THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACTORS PERCEIVED IMPORTANT IN THE

SELECTION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN

UNITARY SCHOOL DIVISIONS OF

RURAL MANITOBA

by

RICHARD R. BENOIT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

April, 1975

FACTORS PERCEIVED IMPORTANT IN THE

SELECTION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN

UNITARY SCHOOL DIVISIONS OF

RURAL MANITOBA

by

RICHARD R. BENOIT

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1975

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the role
of the principal as well as the procedures and the criteria
used in the selection of principals. The study was limited
to the rural unitary school divisions (as of January, 1971)
situated south of the fifty-third parallel in the Province
of Manitoba.

An attempt was made to compare the perceptions of two
groups, the superintendents and the school board members, in
relation to the role of the principal and the various criteria
that should be met by successful candidates for the princi-
pal's position. Comparisons were made between the reports
of both groups regarding the procedures used by the divisions
in the selection of principals.

A questionnaire was developed to gather the data
for this study. Twenty-five of the twenty-eight superinten-
dents employed by divisions selected for the project were
interviewed. Questionnaires were mailed to fifty-six
school board members; forty members returned the completed
questionnaires.

After compilation, the data were reported, frequently
on a percentage basis, and analyzed by making comparisons
between the superintendents' and the school board members'
replies. Conclusions as to the nature and extent of agree-
ment or disagreement were made for each function in the role

of the principal, criterion and selection procedure.

The two main findings were as follows. The study of the perceptions of both superintendents and school board members regarding the importance of each of the seven broad functions of the role of the principal and of each criterion used for selection revealed disagreement among and between both groups. Secondly the reports of superintendents and school board members showed that there was a lack of agreement between the two groups as to the actual use of the six procedures used when selecting a candidate for the vacant position.

The principal recommendations were that there be more frequent discussions and intensive study by superintendents and their school board members jointly regarding the sophisticated role of the principal and regarding the improvement of the procedures and criteria used in the selection of principals. Closer rapport and liaison with the faculties of education were also recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

A STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

I.   INTRODUCTION

If the enterprise of education is to
successfully carry out the responsibilities
increasingly set before it and achieve the
results expected, it is natural that atten-
tion be focused on the positions of leader-
ship in the educational hierarchy and the
preparation of the individuals who will be
selected and educated to assume these posi-
tions.[1]

Every year, many school divisions are faced with the

task of having to appoint new candidates to administrative

posts which have become vacant through various reasons.

When selecting these candidates for the vacant

administrative positions, school divisions are performing

one of their most important tasks. According to Conant, "the

difference between a good school and a poor school is often

the difference between a good and a poor principal."[2]

Since the quality of education available to the children

of the area will be determined to a high degree by the type

of person chosen for the position, the process and criteria

[1]Donald C. Tope, Robert Campbell, Howard Dean, John
M. Foskett, Fred Fosmire and Richard A. Littman, The Social
Sciences View School Administration (Englewood Cliffs:
Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 2.

[2]M. Dale Baughman, Wendell G. Anderson, Mark Smith
and Earle W. Wiltse, Administration and Supervision of the
Modern Secondary School (West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publish-
ing Company, Inc., 1969), p. 18.

for selection become important instruments which should be devised to bring forth the best person available for the position.

Rural Manitoba at present is making great strides in attempting to present to its students an education with opportunities comparable to those received by students in urban Manitoba. With the creation of unitary divisions within the province, available grants and incentives have made it possible for these rural divisions to hire superintendents, professionals in the field of education, to assist division boards in formulating and coordinating divisional education policies. Therefore, now, in such divisions, professionals and laymen interested in education work together in all related areas for the purpose of local education betterment.

More and more, "the board of education looks to the superintendent as its chief executive and perhaps even more importantly as its adviser, guide and leader."[3] Forever keeping the best interests of the children and youth of the area in mind, the superintendent is expected to show leadership in the planning and evaluation of all phases of the instructional program. Responsible to the board, he must submit his findings and the results of his evaluation to it and offer viable alternatives to the programs that

---

[3]C. L. Morphet, R. L. Johns and T. L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1959), p. 304.

are not as successful. However, the superintendent in charge of the whole division often finds himself limited to operating at this high level. He must be able to rely upon the principals in the schools, members of his administrative team, for their advice and opinions. He must constitute a source of stimulation in their development and the development of their schools, but they must carry on from there. Thus, the selection of principals becomes a most important function in the attainment of the overall objective of educational improvement in the division.

What selection procedures are followed in rural areas to find the most competent people for administration positions? What qualifications and personal characteristics do trustees and superintendents consider important when selecting administrators and to what degree do the perceptions of the two groups compare? To what extent have the research and writings of scholars in this field affected the criteria and procedures used by our superintendents and board members in rural divisions? A study providing the answers to these questions and reviewing the literature available on the topic might assist divisions, superintendents and board members in reviewing this whole question of the selection of principals if they so desired.

II. THE PROBLEM

Significance of the Study

The success of education is highly dependent upon the quality of leader-

ship in educational organizations. Con-
temporary administrators are confronted
by increasing and conflicting demands
and expectations, by broadly-based chal-
lenges to existing authority structures
and by a multiplicity of pedagogical
alternatives which demand sophisticated
decision-making skills.[4]

The quality of educational leadership being of
such importance, documented research on the selection of
principals in rural Manitoba could enable all concerned with
this process to compare their procedures and perceptions of
qualifications and skills necessary in school administration
with those recommended by scholars and writers in the field
of educational administration.

A study comparing the perceptions of school board
members and superintendents regarding the necessary qualifi-
cations and personal characteristics required for principals
might reveal conflicts between the two groups. Such dif-
ferences could lead to the selection of compromise candi-
dates, which is not necessarily the answer. Identification
of such differences should point to the need for clarifica-
tion of the changing role of the principal and the necessity
for both parties to agree on the relative importance of the
established criteria before going on with the actual selec-
tion process.

There has as yet been no study conducted on the

---

[4]P. J. Warren, "The Search for Administrative
Talent: Recruitment and Selection of Candidates," (King-
ston: Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the
Study of Education, 1973), p. 9. (Mimeographed).

selection of principals or on the criteria for such selection in Manitoba. This first study should provide more information on this process of high importance to the quality of education in the province.

Statement of the Problem

Both school board members and their superintendents are involved in the process of the selection of principals. Differences of opinion reflecting the oftentimes highly divergent backgrounds of these two groups could easily occur when judging the qualifications and personal characteristics necessary for a principalship. Two points of view are brought forth, those of the professional, board appointed superintendent and those of the locally elected school board members. Therefore, the purpose of this study is an attempt to answer this question:

When selecting candidates for the principalship, is there a difference between the perceptions of school board members and their superintendents as to the qualifications and personal characteristics deemed necessary for successfully filling the position?

Related to this main question are the sub-questions listed below. Answers to these should help to shed more light in the discussion of the main question.

    1. Do school board members perceive the role of the administrator differently than do superintendents?

    2. When selecting a candidate for the principalship,

what are the procedures used in rural Manitoba?

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that in such important matters
    as the selection of principals, both board
    members and superintendents are closely in-
    volved.

2. It is assumed that even if the criteria and
    procedures used in some divisions are not formally
    listed, all divisions have formulated some
    criteria and certain procedures, at least in
    practice.

3. It is assumed that all divisions have a choice
    of candidates available when making their
    selection of administrators.

Delimitations

1. The study is confined to the rural unitary
    divisions in Southern Manitoba employing a
    superintendent during the 1971 spring term.
    For the purposes of this study, Southern Mani-
    toba means all divisions in the province exclud-
    ing those north of the fifty-third parallel.

2. Respondents for the study include all super-
    intendents, board chairmen and one other board
    member from each division. The second board
    member was selected randomly.

Limitations

1. Board members retiring at the end of 1970 or prior to this date who may have played influential roles in the selection of administrators for many years are not included in the study.

2. The study may not be truly representative of rural Southern Manitoba because not all divisions are included in the study.

Definitions

Administrator: any person occupying the principalship of a public school within a unitary division.

Administrative position: the principalship of a public school within a unitary division.

Identification: the method by which an individual is brought to the attention of a division as a possible candidate for appointment to an administrative position.

Selection: the process whereby a candidate is chosen for an administrative position.

Rural Manitoba: the province of Manitoba excluding the metropolitan area of Greater Winnipeg and the city of Brandon.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The major purposes of the study have been defined. Chapter II will present a review of the relevant literature. The review will emphasize the findings which relate to the

role of the principal, the criteria and the procedures used and recommended for the selection of principals.

Chapter III will describe the data sources, the instrumentation, and methodological concerns of the study. The presentation and the analysis of the data will be presented in Chapter IV. The final chapter will summarize the major findings of the study, draw some conclusions and present certain recommendations resulting from the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to survey the related literature to establish a basis for comparison between recommended methods of identification, the perceived role of the principal, and recommended selection criteria and procedures on the one hand and the actual practices, perception and criteria existing in rural, southern Manitoba on the other.

I.   IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATES

While the available quantity of good candidates for administrative positions has most probably never been lacking, Willis states that the lack of sound identification procedures has seriously hampered the selection of these capable personnel.   Therefore, he suggests that even before beginning a search for leaders, boards should establish clear selection policies.   In this respect he recommends the setting up of an ad hoc committee to develop or overhaul selection procedures.   The duties of such a committee would be five-fold:

1.   to examine existing promotion practices,

2.   to read and discuss pertinent research on the problem,

3. to develop a set of selection criteria considered relevant to the school area,

4. to propose a number of methods and techniques for discovering these criteria,

5. to recommend a set of procedures for the selective recruitment of administrators.

