the State of Oklahoma?

This study indicated that the relationship of superintendents and their board of education members would be marked by less conflict than the literature would suggest. The study further determined that the nature of superintendent-board of education conflict is not a result of attitudinal differences on educational concepts, nor did it have an impact on levels of superintendent job stress.

This researcher still contends that there is a great deal of conflict between board of education members and superintendents and that future studies should be completed to address the cause(s) of this conflict so that practicing superintendents may work more effectively with their board of education members without undue stress.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alvey, D. T. (1985). Boards and superintendents clash over power. American School Board Journal, 172(10), 21-25.
- Alvey, D. T., Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J. C. (1986). Board member profile: Meet the typical board member. American School Board Journal, 173(1), 26-28.
- American Association of School Administrators. (1982). The American school superintendency 1982: A summary report. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Ashby, L. W. (1968). The effective school board member. Danville, Il: Interstate Printers and Publishers.
- Barnard, C. I. (1968). The functions of the executive. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Bennett, R. E. (1984). These thirteen gifts will make your board and superintendent a lucky match. American School Board Journal, 171(9), 38-39.
- Blumberg, A. J. (1985a). The school superintendent: Living with conflict. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blumberg, A. J. (1985b). A superintendent must read the board's invisible job description. American School Board Journal, 172(9), 44-45.
- Brook, A. (1973). Mental stress at work. The Practitioner, 210, 500-506.
- Buck, V. E. (1972). Working under pressure. New York: Staple Press.
- Callahan, R. E. (1974). The American board of education, 1979-1980. In P. J. Cistone (Ed.), Understanding school boards. (pp. 19-33). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Campbell, R. L., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O. & Usdan, M. D. (1975). The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Cistone, P. J. (Ed.) (1975). Understanding school boards. Boston, MA: Lexington Books, 110-116.

- Cistone, P. J. (1978). School board members learn their skill before they become board members. American School Board Journal, 164(3), 32-33.
- Clark, E. (1981). Board power: A game of numbers. American School Board Journal, 167(3), 27-28.
- Cooper, C. L., & Marshall, J. (1975). Occupational sources of stress: A review of the literature relating to CHD and mental ill health. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 49(6), 11-28.
- Cooper, C. L., & Marshall, J. (1978). Understanding executive stress. New York: Macmillian and Company.
- Corlett, F. N., & Richardson, J. (1981). Stress, work design and productivity. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Counts, G. S. (1927). The social composition of boards of education. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Cuban, L. (1985). Conflict and leadership in the superintendency. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 28-30.
- Cunningham, L. L. (1983). Improving the American school board. Educational Journal, 167, 493-494.
- Ficklen, E. (1985). New state laws are sending you back to school to learn board basics. American School Board Journal, 172(6), 35-36.
- French, J. R. P., & Caplan, R. D. (1970). The mechanisms of job stress and strain. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Friedman, M., & Rosenmann, R. H. (1974). Type A behavior and your heart. New York: Alfred H. Knopf.
- Gay, L. R. (1981). Educational research (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Growler, D., & Legge, K. (1975). Managerial stress. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Gross, N. J. (1958). Who runs our schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hall, D. T. (1972). A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college educated women. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 471-486.
- Herman, J. H. (1980). How to train new board members tactfully. American School Board Journal, 166(4), 37.

- Huck, S. W., Corimer, W. H., & Bounds, W. G. (1974). Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper and Row.
- Iannacone, L., & Lutz, F. W. (1970). Politics, power and policy: The governing of school districts. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Jaccard, J. (1983). Statistics for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., & Snoek, J. D. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Katz, M. (1985). Style: Match the superintendent's and your board's. American School Board Journal, 172(2), 33-34.
- Kerr, N. D. (1964). The school board as an agency of legitimation. Sociology of Education, 38(7), 34-59.
- Kiev, A., & Kohn, V. (1979). Executive stress. New York: C. M. Management Association.
- Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1983). Educational administration (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillian.
- Kindred, L. W. (1976). The school and community relations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mahon, L., & Jackson, S. E. (1985). Does your board need corporate training? American School Board Journal, 172(4), 16.
- Marshall, J., & Cooper, C. L. (1979). Executives under pressure. New York: Macmillian.
- Maslach, C., & Pines, A. (1979). Burn-out: The loss of human caring. In A. Pines & C. Maslach (Eds.), Experiencing social psychology. New York: A. A. Knopf.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2(5), 30-31.
- McCarthy, D. J., & Ramsey, C.E. (1971). The school managers. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- National School Boards Association. (1982). Becoming a better board member: A guide to effective school board service. Washington, DC: Author.