The committee employed by his area was composed of two trustees, an assistant superintendent, a principal, a vice-principal and three teachers. The superintendent, the chairman of the board and the chairman of the personnel committee were ex-officio members of the committee, as was a professional consultant. If selection policy can be clearly outlined and the criteria can be clearly defined, then, Willis states that the board is more likely to select the right person for appointment.[1]

Both Davis and Peach, in companion studies conducted on the selection of principals in large urban Canadian systems, strongly recommend that all school boards commit their selection policies to writing and that the criteria for selection be clearly and specifically enumerated. According to Davis, the availability of such written policies to all teaching personnel and to any other persons who apply for administrative positions would help to improve morale and would provide guidance to teachers wishing to become

---

[1] H. L. Willis, "Major Tasks Facing Larger Boards in Selection of Top Personnel," School Administration, V (November, 1968), pp. 34 - 35.

administrators and to institutions which prepare administrators.[2] While acknowledging that written policies will greatly help the identification process, Peach recommends other identification methods such as:

1. requesting recommendations from faculties of education,

2. the development of a guidance program at the high school level to make students aware of the challenges and rewards of administrative positions,

3. the compilation of systematic, cumulative records of teacher performance.[3]

Buckley, in proposing six steps to further improve the process of selecting urban school administrators, suggests the creation of an Office of Executive Selection whose main function would be to identify prospective administrators who would be compatible with the policies of the school system and also who demonstrate knowledge of and expertise in the findings of current research. The director of such a body, being knowledgeable as to the best means of identifying administrators, would participate in the development of selection criteria and would also be responsible for the testing, training, interviewing and

[2]John E. Davis, "Selecting Administrators," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, IX (June, 1963), p. 99.

[3]J. W. Peach, "Procedures and Criteria Used in Selecting Administrative Personnel in Large Urban School Systems in Western Canada," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Alberta, August, 1963), p. 99.

preliminary hiring of administrators. As the second step, Buckley advocates the establishment of more effective and systematic liaisons with administrator training institutions throughout the country.[4]

Henry Otto assails the majority of superintendents who depend primarily upon "the old eagle eye" to discover candidates who might make good principals. Often, he states, the principalship of an elementary school goes to successful high school teachers or to coaches who have no training or experience in elementary education.[5] While not downgrading the employment of formal procedures and channels for the selection of principals, Tronc and Enns postulate that these may be insufficient in gaining the attention from superiors necessary to get the appointment. Therefore, candidates aspiring to an administrative appointment may need to adopt extraordinary behaviour which, in the manner perceived by them, will ensure visibility and approval in the light of their superiors.[6]

In attempting to identify talent pools from which administrative leaders may be recruited, Anderson discerned

[4]James J. Buckley, "The Determination to Pioneer: Six Ways of Improving the Process of Selecting Urban School Administrators," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (February, 1971), pp. 361 - 362.

[5]Henry J. Otto, "Principal Preparation at the Crossroads," Educational Leadership, XIII (October, 1955), pp. 28 - 32.

[6]Keith Tronc and F. Enns, "Promotional Aspirations and Differential Role Perceptions," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XV (September, 1969), pp. 169 - 183.

three. The existing professional personnel, i.e., classroom
teachers and counsellors, was described as the most common
pool. However, Anderson did not concentrate exclusively
on the school personnel for potential candidates. He identi-
fied college students and graduates in fields other than
education as a second major pool of educational leaders.
If recruiting liberal arts graduates in teaching careers is
being carried on successfully on many campuses, why could
not the same approach be used for recruiting leadership
talent, Anderson asks. Finally, he suggests that a good
deal of effort should be spent in communicating with the
third major pool--the secondary school students. Career
choices are often shaped during the later adolescent years,
thus making this group a very important target in our
recruitment efforts. Practicing school administrators can
play a very important role in dealing with two of the talent
pools identified--the classroom teacher and the secondary
student pools for they are constantly in touch with these
two groups. This accessibility carries with it the responsi-
bility for assessing leadership potential, communicating
to the talent pools, and creating a favourable image of the
school administrator.[7]

When attempting to identify prospective educational
leaders, the University Council for Educational Administration

---

[7]Donald P. Anderson, "Recruiting Leaders for Tomor-
row's Schools," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV
(April, 1965), pp. 49 - 50.

finds that those in the top third of high school, college
and teaching populations offer much promise as candidates.
It states that better methods are needed for encouraging
secondary school students to consider such a career. It
further advocates the development and dissemination of
systematic information about leadership opportunities and
challenges in education for counselling purposes at the
high school level.[8]

McIntyre, in his attempt to identify the best
possible candidates for educational administration, suggests
that a higher proportion of able young people be encouraged
to go into teaching with the specific intention of entering
school administration later. Thus, people not interested
in teaching as a permanent career might not be lost.
Further, McIntyre calls for a more diligent search amongst
those in the teaching field to discover those who have the
necessary attributes for leadership but who had never given
it any thought or attention.[9]

In summary, it can be stated that there should be a
continuous systematic search for potential administrators
carried on by as many as possible in the school system.

---

[8]The University Council for Educational Administra-
tion, The Selective Recruitment of Educational Leaders.
A U.C.E.A. Position Paper (Columbus, Ohio: The University
Council for Educational Administration, 1966), pp. 8 - 11.

[9]Kenneth E. McIntyre, Selection of Educational
Administrators (Columbus, Ohio: The University Council
for Educational Administration, 1966), p. 3.

The selection policy and the criteria required should be outlined in writing. Beside a careful examination of all possible candidates from within the teaching pool, the search should also begin at the secondary school level and continue throughout the university years. If the best candidates are to be found, the onus of identification should rest with those in charge of recruitment and not with the individual. Finally, to secure the best candidate, it is essential not to restrict the search to a confined area, but to conduct it on as broad a geographic basis as possible.

II. SELECTION PROCEDURES

Who should determine the qualifications which an appointee to an administrative position should have? Who should interview, screen, and select the candidates to be recommended to the board? Who should make the final selection of the candidates to be appointed? What are the procedures to be followed in the selection of the principal?

The American Association of School Administrators firmly declares that the responsibility for selection and assignment of principals rests in the superintendency. The reason given to substantiate this position is that it is a generally accepted and well established principle that the school board's prime concern should be the formulation of policies to guide identification, selection and assignment rather than execution. The association places its faith in the superintendent who, it states, is held accountable for the quality of the administrative team effort.

By assigning such responsibility to the superintendent, the Association does not imply that the board and other groups should not be involved. On the contrary, the superintendent in recommending his candidate must justify his actions within the general framework created by the board. Other groups such as members of the professional staff, other administrators and teachers can also participate in the selection process by being members of a principal selection committee whose duty it is to advise the superintendent on the choice of the candidate. Different committees with specified functions are possible. One committee, broadly representative of the personnel in the district can focus on the development of the selection criteria, thereby giving an opportunity to various segments of the staff to contribute to the formulation of appropriate standards for selection. Another committee, more specialized in function may be established to implement procedures used to identify, screen, interview, and evaluate candidates. Such committees may include university professors as consultants. The exact composition of any committee should be determined by the superintendent so as to best meet the unique needs of his particular school system.[10]

The American Association of School Administrators

---

[10]American Association of School Administrators, The Right Principal for the Right School (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1967), pp. 9 - 11.

Committee on the Selection of Principals recommends that the
board, after having established policies to guide the super-
intendent in the selection of principals, select only those
persons recommended by the superintendent for a principal-
ship. While it is the board's right to reject any person
recommended and to call for new names, no other names should
be substituted without their having been recommended by
the superintendent.[11]

The Inkster School System in Michigan also uses a
committee to help in the selection process. The committee
composed of a board member, two teachers, a school secretary,
a parent and a principal functions as an advisory body,
formulating recommendations as to:

1. the qualifications necessary for the position, and

2. the procedure to be followed in arriving at a
    final choice.[12]

An important factor which should be considered is
the amount of deliberation given to job-analysis--the man-
job fit. Willis believes that an administrator should not
be selected and then fitted into a school district. Instead,
the needs of the area should be analyzed, a set of criteria
should be developed and then, an attempt should be made to
try to find the person who will best satisfy those local

---

[11]Ibid., p. 12.

[12]Lawrence F. Read, "Appointing the Principal,"
The American School Board Journal, CXXXIX (July, 1959),
pp. 14 - 15.

needs.[13]

The procedures generally used in selecting administrative personnel will now be discussed. These consist of application forms or letters of application, interviews, university transcripts, individual tests, references or letters of recommendation, and field checks.

Application Forms or Letters of Application. The use of application forms receives little attention in the literature surveyed. They are used to gather routine information about the personal background of the applicant.[14] While widely used in teacher selection, more reliance is placed upon the use of other procedures in the selection of principals and the application form correspondingly declines in importance.[15] For candidates applying from within the division, these histories are probably in the personnel files, but, nonetheless, the application forms or letters of application do indicate the applicant's interest in the position and do act as a starting point from which further inquiries can be made.

---

[13]Willis, op. cit., p. 35.

[14]Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1966), p. 391.

[15]Kenneth E. McIntyre, "The Selection of Elementary School Principals," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV (April, 1965), p. 46.

Interviews. The interview is generally used to provide the prospective employer with some indication of the appearance, poise, speaking ability, and knowledge of the candidate. McIntyre states that certain objectives, if clearly identified, might be reasonably sought in interviews, provided that the interviewer is skillful enough to accomplish his objectives and humble enough to avoid instant psychoanalysis. However, he further warns that:

> Nothing in the research on selection methodology is so completely established and repeatedly verified as is the unreliability of short interviews as they are usually conducted.[16]

Willis terms the single interview as a selection device of questionable validity.[17] While cautioning that the interview can be grossly overrated, the American Association of School Administrators does not recommend its abandonment for it does remain one of the few personal contacts the employer is provided with the applicant. Moreover, the interview can be used to corroborate previously obtained information and it can be a two-way street whereby expectations of the principalship and the nature of the school system are transmitted to the candidate.[18] If the interview is to be used, Peach suggests that it be a structured one where each interviewer uses a standard

---

[16]McIntyre, op. cit., p. 7.

[17]Willis, op. cit., p. 35.

[18]American Association of School Administrators (1967), op. cit., p. 40.

rating scale.[19]

University Transcripts. The transcript of graduate
and undergraduate credits earned sheds some light on the
academic history and achievement of a prospective school
principal. The American Association of School Administra-
tors cautions, however, that it takes an experienced inter-
preter to comprehend the endless variety of course numbers
and titles offered by the various universities.[20] While
also recommending that the interpreter of such transcripts
check the university from which they originate, McIntyre
singles out the transcripts of college credits as the best
single predictor of further scholarly attainments. Stat-
ing his belief that those engaged in the selection of
administrators should be interested in seeing to it that
the schools are headed by individuals who have themselves
demonstrated a capacity for scholarly activity, McIntyre
sees the transcripts as a proof of the capacity of the
individual.[21]

Ability, Physical and Personality Tests. While
testing procedures are found more often in city schools
than in smaller districts, the use of tests as a part of the

[19]Peach, op. cit., p. 100.

[20]American Association of School Administrators
(1967), op. cit., p. 35.

[21]McIntyre, "Selection of Educatioal Administrators,"
op. cit., p. 8.

selection procedures is becoming more common.[22] The American Association of School Administrators believes that tests may be used appropriately to portray accurately a personal or professional variable related to a meaningful criterion. It warns, however, against putting tests to a use never intended by the test maker. It is suggested that universities are in a unique position to serve as administrating centers for most tests used in principal selection, thereby insuring a more correct interpretation. Administration being action oriented, the ability to implement what is known, and to exercise good judgement counts more than mere potential or accumulation of knowledge.[23] The use of a research officer to analyze standardized culture-fair intelligence tests such as the Cottell is advocated.[24]

McIntyre firmly believes in a test used by the military, the situational performance test. The appeal of this test is that it is an attempt to evoke behaviour under controlled conditions, providing the exercise of both situational and personal influences on that behaviour. The use of in-basket type situations and of computers should provide a whole new opening into this area.[25]

---

[22]Campbell, Corbally & Ramseyer, op. cit., p. 392.

[23]American Association of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 39.

[24]Willis, op. cit., p. 35.

[25]McIntyre, op. cit., p. 10.

Peach recommends that each candidate for an administrative position be required to undergo a medical examination unless the school system makes provision for regular physical examinations.[26]

Campbell and Gregg have this to say about the use of tests:

> As a simple solution to the problem of selecting educational leaders, the use of tests leaves much to be desired. As a means of improving present practice in most places, tests can make a significant contribution . . . . Where several relevant tests are used, however, and where the results are considered along with other appropriate measures, there is little doubt that selection with tests can be more valid than selection without tests.[27]

References or Letters of Recommendation. The use of letters of recommendation rates poorly in the literature surveyed. The American Association of School Administrators states that such letters have some value in identifying the least likely candidates, but do little to aid discrimination among the good, better and best. It believes that the position of principal is sufficiently important to warrant making a few telephone calls to corroborate opinions or to seek elaborations upon, or interpretations of judgments rendered in the letter of recommendation.[28] Willis also

---

[26]Peach, op. cit., p. 100.

[27]Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (eds.), Administrative Behavior in Education (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 401.

[28]American Association of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 35.

hesitates in blindly accepting such letters and calls for more direct and confidential recommendations from the candidate's previous and present superiors and associates.[29] McIntyre expresses the feeling that open-ended letters of reference, unless the writer and his meanings are well known, are almost worthless. He classifies rating scales as being more of value but finds these to have inherent weaknesses also.[30]

Field Checks. Field checks are used to view candidates on the job in which they are presently engaged. Both Willis and Campbell assert that research evidence tends to indicate that the best method of identifying leadership is to observe the candidate in action in his present post.[31, 32]

III. SELECTION CRITERIA

The criteria which appear to be used most commonly in the selection process are: age, sex, experience, academic training, level of scholastic achievement, intelligence, personality or personal factors, physical fitness and general

---

[29] Willis, op. cit., p. 35.

[30] McIntyre, "The Selection of Elementary School Principals," op. cit., p. 45.

[31] Willis, op. cit., p. 35.

[32] Campbell and Ramseyer, op. cit., pp. 186 - 187.

knowledge. Each of these will be discussed to discover the relative importance attached to each one by the authorities.

Age. McIntyre believes that school administration is not presently attracting its share of the most able young people in the population.[33] The American Association of School Administrators claims that there is some evidence that candidates named at age forty-five or older may not perform as well as candidates named at a younger age. Yet, one of its recent studies reveals that the average age for principals was forty-seven.[34] Another authority, emphasizing the importance of flexibility in selecting principals, states that according to recent research, such factors as age should not necessarily be considered in the selection process.[35] Campbell and Gregg assert that only extreme youth or senility could be significant factors. The candidate must be old enough to have the maturity, experience and education necessary to do his work and command respect but he must be young enough so that his services will be available for a number of years.[36]

---

[33]McIntyre, "Selection of Educational Administrators," op. cit., p. 18.

[34]American Association of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 19.

[35]Willis, op. cit., p. 35.

[36]Campbell and Gregg, op. cit., p. 411.

<u>Sex</u>. Reporting on an intensive study of the school principal conducted by the College of Education, University of Florida, Grobman and Hines found that schools with women as principals tended to outrank those where men were principals--even in discipline. The women ranked in the study were principals of elementary schools.[37] Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederikson substantiated the findings of the above study and found that there probably is no reason to prefer men as principals.[38] In a survey by Barter, a group of teachers rated female and male principals as equal in ability and personal qualities,[39] while a study conducted by Newell found that female elementary school principals showed more evidence of being aware of the cognitive factor of the learning process than did male administrators.[40] In a study that compared the manner in which male and female principals make decisions or solve problems, Hoyle dis-

---

[37]Hulda Grobman and Vynce A. Hines, "What Makes a Good Principal," <u>The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals</u>, XL (November, 1956), pp. 5 - 16.

[38]John K. Hemphill, Daniel C. Griffiths, and Norman Frederikson, "Administrative Performance and Personality," in John Hoyle, "Who Shall Be Principal--A Man or a Woman?", <u>The National Elementary Principal</u>, XLVIII (January, 1969), p. 23.

[39]Alice S. Barter, "The Status of Women in School Administration," in John Hoyle, "Who Shall be Principal--A Man or a Woman?", <u>The National Elementary Principal</u>, XLVIII (January, 1969), p. 23.

[40]Laura A. Newell, "A Study of Instructional Awareness of Elementary School Principals in Selected School Districts Throughout the United States," in John Hoyle, "Who Shall Be Principal--A Man or a Woman?", <u>The National Elementary Principal</u>, XLVIII (January, 1969), p. 23.

covered that female administrators outranked their male counterparts in two variables, the ability to notice potential problem situations and the ability to evaluate results of the action taken; there was no significant difference in three other variables tested.[41] In presenting the case for women, McIntyre criticizes the apparent disregard for this talent pool which constitutes a great preponderance of the population from which elementary principals are selected.[42] The American Association of School Administrators points out that although two-thirds of the teachers in America are women, more than three-fourths of the principals are men. Some of the reasons brought forth for this fact were that fewer women had a master's degree, that they consider their chances for promotion as being very slim and that many leave the profession to get married and raise a family. The Association concludes that "All other things being equal, men principals are not superior to women principals by any measure of administrative effectiveness."[43]

Experience. While most authors agree that some teaching experience is necessary, there is no agreement on

---

[41]John Hoyle, "Who Shall Be Principal--A Man or a Woman?", The National Elementary Principal, XLVIII (January, 1969), p. 23.

[42]McIntyre, "The Selection of Elementary School Principals," op. cit., p. 42.

[43]American Association of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 28.

the amount and the type of experience which potential
administrators should have. In a study where he attempted
to determine the extent to which certain personal and pro-
fessional characteristics of principals were related to
levels of rated effectiveness in over-all school administra-
tion, Scott found that the length of teaching experience is
not significantly related to the rated effectiveness of the
principal.[44] Thiemann, in his study, found that the
typical principal in Alberta had been in the educational
field for twenty years.[45] According to the American Associa-
tion of School Administrators, the average total experience
of elementary principals in the classroom is 10.6 years,
while the high school principal reports at least eight
years of teaching experience prior to the assumption of the
principalship. The same association concludes that the
issue of how much prior experience is necessary to become a
principal remains unresolved, but unusually long periods
are not recommended.[46] Willis believes that the kind of
teaching experience and that previous administrative

---

[44]Frank A. Scott, "The Development and Evaluation
of an Instrument to Assess the Attitudes of Public School
Principals," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI
(March, 1958), p. 195.

[45]Francis C. Thiemann, "The Alberta School Admini-
strator's Career So Far, So Good," The Canadian School
Administrator Bulletin, IX (February, 1970), pp. 4 - 16.

[46]The American Association of School Administrators,
op. cit., pp. 20 - 24.

experience have little empirical justification if they are used as criteria for selecting administrators.[47] Criticizing the rewards system of promotion within the profession, McIntyre states that there is very little evidence that teaching experience beyond the first four or five years contributes to effectiveness in administration. The same author, therefore, strongly encourages a shortening of the career line into administration so as to prevent candidates from having lost all their energy before reaching the desired position.[48]

Academic Training. The case for a greater degree of advanced training for potential administrators is gaining ground. Stressing the importance of graduate courses providing more understanding of American culture and methods of teaching and curriculum development, three American educators, intimately involved in the education of future administrators, also emphasize the necessity of the introduction to concepts of administration which will lead to a greater understanding of the process and of the role of the administrator within it. They also point out that the American Association of School Administrators requires two years of graduate work in educational administration in an accredited university program as one of the conditions for

[47]Willis, op. cit., p. 34.

[48]McIntyre, "Selection of Educational Administrators," op. cit., p. 7.

membership.[49] This association recommends that a year of
graduate study or its equivalent be the absolute minimum
for consideration for selection as a principal, with post-
master's work in school administration, particularly a
doctorate being given a high order of preference.[50] While
not specifying any degree per se, the University Council
for Educational Administration states that the educational
leaders of the future will need a better education than
their predecessors because the citizenry at large will be
a more educated one.[51] Otto, stating that college degrees
alone are not an adequate index of professional prepara-
tion recommends the establishment of special university
programs uniquely designed for prospective principals.[52]
Stressing the need for a more broadly based preparatory
program, Culbertson states that the relevance of such
sciences as sociology, economics, social psychology,
political science, and anthropology has become more clearly
recognized.[53] Ovard indicates that a majority of states

---

[49]Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer, op. cit., pp. 342 -
343.