- Oklahoma. (1986). School laws of Oklahoma, 1986. Oklahoma City: State Central Printing Services.
- Oklahoma educational directory 1985-86. (1985). Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Department of Education.
- Reeves, C. E. (1954). School boards, their status, functions, and activities. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Thomas, M. D. (1985). Here's what makes an exemplary board member. The American School Board Journal, 172(4), 31-44.
- Tucker, H. J., & Zeigler, L. H. (1980). Professional versus the public: Attitudes, communication and response in school districts. New York: Longman.
- Wiles, D. K., Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1981). Practical politics for school administrators. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Zeigler, L. H., & Jennings, M. H. (1974). Governing American schools. North Scituate, MA: Druxbury Press.
- Zeigler, L. H., & Tucker, H. J. (1977). Communications and decision making in American public education. In L.H. Zeigler and H.J. Tucker (Eds.), A longitudinal and comparative study. National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook 1977. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

## APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

## Human Services Survey

Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson

The purpose of this survey is to discover how various persons in the human services or helping professions view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely. Because persons in a wide variety of occupations will answer this survey, it uses the term *recipients* to refer to the people for whom you provide your service, care, treatment, or instruction. When answering this survey please think of these people as recipients of the service you provide, even though you may use another term in your work.

On the following page there are 22 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way *about your job*. If you have *never* had this feeling, write a "0" (zero) in both the "HOW OFTEN" and "HOW STRONG" columns before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate *how often* you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. Then decide *how strong* the feeling is when you experience it by writing the number (from 1 to 7) that best describes how strongly you feel it. An example is shown below.

Example:

HOW OFTEN:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day	
HOW STRONG:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Never	Very mild, barely noticeable			Moderate			Major, very strong

<u>HOW OFTEN</u>	<u>HOW STRONG</u>
0-6	0-7
_____	_____

Statement:

I feel depressed at work.

If you *never* feel depressed at work, you would write the number "0" (zero) on both lines. If you *rarely* feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would write the number "1" on the line under the heading "HOW OFTEN." If your feelings of depression are *fairly* strong, but not as strong as you can imagine, you would write a "6" under the heading "HOW STRONG." If your feelings of depression are very mild, you would write a "1."

Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.  
577 College Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306

## Human Services Survey

<b>HOW OFTEN:</b>	0 Never	1 A few times a year or less	2 Once a month or less	3 A few times a month	4 Once a week	5 A few times a week	6 Every day
<b>HOW STRONG:</b>	0 Never	1 Very mild, barely noticeable	2	3	4 Moderate	5	6 7 Major, very strong

HOW OFTEN 0-6	HOW STRONG 0-7	Statements:
1. _____	_____	I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. _____	_____	I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. _____	_____	I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
4. _____	_____	I can easily understand how my recipients feel about things.
5. _____	_____	I feel I treat some recipients as if they were impersonal objects.
6. _____	_____	Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
7. _____	_____	I deal very effectively with the problems of my recipients.
8. _____	_____	I feel burned out from my work.
9. _____	_____	I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.
10. _____	_____	I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.
11. _____	_____	I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.
12. _____	_____	I feel very energetic.
13. _____	_____	I feel frustrated by my job.
14. _____	_____	I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
15. _____	_____	I don't really care what happens to some recipients.
16. _____	_____	Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
17. _____	_____	I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my recipients.
18. _____	_____	I feel exhilarated after working closely with my recipients.
19. _____	_____	I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
20. _____	_____	I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.
21. _____	_____	In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.
22. _____	_____	I feel recipients blame me for some of their problems.

(Administrative use only)

cat.		cat.	
EE:F _____	_____	EE:I _____	_____
DP:F _____	_____	DP:I _____	_____
PA:F _____	_____	PA:I _____	_____

©1981 Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. All rights reserved. No portion of this material may be reproduced by any means without written permission of the Publisher.

First Printing, 1981

## Demographic Data Sheet

Your sex:

\_\_\_\_\_ (1) male \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ (2) female \_\_\_\_\_

Your age:

\_\_\_\_\_ years

Are you (check only one group)

\_\_\_\_\_ (1) Asian, Asian American

\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Black

\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Latino, Mexican, Mexican American

\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Native American, American Indian

\_\_\_\_\_ (5) White, Caucasian

\_\_\_\_\_ (6) Other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_ )

What is your religion?