[50]The American Association of School Administrators,
op. cit., p. 31.

[51]The University Council for Educational Admini-
strators, op. cit., p. 8.

[52]Otto, op. cit., p. 31.

[53]Jack A. Culbertson, "Changes in the Preparation of
School Administrators," The National Elementary Principal,
XLIV (April, 1965), p. 56.

require a master's degree or its equivalent for certification[54] while Hemphill's study on the secondary school principalship revealed that only nine per cent of the principals concerned hold less than a master's degree.[55] Table I reveals his findings.

TABLE I

UNIVERSITY STANDING HELD BY PRINCIPALS
IN URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

Response	All Schools	Location	
		Cities	Rural
No college degree	00	00	01
Bachelor's (or equivalent)	09	07	15
Master's: education	35	25	40
Master's: other field	04	08	03
Master's: plus work	41	40	37
Master's: plus all doctor's course work	06	09	03
Doctor of Education	02	05	01
Doctor of Philosophy	01	05	00
Some other degree	01	01	00

Source: J. K. Hemphill, "Progress Report: A Study of the Secondary School Principal, Part II," Bulletin of N.A.S.S.P., p. 220. (Reprinted by permission from the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, April, 1964.) Copyright: Washington, D.C.

---

[54]Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968), p. 59.

[55]J. K. Hemphill, "Progress Report: A Study of the Secondary School Principalship, Part II," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIX (April, 1964), p. 220.

Scholastic Achievement.   Closely associated with the
criterion of academic training is the one of scholastic
achievement.   Most Canadian universities require at least
a second class standing for admittance to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies.   McIntyre describes the scholastic
achievement of prospective administrators as the best single
predictor of further scholarly attainments.   Furthermore,
he states that schools should be headed by individuals who
have themselves demonstrated a capacity for scholarly
achievement.[56]   Campbell, et al., suggest that the under-
graduate record should indicate general academic success
while the graduate record should provide evidence of better
than average performance, signalling a grade average of
"B" as a minimum standard of performance.[57]

Intelligence.   According to Ovard, the principal
should be above average in intelligence and at least as
intelligent as the group with whom he works, although if
he excels the group by an extreme degree, his ideas may
not often be accepted.[58]   Campbell, et al., state that an
above-average I.Q. does correlate with success in educa-
tional administration.   They add, however, that one gross
I.Q. score is not especially meaningful in itself and that

---

[56]McIntyre, "Selection of Educational Administra-
tors," op. cit., p. 8.

[57]Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer, op. cit., p. 346.

[58]Ovard, op. cit., p. 6.

psychologists refer more and more to factors of intelligence such as verbal facility, computational skill, reasoning ability, memory spatial judgment, judgmental capacity and observational skill.[59] When selecting administrators, McIntyre advocates a high cut-off point on intelligence for, although the correlations between intelligence and effectiveness criteria do not tend to be high, they do tend to be consistently respectable.[60] Acknowledging that there are enough brilliant failures to warrant other considerations, the American Association of School Administrators agrees with the findings of the above authors that intelligence appears to be a relatively valid standard, especially when coupled with a high level of academic achievement. Examining 124 studies on the relationship of personality factors to leadership, Stogdill reported that the average leader exceeded the average members of his group in intelligence.[61] While Myers' analysis reached the same conclusions as Stogdill's, he found there is no significant relationship

---

[59]Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer, op. cit., pp. 322 - 332.

[60]McIntyre, "Selection of Educational Administrators," op. cit., p. 12.

[61]Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership, A Survey of the Literature," in Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 124.

between superior intelligence and leadership.[62] Revealing

his own formula for choosing administrators, Riederer looks

for intelligence which he defines as the crystal clear

capability and perceptiveness of an uncluttered mind.[63]

Personal Factors. Many authorities attribute a

high importance to personality or personal characteristics.

The American Association of School Administrators believes

that leadership ability and insight into community power

structures are most useful criteria.[64] In outlining a

simple schema for a selection program, McIntyre includes

human relations skills, emotional stability and moral fit-

ness as three of the main categories upon which administra-

tive candidates should be assessed.[65] Willis includes the

following personal factors in his list of criteria to be

considered: human relations and communication skills,

creative and innovative behaviour and a strong motivation

to serve.[66] The University Council for Educational Administra-

---

[62]Robert B. Myers, "The Development and Implica-
tions of a Conception for Leadership Education," in Edgar L.
Morphet, Roe L. Johns and Theodore L. Reller, Educational
Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice
Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 125.

[63]L. G. Riederer, "Recruiting Leaders in School
Administration," Education Canada, X (June, 1970), p. 34.

[64]American Association of School Administrators,
op. cit., p. 30.

[65]McIntyre, "Selection of Educational Administra-
tors," op. cit., p. 13.

[66]Willis, op. cit., p. 35.

tion foresees the need for much courage in aspiring administrators if they are to meet successfully the challenge of change.[67] In an analysis of more than two hundred studies of leadership, Myers concluded that the following characteristics correlate significantly with leadership: insight, initiative, cooperation, originality, ambition, persistence, emotional stability, judgment, popularity, and communication skills.[68] Concluding as did Myers, that the assumption, "leaders are born not made," is mainly false, Stogdill found that the average leader exceeds the average member of his group to some degree in the following respects: sociability, initiative, persistence, knowing how to get things done, self-confidence, alertness to and insight into situations, cooperativeness, popularity, adaptability and verbal facility.[69] According to Davis, superintendents in eighteen larger urban systems in Eastern Canada considered the ability to get along with people, initiative and willingness to work, and leadership as the qualities most essential in prospective principals.[70]

---

[67]The University Council for Educational Administration, op. cit., p. 8.

[68]Robert B. Myers, "The Development and Implications of a Conception for Leadership Education" in Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 125.

[69]Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership, A Survey of the Literature," in Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 125.

[70]Davis, op. cit., p. 96.

Peach reports that Western Canadian urban superintendents considered leadership and the ability to teach the most important qualities in future principals.[71]

Physical Fitness. Pierce and Merrill, in Campbell and Gregg, state that although physique, energy and health are not significantly related to leadership, it must be assumed that a minimum energy level can be maintained.[72] Ovard stresses the need for good physical health as a main requisite for maximum effectiveness.[73] Explaining the wide diversity of activities an administrator must perform and the length of his working day, Campbell sees above-average physical energy as one of his most important attributes.[74] The American Association of School Administrators recommends periodic health examinations for all principals, for these latter are subjected to excessive stress and strain.[75]

Breadth of Knowledge. Campbell and Gregg state that successful leaders in education have a greater breadth

---

[71]Peach, op. cit., p. 98.

[72]Campbell and Gregg, op. cit., p. 325.

[73]Ovard, op. cit., p. 6.

[74]Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer, op. cit., pp. 321 - 322.

[75]American Association of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 23.

of knowledge than their unsuccessful counterparts.[76]
McIntyre suggests that a principal should serve as a model
of the well-educated person who is able to appreciate the
contributions of the various subject areas and disciplines
and who is able to discuss current developments with informed
laymen.[77] Emphasizing the importance of a thorough know-
ledge of the social sciences, Goldhammer advocates that
the administrator training program of the future include
a much greater percentage of the study of social sciences
in its curriculum.[78]

These are what appear to be the major criteria.
However, the trend seems to be advancing in favour of a
more coordinated policy, where the different criteria are
no longer judged in isolation but in relation to each
other. The trait approach is being attacked by many
authorities in the field. The use of simulation tests
where candidates are given the opportunity to "display"
their capacities and characteristics in as close a life-
like situation as possible is also becoming a more recognized
way of selecting administrators.

---

[76]Campbell and Gregg, op. cit., p. 409.

[77]McIntyre, "The Selection of Elementary School
Principals," op. cit., p. 44.

[78]Keith Goldhammer, The Social Sciences and the
Preparation of Educational Administrators (Eugene, Oregon:
The University Council for Educational Administration, 1963),
p. 32.

IV. PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

The role of the principal has changed significantly in the past and will probably continue to do so in the future. While the principal was once the manager of the school office and the dispenser of discipline, he is now expected to be the educational leader in the school and therefore, to assume responsibility for every activity undertaken by the school. Ingram categorized these activities into seven convenient groupings: school-community relations, curriculum development, administration of pupil personnel, administration of staff personnel, administration of physical facilities, finance and business management and administration of the organizational and structural aspects of the school. To carry out these tasks effectively, he reports four categories of skills: "technical-managerial," those relating to the non-human aspects of management; "technical-educational," those pertaining to competence in the general field of education; "human-managerial," those necessary to stimulate and motivate individuals towards certain goals; "speculative-creative," those skills enabling a principal to do a good job of educational planning and innovation.[79]

Conceptualizing the role of the principal in the school, Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer see his role as one

---

[79]E. J. Ingram, "Supervising the Instructional Program: The Role of the Principal," The CSA Bulletin, VI (June, 1967), pp. 23 - 24.

similar to that of the school superintendent, but on a more
limited scale. Consequently, instructional leadership,
community relationships, staff personnel, pupil personnel,
facilities, finance and business management and organiza-
tion are all areas in which tasks must be performed at the
school building level as well as the level of central
office administration. The nature of these responsibilities
will differ, however, at the various levels, elementary,
junior high and senior high. With these many and varied tasks
under his jurisdiction, the principal is viewed, by these
authors, as many agents in one. As an organizer, the princi-
pal must organize his school in such a way that the tasks are
accomplished. He must weld together these resources--
those of his teachers, of the neighbourhood, and of the
students--into a school community that has a character of
its own. As a communicator he must act as the intermediary
between central office and his teachers, between teachers
and parents. Through his contributions his school should
become part of the integrated unit of schools. As in-
structional leader, the principal becomes the key person.
He must prove that under his leadership, the school is
achieving the purposes he proposed it should strive toward.
In this role he becomes at once a diagnostician of the
problems facing his school and a synthesizer of the forces
that must be brought together to solve them.[80]

---

[80]Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer, op. cit.,
pp. 225 - 227.

Pursuing the description of the task of educational administration from the point of view of the socially desired while recognizing that the perceptions of the various administrators in actuality will cause the responsibilities indicated by the task to differ widely, Campbell and Gregg examine the task of educational administration under four major categories of responsibilities: relating to the community; improving the educational opportunity; obtaining, developing and improving personnel; and providing and maintaining funds and facilities. In relating to the community, the principal must grasp the community's expectations of the school and the school's potential for realizing these expectations. He then must be able to interpret them to his personnel. As liaison officer, he must also strive to have the educational program understood by the community and, at times, seek to stimulate a desire for certain improvements deemed necessary by his own staff. Noting that improvement of educational opportunity is frequently referred to as the primary responsibility of the principal, the authors emphasize the need for continuous change and improvement of the educational system under the guidance of the principal. With the establishment of clearly defined goals, the principal must see that these programs are continuously evaluated and revised to meet the desired objectives. While outlining the necessity for obtaining, developing, and improving personnel, Campbell and Gregg do not clearly delineate who is in charge of employing the

personnel. However, they do stress the importance of developing a climate conducive to the professional and personal development of his personnel. While noting that the primary responsibilities of administrators rest upon such matters as designing and organizing a sound educational program, Campbell and Gregg state that principals must also deal with the "things" of administration which they call providing and maintaining funds and facilities.[81]

Ovard, seeing the school as a body which must constantly undergo changes if it is to improve, points to the principal as the key person through whom educatioal change can occur. Outlining the tasks of the principal, this change agent, he divides these into three main categories: the administration of changing instructional programs, the administration of student affairs and the administration of auxiliary services. In his opinion, a major portion of the principal's time should be spent in the areas of curriculum and instruction. In the areas of student affairs such as the orientation and admission of new students, the counseling and guidance of students and the administration of discipline, Ovard states that the principal is the director of all these services, but he delegates to assistants, counselors, and other personnel. His role in this field is primarily one of providing administrative

---

[81]Campbell and Gregg, op. cit., pp. 209 - 227.

leadership and organizational patterns for the various
programs. In administration of auxiliary services, Ovard
includes the administration of business affairs, administra-
tion of the office, administration of various services
including the school plant, health and safety programs,
transportation, the planning of new facilities and the
administration of school-community relations. The business
management of a school, Ovard states, is a continuing
responsibility of a school principal throughout the year.
While not minimizing the importance of organizing an effi-
cient and effective office, Ovard recommends that a minimal
amount of time be spent in office procedure, the greater
part of such work being delegated to clerical staff. In
the area of auxiliary services, the author advocates close
cooperation between the principal and the other responsible
people involved. The principal should definitely be in-
volved in the planning of new buildings. Finally, Ovard
designates the principal as the agent responsible for
organizing and administering the public relations program.[82]

Morphet, Johns and Reller believe that the role of
the principal is determined largely by the role assigned to
him by the board of education and its administration and
by the subject's perception of that role. His role is also
determined to a degree by the perceptions of his role held

---

[82]Ovard, op. cit., pp. 1 - 446.

by the local community and the staff of his school.[83]
According to Lipham, theorists, researchers, and practi-
tioners agree that the role of the principal is one of high
conflict, but here agreement ends. Despite the many
studies conducted on the role of the principal, there is
little agreement as to what the principal should be doing
or as to what he is actually doing.[84]

Getzels notes that roles are defined in terms of
role expectations, the normative rights and duties which
define within limits what a person should or should not do
under various circumstances. Role expectations are held
not only by the role incumbent himself, but by many others
also.[85] Lipham points out two major weaknesses in studies
of role expectations. The first, a methodological one,
concerns the nature of the descriptive items which prevent
open-end type responses. The second, a substantive weak-
ness, relates to the fact that the impact of situational
factors is usually ignored. Despite these two weaknesses,
Lipham advocates such studies for they reveal to the in-
cumbent the tasks judged to be important by each of his

---

[83]Morphet, Johns, Reller, op. cit., p. 339.

[84]James M. Lipham, "The Role of the Principal:
Search and Research," The National Elementary Principal,
XLIV (April, 1965), p. 29.

[85]Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social
Process," Administrative Theory in Education (edited by
Andrew W. Halpin) (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center,
University of Chicago, 1958), p. 153.

primary reference groups and they also give to this person

a better understanding of the indivuals and groups with

whom he must work.[86] Some studies of role expectations have

revealed differences in expectations held for the role of

principal due to such factors as age, occupational level,

sex, religious polity and urban orientation of respond-

ents.[87] Analyzing different studies of the principal's

role, Ranniger discovered that the duties of the elementary

school principal are not generally agreed upon and that

principals devote too much time to routine clerical duties

at the expense of supervision, public relations and

curriculum development.[88]

The American Association of School Administrators

describes the principalship as a cluster of functions

which are best realized through the efforts of many rather

than only one person. They further assert that the expecta-

tions of the principal and the responsibilities to be given

primary emphasis vary with the times and referent groups.[89]

---

[86]Lipham, op. cit., pp. 30 - 31.

[87]Furnan Owens, "A Study of the Role of the Elemen-
tary Principal as Perceived by Parents," (Unpublished
doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,
1963).

[88]Billy Jay Ranniger, "A Summary Study of the Job
Responsibilities of the Elementary School Principal," in
James A. Lipham, "The Role of the Principal: Search and
Research," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV
(April, 1965), pp. 31 - 32.

[89]American Association of School Administrators,
op. cit., p. 13.

Looking into the future, Goldman predicts that principals
will become more community oriented and that their prime
function will be that of school-community specialist in
charge of interpreting educational programs to the public,
interpreting the community to the school personnel, direct-
ing the involved parties to the right level of the ad-
ministrative hierarchy and recommending to the superintendent
certain lines of action after having translated to him all
available knowledge about the community.[90] Viewing tomor-
row's principalship as a dynamic assignment, highly un-
predictable and with varied and changing responsibilities,
Austin foresees the principal's role as an agent of change.[91]

V. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER II

Identification of Candidates. Boards should estab-
lish clear selection policies before beginning to search
for principals. Those in charge of selection should be
knowledgeable as to the best means of identifying candidates;
close liaison with the universities would help in this
respect. Attempts at identification of potential leaders
must be as broad as possible, going beyond the actual
teaching body to promising students in universities and
high schools.

---

[90]Harvey Goldman, "New Roles for Principals," The
Clearing House, XLV (November, 1970), pp. 135 - 139.

[91]David B. Austin, "Thoughts and Predictions on the
Principalship," Bulletin of the National Association of
Secondary School Principals, LII (December, 1968),
pp. 141 - 150.

Selection Procedures. While the board formulates policies to guide identification and selection, the superintendent, accountable for the quality of the team efforts in his division, should be responsible for the selection of principals. Committees consisting of board members, administrators, teachers, parents and others can advise the superintendent in the selection of criteria or the formulation of standards. Committees can also be helpful in interviewing, screening and evaluating candidates. The advice of university professors might also be sought. The board should only appoint candidates recommended by the superintendent and great care should be taken to find the proper person for a specific job.

Applications. These are used to gather routine information about a candidate and can act as a starting point in the selection process.

Interviews. If used, the interviewer must have certain objectives and be skillful enough to accomplish these objectives. They do provide the opportunity for personal contact.

University Transcripts. When skillfully analyzed, they can provide a valuable insight as to the capacity of the individual.

Ability and Personality Tests. If properly selected, administered and interpreted, perhaps with the help of

local universities, such tests can be valuable.   In-basket
types and computer simulations are promising.

References.   The use of references rated poorly in
the literature surveyed.

Field Checks.   These were qualified as a good
method of identifying leadership.

Age.   Extreme youth or senility must be avoided.
A candidate must have gained some degree of maturity,
education and experience but yet must be able, energetic
and available for some yars.

Sex.   Women are as effective in school administra-
tion as men.

Experience.   While some teaching experience is
necessary, this criterion must not be overly stressed.

Academic Training.   Candidates need a broadly based
preparatory program which is usually found only in graduate
work.

Scholarship.   Individuals must have a demonstrated
capacity for scholarly achievement.   A "B" average at the
graduate level should be a minimum standard of performance.

Intelligence.   Above average or superior intelligence
is required.

<u>Personal Factors</u>. There is no complete agreement amongst the authors in this area. However, following are some of the qualities stressed by various authors: leadership; insight; emotional stability; moral fitness; communication skills; creativity; motivation to serve; initiative; cooperativeness; originality; ambition; persistence; judgement; popularity; sociability; ability to get things done; self-confidence; adaptability; and verbal facility.

<u>Physical Fitness</u>. A good physical health and a minimum energy level are essential for maximum effectiveness.

<u>Breadth of Knowledge</u>. Candidates must possess a good breadth of knowledge and be able to discuss current developments intelligibly.

<u>Perceptions of the Role of the Principal</u>. There has been a change from the historical role of the principal as the head teacher and office manager. The perceptions of the new emerging role are different according to the different referent groups and individuals. The principal's role is highly influenced by situational factors which are frequently conflicting. While it is impossible to reach a concensus on the role of the principal, most authors agree that his work is directed mainly to the following seven role functions: improving the educational program; selecting and developing personnel; working with pupils; maintaining the school plant; working with the community;

managing the school; and personal professional development.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF STUDY AND COLLECTION OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to compare the criteria perceived important by school board members when selecting principals with the criteria perceived important by their superintendents. The study was also to compare the perceptions of the role of the principal as perceived by both board members and superintendents. It was also to survey the selection procedures used in unitary school divisions of Manitoba. This chapter outlines the instrument construction and gives details about the collection of data. Information on the organization and treatment of the data is included.

I. SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

When the thesis topic and method of study had been approved by the committee, copies of a letter included in the Appendix were sent to the superintendents of the twenty-eight rural unitary divisions involved. This letter requested their agreement to participate in the study by granting time for an interview and by encouraging the two board members selected in their division to answer the questionnaire sent to them. Interviews were conducted with twenty-five of the twenty-eight. Two others agreed to the

interview but these were not conducted either because of time or distance factors. One superintendent indicated a reluctance to participate in such a study. All the interviews took place in the months of April and May, the last one being on May 12, 1971.