\_\_\_\_\_ (1) Protestant (specify denomination \_\_\_\_\_ )

\_\_\_\_\_ (2) Roman Catholic

\_\_\_\_\_ (3) Jewish

\_\_\_\_\_ (4) Other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_ )

\_\_\_\_\_ (5) None, no religion

How religious do you consider yourself to be? (Circle the appropriate number.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very						Not at all
Religious						Religious

Marital status:

\_\_\_\_\_ (1) single

\_\_\_\_\_ (2) married

\_\_\_\_\_ (3) divorced

\_\_\_\_\_ (4) widowed

\_\_\_\_\_ (5) other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_ )

If married, for how long have you been married to your current spouse?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

If you have children, how many of them are now living with you?

\_\_\_\_\_ children live with me

\_\_\_\_\_ I have no children

continued

### Demographic Data Sheet (cont.)

What was the highest year you completed in school? (Check only one answer.)

- (1) completed high school  
 (2) some college  
 (3) completed 4 years of college  
 (4) some postgraduate work or degree  
 (5) other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_ )

Please check the highest degree you have received:

- (1) AA                       (5) RN                       (9) ThD  
 (2) BA/BS                   (6) LPN                     (10) EdD  
 (3) MA/MS                   (7) MD                      (11) JD  
 (4) MSW                     (8) PhD                     (12) Other (specify \_\_\_\_\_ )

What is the primary area in which you work? (Check only one answer.)

- (1) medical                   (7) corrections  
 (2) mental health           (8) counseling  
 (3) education                 (9) pastoral work  
 (4) social services           (10) business  
 (5) legal services            (11) other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_ )  
 (6) law enforcement        \_\_\_\_\_ )

What is the level of your primary position? (Check only one answer.)

- (1) staff member  
 (2) supervisor/manager  
 (3) administrator  
 (4) trainer  
 (5) private practice  
 (6) other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_ )

How many hours per week do you work at the job indicated above?

- 50 (or more) hours per week  
 40-49 hours per week  
 30-39 hours per week  
 20-29 hours per week  
 fewer than 20 (specify: \_\_\_\_\_ hours per week)

How long have you been at your present job?

\_\_\_\_\_ months

How long have you been employed for this general type of work?

\_\_\_\_\_ months

(Administrative use only)

	cat.		cat.
EE:F	_____	EE:I	_____
DP:F	_____	DP:I	_____
PA:F	_____	PA:I	_____

Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.  
577 College Avenue  
Palo Alto, California 94306

APPENDIX B

OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

Oklahoma School Board Attitudinal Survey  
by  
Dr. Gary Green  
University of Oklahoma

This survey is being conducted under guidelines established by the University of Oklahoma. By cooperating, you will help the survey administrators find answers to important questions; however, your participation is strictly voluntary. You should omit any questions which you feel unduly invades your privacy or which are otherwise offensive to you. Confidentiality is guaranteed; your name will not be associated with your answers in any public or private report of the results.

1. Age: \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Sex: \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Race: Caucasian \_\_\_\_\_ Black \_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic \_\_\_\_\_ Native American \_\_\_\_\_  
Asian American \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_
5. Your Education:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Did not complete elementary school
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Completed elementary school
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Graduated from high school
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Some college
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Graduated from college
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate or professional school (If Ph.D. or M.D. - please circle one)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Technical or trade school
6. Family income (in thousands): 10-15 \_\_\_\_\_ 15-20 \_\_\_\_\_ 20-25 \_\_\_\_\_  
25-30 \_\_\_\_\_ 30-40 \_\_\_\_\_ 40-50 \_\_\_\_\_ 50-60 \_\_\_\_\_ above 60 \_\_\_\_\_
7. Is the town where you grew up:
 

Check one:

  - \_\_\_\_\_ Rural
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Suburban
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Urban
  - \_\_\_\_\_

Check one:

  - \_\_\_\_\_ Small
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Middle-sized
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Large
8. Current Marital Status:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Married
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced or separated
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Single
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Widowed
9. Number of years on the school board: \_\_\_\_\_
10. How many years have you lived in this community?: \_\_\_\_\_
11. As you were growing up, how would you rate your parents on their interest in community affairs:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Very active
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Moderately active
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Not very active
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Not at all active

12. As you were growing up, how would you rate your parents on their interest in school matters:  
 Very active  
 Moderately active  
 Not very active  
 Not at all active
13. Have you ever served, or are you now serving, as president of the school board?  
 Yes  No
14. Have you ever had children in public school: \_\_\_\_\_ If so, how many: \_\_\_\_\_
15. Of those children how many are currently in school: \_\_\_\_\_
16. Number of students in entire school (K-12): \_\_\_\_\_