To obtain an adequate sampling of the perceptions of board members, the following procedure was used. All chairmen of the twenty-eight division boards were included in the study. These were selected because they were generally thought to be influential members on their boards and therefore more actively involved in the decision making process. A second member of each board chosen randomly also formed part of the study. Questionnaires were mailed to each of the fifty-six chosen participants. Stapled to the questionnaire was a cover letter (see Appendix) explaining the purpose of the study and inviting the recipient to answer this attached questionnaire. A stamped, addressed envelope was enclosed so that all replies were mailed directly to the writer.

Three weeks after the mailing of the questionnaires a follow-up letter thanking those who had replied and repeating the invitation to those who had not yet answered, was sent out. A third and final letter was mailed a month later, May 12, 1971, to those who still had not replied. A final count of the completed questionnaires received showed a total of forty. The final number of responses was slightly over seventy-one percent of the original number of questionnaires sent out.

II.   THE QUESTIONNAIRES

A questionnaire was the instrument used to collect
the data.   It was based on information gathered from the
literature and included types of questions similar to those
found in related studies.   The questionnaire was divided
into four parts:

A.   Selection procedures;

B.   Perceptions of the role of the principal;

C.   Criteria for selection;

D.   Related information about the respondent.

The questionnaire was used with both the superin-
tendents and the school board members.   The school board
members answered the questionnaire by writing their answers
while the superintendents were interviewed.

III.   ORGANIZATION AND TREATMENT
OF THE DATA

The data obtained from the twenty-five completed
questionnaires answered by superintendents were compiled
in tabular form.   The same procedure was followed for the
data obtained from the forty completed questionnaires
returned by the school board members.   An analysis comparing
the perceptions of both groups was then undertaken.   On
analysis, the content of the twenty-five superintendents'
questionnaires was almost entirely usable, no vital section
having been omitted.   While not all board members answered all
sections of the questionnaire completely, all forty replies were

used to the fullest degree possible.

The answers given by the respondents to each question were compiled in terms of the number of respondents giving each answer. In most cases these totals were transformed into percentages of the total number of usable questionnaires. In all ranking questions the median ranks were found. In two of three ranking questions, a Spearman's rho was computed to measure the amount of agreement between the superintendents and the school board members in ranking the various functions in the role of the principal and personal factors. A chi square was computed for each function in the role of the principal to compare the distribution among the ranks given by the superintendents and school board members. The variance was found for each selection procedure to find the degree of agreement within each of the two groups, the superintendents and the school board members.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purposes of this chapter are to present a descriptive analysis of:

1. The perceived importance of the various functions comprising the role of the principal.

2. The various procedures involved in the selection of principals in rural divisions of Southern Manitoba.

3. The perceived importance of certain criteria used in the selection of principals.

In all cases, a comparison will be made between the responses of the superintendents and those of school board members.

I. PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

The purpose of this section is to present a descriptive analysis of the perceived importance of the various functions comprising the role of the principal. Comparisons will be made between the perceptions of the superintendents and those of the school board members.

To facilitate matters, the role of the principal was divided into seven broad functions referred to as role

functions. To explain more clearly what was included in these role functions, various tasks relating to these were listed. While the candidates answering the questionnaires were asked to consider each role function and task and to rate these, this analysis will confine itself only to the seven broad role functions.

When answering the questionnaire, some trustees, either willingly or unwillingly, did not rate the seven broad role functions per se, but did rate all of the related tasks. In such cases, the importance attributed to the related tasks were averaged out and these averages were assigned to the role functions.

Following is a comparative analysis of the importance of each of the seven broad role functions as perceived by superintendents and school board members.

Improving the Educational Program

Improving the educational program was considered to include all of the following tasks:

1. Conducting personal professional research.
2. Evaluating present programs.
3. Initiating curricular revisions.
4. Motivating the faculty in curriculum improvement.
5. Providing the necessary resources for curriculum.
6. Planning in-service and orientation sessions.
7. Supervising instruction.

Table II presents a comparison of the importance assigned to this role function by both superintendents and school board members.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED
BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO
THE ROLE FUNCTION OF IMPROVING THE
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

	Important	Useful	Not Important
Superintendent	100	0	0
School Board Members	65	32.5	2.5

All twenty-five (100 per cent) superintendents rated this role function as important.

Twenty-six of the forty school board members (65 per cent) reported that they perceived this function to be an important part of the role of the principal. Thirteen (32.5 per cent) stated that this role function was a useful one while one (2.5 per cent) member considered this area to be an unimportant one.

Therefore, the superintendents seemed to attribute more importance to this role function than the school board members. While 100 per cent of the superintendents considered this role function an important one, only 65 per cent of the school board members considered it in the same light.

Selecting and Developing Personnel

The role function of selecting and developing personnel was thought to include all that related to the recruitment and growth of a personnel. More specifically, the tasks included were:

1. Recruiting new staff members.

2. Creating good staff morale.

3. Stimulating professional development.

4. Stimulating personal development.

5. Providing open lines of communication at all times.

Nineteen superintendents (76 per cent) reported that they considered this role function to be an important part of the principal's role. Six (24 per cent) superintendents stated that they considered it to be useful.

Twenty-nine (72.5 per cent) school board members reported that they considered selecting and developing personnel an important part of the principal's role. Ten (25 per cent) stated that they considered it useful while one member (2.5 per cent) considered it as not important.

Table III shows that there was almost complete agreement in this function between the two groups. The percentages reported by both groups were very similar.

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED
BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
TO THE ROLE FUNCTION OF SELECTING AND
DEVELOPING PERSONNEL

	Important	Useful	Not Important
Superintendents	76	24	0
School Board Members	72.5	25	2.5

Working with Pupils

Working with pupils was meant to include all tasks relating to pupil personnel in the schools. The specific tasks included in this area were:

1. Maintaining discipline and student control.

2. Organizing, administering and improving the guidance program.

3. Controlling extra-curricular activities.

4. Admitting and orientating new students.

5. Counselling students.

Twenty-three (92 per cent) superintendents reported that they considered working with pupils to be an important function in the role of the principal. Two (8 per cent) perceived this area to be a useful one.

Thirty-two (80 per cent) school board members stated that they perceived this role function to be an important one while eight (20 per cent) others considered it to be useful.

The perceptions of both groups in regards to the

importance assigned to the role function of working with
pupils are presented in Table IV. This role function was
perceived as important by a greater percentage of super-
intendents. While only 8 per cent of the superintendents
found it to be only useful, 20 per cent of the school
board members judged it so.

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANCE
ASSIGNED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS TO THE ROLE FUNCTION OF
WORKING WITH PUPILS

	Important	Useful	Not Important
Superintendents	92	8	0
School Board Members	80	20	0

Maintaining the School Plant

While many of the functions included in the role
of the principal relate to people and in particular, the
people relating to the school community such as the person-
nel, the pupils, the parents and the senior administration,
this role function relates to the physical plant. The two
following tasks were considered to be its main components.

1. Supervising and inspecting facilities.

2. Planning new buildings.

Thirteen (52 per cent) of the superintendents stated
that they considered maintaining the school plant as being
an important part of the role of the school principal.
Nine (36 per cent) reported that they considered this role

function a useful function in the role of the principal while three (12 per cent) perceived it as an unimportant one.

Twenty-one (52.5 per cent) of the school board members reported perceiving the maintenance of the school plant as an important function in the role of the principal. Sixteen (40 per cent) stated that they considered it a useful function while three (7.5 per cent) reported it as not important.

Table V presents the comparison of the importance assigned to this role function by the superintendents and the school board members. The similarities in perceptions between the two groups are revealed by the high degree of agreement in the percentages assigned by both groups.

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANCE
ASSIGNED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS TO THE ROLE FUNCTION OF
MAINTAINING THE SCHOOL PLANT

	Important	Useful	Not Important
Superintendents	52	36	12
School Board Members	52.5	40	7.5

Working with the Community

While the principal works directly with the personnel and students within the school, he must also relate to the public what is happening in the school. The school

cannot remain isolated from the community it is serving,
it should become an integral part of it. The tasks relating
to this role function of working with the community were
outlined as follows:

1. Interpreting the educational problems and
   programs to the public.

2. Promoting cooperation with parent and community
   advisory groups.

3. Making personal contact with parents.

4. Creating a good public relations program.

Twenty-two (88 per cent) of the superintendents
reported that they considered working with the community
to constitute an important function in the role of the
principal. Three (12 per cent) of the superintendents
stated that they considered it to be useful.

Thirty-one (77.5 per cent) of the school board
members related that they considered this role function to
be an important one. Nine (22.5 per cent) reported that they
perceived it as useful.

This role function was perceived to be important by
a greater proportion of the superintendents than by the
school board members. Table VI, which shows the importance
attributed by superintendents and school board members to
this role function of working with the community, confirms
this difference.

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED
BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO
THE ROLE FUNCTION OF WORKING WITH
THE COMMUNITY

	Important	Useful	Not Important
Superintendents	88	12	0
School Board Members	77.5	22.5	0

Managing the School

The learning process in school involves not only
people. To function properly teachers and students need
equipment and supplies. Technical and secretarial assistance
must also be provided. These functions were thought to
compose another function of the principal's role. The
tasks specifically outlined under this role function were:

1. Purchasing equipment and supplies.

2. Distributing equipment and supplies.

3. Determining the school budget.

4. Managing the office.

Seventeen (68 per cent) of the twenty-five super-
intendents reported that they considered managing the school
to be an important function in the role of the principal.
Five (20 per cent) stated that they considered it a useful
role function while three (12 per cent) perceived it as an
unimportant one.

Twenty-six (65 per cent) of the school board members
reported that managing the school was considered by them to

be an important function in the role of the principal. Thirteen members (32.5 per cent) found this to be a useful role function while one member (2.5 per cent) considered it to be an unimportant one.

Table VII refers to the comparison of the importance assigned by superintendents and school board members to the role function of managing the school. While a relatively similar percentage of both groups perceived this as an important role function, more superintendents than school board members perceived it as unimportant. Correspondingly, fewer superintendents found this to be a useful role function.

TABLE VII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED
BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
TO THE ROLE FUNCTION OF MANAGING THE SCHOOL

	Important	Useful	Not Important
Superintendents	68	20	12
School Board Members	65	32.5	2.5

Personal Professional Development

As professional leader within his school the principal must assure himself/herself of his/her own professional growth. The tasks included under personal professional development were:

1. Attending professional meetings.

2. Attending superintendent's conferences.

3. Improving one's professional skills.

All (100 per cent) superintendents agreed that personal professional development constitutes an important function in the role of the principal.

Twenty-five (62.5 per cent) of the school board members stated that they considered personal professional development to be an important function in the role of the principal. Thirteen (32.5 per cent) members reported that they considered it to be a useful role function while two (5 per cent) perceived it as not important.

The importance assigned by superintendents and school board members to the role function of personal professional development is shown in Table VIII. There existed a considerable difference of opinion in this area between the two groups. All superintendents rated this role function an important one while only 62.5 per cent of the school board members rated it in the same fashion. Thirty-two point five per cent of the members rated this area as a useful one while 5 per cent rated it as not important.

TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED
BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO
THE ROLE FUNCTION OF PERSONAL
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	Important	Useful	Not Important
Superintendents	100	0	0
School Board Members	62.5	32.5	5

<u>Relative Importance of the Perceptions</u>
<u>of the Role of the Principal</u>

Table IX shows the comparative importance attached to the seven broad functions of the role of the principal when ranked from one to seven by the superintendents and school board members. A calculation of Spearman's rho used to measure the degree of agreement on the comparative importance of the seven broad areas between both groups, reveals a high degree of agreement between the two groups.

TABLE IX

MEDIAN RANKS AND RANK ORDER ASSIGNED BY
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
TO THE SEVEN BROAD FUNCTIONS
CONSTITUTING THE ROLE OF THE
PRINCIPAL

Area	Median		Rank	
	S^a	S.B.M.^{b}	S	S.B.M.
Imp. the Ed. Prog.	1.31	2.00	1	1
Selecting and Developing Pers.	2.00	3.70	2	4
Working with Pupils	2.70	2.31	3	2
Working with Comm.	3.67	5.25	4	5
Managing the School	5.21	2.75	5	3
Perf. Per. Duties	5.38	6.38	6	7
Maintaining Sch. P.	6.75	5.96	7	6

[a]Superintendent.

[b]School board member.

A calculation of Spearman's rho gives a coefficient of .786. With N = 7, this rank correlation is significant at the .05 level.

Table X shows the results of the median test applied to the distribution of ranks given to each of the broad functions constituting the role of the principal by superintendents and school board members. A significant difference was noted between the ranks assigned by superintendents and school board members in two role functions, maintaining the school plant and managing the school. School board members attributed more importance to these two role functions than did their superintendents. This may be due to the fact that from a lay and business point of view, these two areas are more concrete, more noticeable and easier to evaluate than are the other five areas which are more professionally oriented in nature. In the training of educational administrators, the importance of the other five areas is stressed to a greater degree than are the areas of managing the school and maintaining the school plant.

The degree of agreement on the perceived role of the principal may have resulted from the fact that superintendents are employed by school boards to advise the board in such educational matters. Presumably the superintendents have clearly indicated their perceptions of the role of the principal to the boards and the latter concur with their superintendents. Secondly some divisions have policy manuals in which is included the role of the principal. Since such a manual is the outcome of much thought and deliberation between the two groups, such a manual may

66

TABLE X

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN RANK ASSIGNED
BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
TO EACH BROAD FUNCTION CONSTITUTING THE
ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

Area	Value of X^2
Improving the Educational Program	2.41
Selecting and Developing Personnel	2.11
Working with Pupils	1.32
Maintaining the School Plant	8.59[a]
Working with the Community	4.65
Managing the School	11.12[a]
Personal Professional Development	3.26

[a]Significant at the .01 level, df = 1.

have influenced similar perceptions. Thirdly, this degree
of agreement may be fairly representative of our society
in general where the quality of the instructional programs
in the school is often associated closely with the princi-
pal, the leader of that school.

II. SELECTION PROCEDURES

The purpose of this section is to present a
descriptive analysis of the various procedures involved
in the selection of principals in rural divisions of South-
ern Manitoba as perceived by superintendents and school
board members. The means of determining the qualifications
which candidates must meet will be discussed and a compari-

son will be made among procedures reported by superinten-
dents and procedures reported by the school board members.

Determining the Educational Qualifications

Twelve (48 per cent) of the superintendents inter-
viewed stated that their divisions had established a mini-
mum set of educational qualifications a candidate should have
before being considered for a principal's position while an
equal number (48 per cent) stated that their divisions did
not stipulate any such minimum requirements. One super-
intendent (4 per cent) preferred not to state divisional
policy on this point. In three (25 per cent) of the twelve
divisions requiring a minimum set of educational qualifica-
tions from their applicants, these requirements were de-
termined by the superintendent alone. In five (41.7 per cent)
of the twelve divisions, the superintendent and the entire
school board were the ones involved in determining the
necessary educational qualifications. A committee composed
of the superintendent and some board members was used in the
remaining four (33.3 per cent) divisions. In rural Southern
Manitoba only the superintendents and the school board
members were involved in determining the necessary educa-
tional qualifications for candidates to a principal's
position. School principals, supervisors and other members
of the divisional personnel such as teachers were excluded
from the qualifications committee and from the whole process
of determining the educational qualifications needed.

Of the thirty-eight school board members responding

to this section of the questionnaire, thirty-three (86.8 per cent) stated that their divisions required a minimum set of educational qualifications from prospective candidates while five (13.2 per cent) members reported that there were no such requirements. Of the thirty-three responding that there existed a minimum set of educational qualifications needed for prospective candidates, twenty-one (63.6 per cent) members stated that such qualifications were determined by the superintendent and the entire school board. Three (9.1 per cent) members indicated that the superintendent alone determined such qualifications while one (3 per cent) member reported that the school board alone decided on this issue. Of the eight (24.3 per cent) school board members reporting that a committee was used to determine such qualifications all reported that such a committee was composed of the superintendent and school board members.

Table XI shows the number of divisions requiring certain qualificatins. While only 48 per cent of the superintendents stated that their divisions had established a minimum set of educational qualifications a candidate should have before being considered for a principal's position, 86.8 per cent of the school board members reported that such was the case in their divisions. It may be concluded that there is a substantial difference between both groups on the actual use of this procedure.

TABLE XI

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF MINIMUM QUALIFICATION
REQUIREMENTS NEEDED BY POTENTIAL CANDIDATES
AS REPORTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS

	Frequency		
	Yes	No	No Answer
Superintendents	48	48	4
School Board Members	86.8	13.2	0

When there existed a minimum set of educational
qualifications, 25 per cent of the superintendents reported
that these were determined by themselves while only 9.1
per cent of the school board members reported that such
was the case, as is shown in Table XII. According to 41.7
per cent of the superintendents and 63.6 per cent of the
board members, such qualifications were determined by the
superintendent and the school board. It was reported by
33.3 per cent of the superintendents and 24.3 per cent of
the board members that the qualifications were determined
by a committee. It seems reasonable to conclude that there
also existed a difference of responses between the two
groups as to the personnel used in determining the qualifica-
tions. However, when committees were used, there was
general agreement as to the composition of these committees.

TABLE XII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE
FOR DETERMINING QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROSPECTIVE
PRINCIPALS AS REPORTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

| | Frequency | |
Personnel	S^a	$S.B.M.^b$
The school board	0	3
The superintendent	25	9.1
A committee	33.3	24.3
Principals only	0	0
The superintendent and the school board	41.7	63.6

[a]Superintendents.

[b]School board members.

Identification From Outside the Division

Twenty-four of the twenty-five superintendents interviewed stated that their divisions considered applications from outside their school divisions while one reported that outside applications were not accepted by his division. Of the twenty-four divisions who considered outside applications twenty-one (87.5 per cent) always advertised for applications to fill the vacant position while three (12.5 per cent) frequently advertised. Only three (12.5 per cent) superintendents stated that either they or their school board members always contacted prospective candidates personally. Two (8.3 per cent) divisions followed this personal contact procedure frequently while six (25 per cent)

divisions did so occasionally. Thirteen (54.2 per cent)
superintendents stated that personal contacts were never
used by their school divisions when identifying candidates.
Only one (4.2 per cent) of the divisions considering
applications from outside the division reported occasionally
requesting names of suitable candidates from faculties of
education while the twenty-three (95.8 per cent) other
divisions never followed this procedure.

Thirty-six of the thirty-seven school board members
responding in this instance, reported that their divisions
considered applications from outside their own divisions.
Only one of the respondents stated that applications
from the outside were not accepted by his division.
Advertising was reported as always used by thirteen
(40.6 per cent) of the school board members. Fourteen
(43.8 per cent) members reported that advertising was
frequently used while five (15.6 per cent) board mem-
bers stated that this procedure was occasionally used.
Personal contacts by either the superintendent or
school board members with prospective candidates
was reported as always used by their divisions by nine
(29 per cent) board members. Nine (29 per cent) mem-
bers reported frequent use of such contacts while twelve
(38.8 per cent) reported occasional use. Only one
(3.2 per cent) school board member reported that such
personal contacts were never used. Two (9.1 per cent)

school board members reported that their divisions frequently requested names from faculties of education. Nine (40.9 per cent) members reported requesting names from the faculties occasionally while eleven (50 per cent) members stated that this procedure was never used in their division.

Table XIII refers to the use made of various methods of identifying candidates from outside the division. As reported by 87.5 per cent of the superintendents and 40.6 per cent of the school board members, advertising was always used for the identification of candidates from outside the division. The difference in percentages does indicate a divergence of opinion between the two groups.

While only 3.2 per cent of the school board members reported that personal contact was never used as a means of identifying candidates from outside the division, 54.2 per cent of the superintendents stated likewise, once again indicating a considerable difference in replies. A similar conclusion can also be drawn when looking at the identification of such candidates by obtaining names from faculties of education for, while 95.8 per cent of the superintendents stated that this method was never used, only 50 per cent of the school board members reported likewise.