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The school board should be consulted in day-to-day administrative decision-making.	1	2	3	4
2. Providing extra dollars to "support winning sports" teams is important to the quality of a school system.	1	2	3	4
3. Automatically granting teacher tenure after three years of satisfactory service is a sound practice.	1	2	3	4
4. Teachers salaries are usually set by available monies, therefore, negotiation is of little value.	1	2	3	4
5. Pay incentives should be offered teachers who are consistently performing above average.	1	2	3	4
6. Students should be required to take more basic courses and fewer elective courses.	1	2	3	4
7. The testing of teachers prior to certification is a good idea.	1	2	3	4
8. School districts should update educational practices through staff development.	1	2	3	4
9. Lack of superintendent/principal leadership leads to a shortage of creativity in the schools.	1	2	3	4
10. Vocational education programs are for academically weak students.	1	2	3	4
11. Corporal punishment is a discipline technique that should be used more often.	1	2	3	4
12. "Social Promotion" is acceptable in the lower grades.	1	2	3	4
13. More academic units should be required for graduation.	1	2	3	4

14.	The school board should spend its time setting policy rather than formulating explicit rules.	1	2	3	4
15.	A student's participation in extracurricular activity should depend on maintaining a passing grade average.	1	2	3	4
16.	Schools should operate more like a business in firing nonproductive personnel.	1	2	3	4
17.	Financial allocation guidelines (tax base) that are set by law should be altered to allow for increased funds available for teacher salaries.	1	2	3	4
18.	The merit pay concept will cause disharmony and jealousy.	1	2	3	4
19.	Today's students have greater academic skills than their parents.	1	2	3	4
20.	Teachers who have recently graduated are more competent in their subject matter and basic skills than their predecessors.	1	2	3	4
21.	Superintendents should require principals to enroll in professional seminars.	1	2	3	4
22.	Schools with outstanding teachers can be highly successful with average leadership.	1	2	3	4
23.	Most skills learned in vocational education classes are outdated by the time students reach the work force.	1	2	3	4
24.	Lack of discipline is a prevalent problem in classrooms.	1	2	3	4
25.	"Social Promotion" is acceptable on the secondary level.	1	2	3	4
26.	Prior to graduation, all students should be required to pass a comprehensive examination on the basics.	1	2	3	4
27.	The role of the board is to act as a consultant to the school system management.	1	2	3	4
28.	Extracurricular activities are necessary for rounding out a students overall educational experience.	1	2	3	4
29.	Teacher productivity declines after tenure is granted.	1	2	3	4
30.	Collective bargaining eventually benefits the whole school system.	1	2	3	4
31.	Teachers deserve monetary recognition for a job well done.	1	2	3	4
32.	There is a need to place more emphasis on reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4
33.	Oklahoma should test the knowledge and skill of teachers.	1	2	3	4
34.	Staff development is a waste of taxpayer's money.	1	2	3	4

35.	Administrators are selected from the ranks of the brightest teachers.	1	2	3	4
36.	Vocational skills should be acquired on the job after graduation, rather than in school.	1	2	3	4
37.	Teachers need additional training in the area of discipline.	1	2	3	4
38.	"Social Promotion" is an injustice to the student in the long run.	1	2	3	4
39.	Seniors should have to go to school a full day to qualify for graduation.	1	2	3	4
40.	An assistant principal should check with the board before changing rules.	1	2	3	4
41.	It is important to offer competitive salary scales to coaches.	1	2	3	4
42.	Teacher tenure should protect the rights of teachers in conflict with school policies.	1	2	3	4
43.	There are circumstances where teachers should have the right to strike.	1	2	3	4
44.	Administrators can devise ways to evaluate faculty performance for merit pay which are fair and do not impose unreasonable demands.	1	2	3	4
45.	To many students are being allowed to graduate from high school without the general basic skills.	1	2	3	4
46.	Oklahoma teachers are respected for their intellectual ability.	1	2	3	4
47.	Training through staff development activities promotes professional growth.	1	2	3	4
48.	Superintendents tend to be penny pinchers and good money managers.	1	2	3	4
49.	Each student should graduate with vocational competencies.	1	2	3	4
50.	Teachers often tolerate disrespectful attitudes and disruptions in the classroom.	1	2	3	4
51.	Special education mainstreaming combined with separate classes is a good alternative to keep students with their age group.	1	2	3	4
52.	Schools should offer two kinds of programs for graduation; academically oriented for college bound students, and vocationally oriented for others.	1	2	3	4

---

APPENDIX C

OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD ATTITUDINAL SCORING KEY

OKLAHOMA SCHOOL BOARD ATTITUDINAL  
SURVEY SCORING KEY

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	3	2	1	0
2.	3	2	1	0
3.	0	1	2	3
4.	3	2	1	0
5.	0	1	2	3
6.	0	1	2	3
7.	0	1	2	3
8.	0	1	2	3
9.	0	1	2	3
10.	3	2	1	0
11.	3	2	1	0
12.	0	1	2	3
13.	0	1	2	3
14.	3	2	1	0
15.	0	1	2	3
16.	3	2	1	0
17.	0	1	2	3
18.	3	2	1	0
19.	0	1	2	3
20.	0	1	2	3
21.	0	1	2	3
22.	3	2	1	0
23.	3	2	1	0
24.	3	2	1	0
25.	0	1	2	3
26.	0	1	2	3
27.	0	1	2	3
28.	3	2	1	0
29.	3	2	1	0
30.	0	1	2	3
31.	0	1	2	3
32.	0	1	2	3
33.	0	1	2	3
34.	3	2	1	0
35.	0	1	2	3
36.	3	2	1	0
37.	0	1	2	3
38.	3	2	1	0
39.	0	1	2	3
40.	3	2	1	0
41.	3	2	1	0
42.	0	1	2	3

---

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
43.	0	1	2	3
44.	0	1	2	3
45.	0	1	2	3
46.	0	1	2	3
47.	0	1	2	3
48.	3	2	1	0
49.	0	1	2	3
50.	0	1	2	3
51.	0	1	2	3
52.	0	1	2	3

---

APPENDIX D  
CORRESPONDENCE

September 1, 1986

Dear

Just a reminder about my recent request for your and your board members to participate in a graduate study through Oklahoma State University.

Your school district was selected as part of a random sample of 51 independent Oklahoma school districts. Therefore, it is imperative that all districts complete the surveys for my study to be valid.

Should you be unable to participate with your board during the September meeting, would you consider your October agenda as an alternative?

Your cooperation is needed and certainly appreciated. Let me know if you have any questions.

Many thanks,

Pamela C. Beck

918-496-3139 Home  
918-299-4411 Office



*Oklahoma State University*

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078  
309 GUNDERSEN HALL  
(405) 624-7244

August 15, 1986

Dear

Your assistance is needed in gathering data for a graduate study to determine differences in attitudes on educational concepts between superintendents and board of education members in the State of Oklahoma. The study will also measure levels of superintendent job stress resulting from attitudinal differences.

Board of education meeting agendas are full, however, the success of this study depends on gathering immediate responses from superintendents and their board of education members. Therefore, would you consider completing the enclosed questionnaires with your board during a pre-designated time at your September 1986 board meeting?

By placing the item, OSU Graduate Research Questionnaire on your September agenda, you and your board could complete the instruments simultaneously and assemble for return mailing. Also enclosed is a job stress instrument for you to complete prior to the meeting. Let me assure you that the anonymity of each individual will be protected.

I sincerely hope you and your board will take the time to assist me in this important study. I believe the results of spending 15-20 minutes completing the questionnaires will be of value to you as a practitioner whose position so critically depends on the attitudes of your board of education members.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request. Your positive response will make a significant difference in my study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela C. Beck  
Department of Education  
Administration and Higher  
Education  
Oklahoma State University

VITA

Pamela Canada Beck

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: ATTITUDES ON EDUCATIONAL CONCEPTS OF OKLAHOMA  
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND SUPERINTENDENTS AND  
SUPERINTENDENT JOB STRESS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Washington, D.C., July 29,  
1956, the daughter of Willis H. and Joyce B.  
Canada. Married to Wesley W. Beck, Jr. on  
October 18, 1980.

Education: Graduated from Scotch Plains-Fanwood High  
School, Scotch Plains, New Jersey, in June 1974;  
received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Oklahoma  
Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma, in July  
1978; received a Master of Education degree from  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University,  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma in July 1982; completed  
requirements for the Doctor of Education degree  
at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,  
Oklahoma, in May 1987.

Professional Experience: Classroom Teacher, Shawnee  
Public Schools, Shawnee, Oklahoma, August 1978 to  
July 1981; Classroom Teacher, Wagoner Public  
Schools, Wagoner, Oklahoma, August 1981 to June  
1982; Administrative Assistant to the  
Superintendent, Wagoner Public Schools, Wagoner,  
Oklahoma, June 1982 to June 1984; Elementary  
Principal and Director of Public Information,  
Cleveland Public Schools, Cleveland, Oklahoma,  
July 1984 to July 1986; Middle School Principal,  
Jenks Public Schools, Jenks, Oklahoma, July 1986  
to present.