Only one respondent in both groups reported that in their divisions, applications from candidates from outside the division were not considered.

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGE USE OF METHODS OF IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE CANDIDATES
FROM OUTSIDE THE DIVISION AS REPORTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS
AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Method	Superintendents Frequency				School Board Members Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Advertising	87.5	12.5	0	0	40.6	43.8	15.6	0
Personal Contact	12.5	8.3	25	54.2	29	29	38.8	3.2
Requesting Names From Faculties	0	0	4.2	95.8	0	9.9	40.1	50

Identification From Within the Division

Table XIV shows the use made of the various methods of identifying possible candidates from within as reported by superintendents. In nine (36 per cent) school divisions, identification was reported always done by the superintendent alone. Five (20 per cent) superintendents stated that they frequently identified potential candidates alone while three (12 per cent) occasionally followed this procedure. Eight (32 per cent) superintendents reported that identification was never made by themselves alone. In twenty-one (84 per cent) of the twenty-five divisions reported from, school board members never identified potential candidates alone. Only four (16 per cent) superintendents reported occasional identification by school board members alone. Identification by the superintendent in consultation with other personnel in the system was reported as always done in ten (40 per cent) divisions. Frequent use of such a procedure was reported in six (24 per cent) divisions and occasional use in six (24 per cent) divisions also. Only three (12 per cent) divisions reported never using this process.

Self identification was a method which had fairly wide usage. Fifteen (60 per cent) superintendents reported that this method was always used; four (16 per cent) reported frequent use of the method and one (4 per cent) occasional use of it. Five (20 per cent) superintendents reported that self-identification was never used in their divisions. Identification of candidates by having names submitted for

TABLE XIV

PERCENTAGE USE OF METHODS OF IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE
CANDIDATES FROM WITHIN THE DIVISION AS
REPORTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS

Method	Frequency			
	Al-ways	Fre-quently	Occasion-ally	Never
Identification by the superintendent alone	36	20	12	32
Identification by the school board members alone	0	0	16	84
Identification by the superintendent in consultation with others	40	24	24	12
Self-identification	60	16	4	20
Submission of names for consideration by supervisory personnel	12	8	20	60

consideration by supervisory personnel was not an extensively used method of identification. Fifteen (60 per cent) super-intendents indicated that such a method was never used; five (20 per cent) reported that it was occasionally used; two (8 per cent) reported that it was frequently used and three (12 per cent) reported that it was always used.

The identification of candidates before they are actually needed does show foresight on the part of the divisions. Eleven (44 per cent) superintendents stated that attempts are always made by their divisions to identify candidates before they are actually needed. Four (16

per cent) superintendents stated that such attempts were frequently made while four (16 per cent) others specified that such attempts are occasionally made. Six (24 per cent) superintendents stated that such attempts were never made.

Some divisions have a practice of keeping a list of suitable candidates from year to year. Twelve (48 per cent) superintendents stated that such a list was kept by their division from year to year; one (4 per cent) superintendent reported that a list was frequently kept; two (8 per cent) superintendents reported that such a list was occasionally kept while ten (40 per cent) reported that their divisions did not follow this practice.

Table XV refers to the use of the various methods of identifying possible candidates from within as reported by the school board members. Four (13.8 per cent) school board members reported that identification by the super-intendent alone was a method always used by their divisions; thirteen (44.8 per cent) members reported that this method was frequently used and four (13.8 per cent) members reported that it was frequently used. Eight (27.6 per cent) school board members reported that identification was never made by the superintendent alone in their divisions. Identi-fication by school board members alone was not a widely used method according to the school board members. Only one (3.7 per cent) member reported that this method was always used while another (3.7 per cent) member stated that it was frequently used. Three (11.1 per cent) school board members

TABLE XV

PERCENTAGE USE OF METHODS OF IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE
CANDIDATES FROM OUTSIDE THE DIVISION AS
REPORTED BY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

| Method | Frequency | | | |
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Identification by the superintendent alone	13.8	44.8	13.8	27.6
Identification by the school board members alone	3.7	3.7	11.1	81.5
Identificatin by the superintendent in consultation with others	48.4	25.8	16.1	9.7
Self-identification	32.1	28.6	21.4	17.9
Submission of names for consideration by supervisory personnel	20	28	32	20

indicated that identification by school board members alone
was a method used only occasionally while the great majority,
twenty-two (81.5 per cent) members, reported no usage of
this method. Identification by the superintendent in
consultation with other personnel in the system was a
method with fairly wide usage according to the school board
members. Fifteen (48.4 per cent) school board members
reported that this method was always used in their divi-
sions; eight (25.8 per cent) reported that it was frequently
used; five (16.1 per cent) reported that it was used occasion-
ally; three (9.7 per cent) members reported that such a
method was never used.

Self-identification in response to an advertisement is also another method of identification. Nine (32.1 per cent) school board members reported that such an approach was always used by their divisions, eight (28.6 per cent) reported that this method was frequently used; six (21.4 per cent) reported that this method was occasionally used while five (17.9 per cent) members reported no usage of this method by their division. Having names submitted for consideration by supervisory personnel was the final method respondents were asked to report on. Five (20 per cent) school board members reported that their divisions always used this method; seven (28 per cent) members reported that this method was frequently used; eight (32 per cent) members reported occasional use of the method; five (20 per cent) members reported no usage of the method.

The policy of attempting to identify candidates before they are actually needed is a good one. Four (11.4 per cent) school board members reported that their divisions always attempted to identify such candidates before they were actually needed; nine (25.7 per cent) members reported that they frequently followed such a policy; fifteen (42.9 per cent) reported that such a policy is occasionally followed while seven members (20 per cent) reported that their divisions never followed such a policy.

Five (14.7 per cent) school board members reported that their divisions kept a list of suitable candidates on

hand from year to year. One (2.9 per cent) reported that his division followed such a practice while seven (20.6 per cent) reported that this was done occasionally. However, twenty-one (61.8 per cent) members, more than half, reported that their divisions did not keep such a list.

When comparing the reports of both groups, certain differences of opinion between the two groups as to the uses of the various methods can be found. Thirty-six per cent of the superintendents stated that candidates were always identified by the superintendent alone while 20 per cent reported that this was frequently the case. However, only 13.8 per cent of the school board members reported that identification of potential candidates was always done by the superintendent alone and 44.8 per cent reported that this was frequently the case.

According to 60 per cent of the superintendents, self-identification was a method always used for identifying candidates while this was the case as reported by only 32.1 per cent of the school board members. Sixty per cent of the superintendents reported that names of possible candidates were never sought from other supervisory personnel while only 20 per cent of the school board members reported likewise. It seems reasonable to conclude therefore that there is a difference, in certain cases considerable, between the replies given by superintendents and school board members.

Methods of Selection

After decisions have been made regarding the
determination of qualifications needed for applicants
and the establishment of selection procedures, a further
decision as to who will make the selection remains. Who
will be responsible for assessing each candidate's quali-
fications in terms of the criteria established?

Twenty-four (96 per cent) of the superintendents
interviewed stated that more than one person was always
considered when filling a vacancy. One (4 per cent) super-
intendent reported that frequently more than one person
was considered in selecting administrators.

The role of the superintendent, as reported by
superintendents, in the selection of principals in rural
Southern Manitoba is an important one. Seventeen (68
per cent) superintendents reported always making the final
selection of candidates who were to be recommended to the
board while two (8 per cent) reported that they frequently
make this final selection for recommendation to the board.
Six (24 per cent) superintendents reported that they never
make this final selection. As reported by the superintend-
ents, eleven (44 per cent) division school boards always
requested their superintendents to select more than one
candidate in his final recommendations; one (4 per cent)
board frequently requested more than one candidate in his
final recommendation; one (4 per cent) board occasionally
requested more than one while twelve (48 per cent) boards
never made this request. Eighteen (72 per cent) superintendents

reported that the vacant positions were always filled by the candidate or one of the candidates recommended by themselves; four (16 per cent) reported that their recommendations were frequently followed while two (8 per cent) stated that their recommendations were only occasionally followed. One (4 per cent) superintendent reported that he never recommended candidates to the board; he saw himself more as a facilitator, one who helped the board to arrive at a final decision as a group.

Nineteen superintendents reported that their divisions made use of committees in the selection process. The superintendent was always a member of the committee. In four divisions the assistant superintendents were always a member of the committee while in another division, the assistant superintendent was frequently a member. (In the great majority of other divisions, there were no assistant superintendents.) School board members always had representation on the committee in eighteen of the nineteen divisions. In the other division, members of the board were represented occasionally. One superintendent reported that school principals were always represented on the selection committee. This was the only division where such a committee included principals.

Twenty-six (66.7 per cent) school board members reported that more than one person was always considered when a vacant principalship was to be filled while thirteen (33.3 per cent) reported that frequently more than one person

was considered. Eleven (30.5 per cent) school board members reported that the superintendent always made the final selection of candidates who were to be recommended to the board; thirteen members (36.1 per cent) reported that superintendents frequently made the final selection; four (11.1 per cent) members reported that superintendents occasionally made this selection while eight (22.3 per cent) members reported that superintendents never made the final selection. Six (16.2 per cent) school board members reported that the board always required the superintendent to select more than one candidate in his final recommendation; fifteen (40.6 per cent) members reported that the board frequently requested more than one candidate; nine (24.3 per cent) members reported that the board occasionally requested more than one candidate; seven (18.9 per cent) members reported that the board never required the superintendent to select more than one candidate in his final recommendation. Eleven (30.5 per cent) school board members reported that the principalship was always filled by the candidate or one of the candidates recommended by the superintendent. Seventeen (47.3 per cent) members reported that the vacant position was frequently filled by the candidate or one of the candidates recommended by the superintendent while eight (22.2 per cent) members reported that such a position was occasionally filled following the recommendations of the superintendent.

According to twenty-five school board members, a

committee was used as part of the selection process. Not
all board members reported the composition of such a commit-
tee however. When a committee was used twenty-two members
stated that the superintendent was always a member of the
committee while two stated that he was frequently a member.
The assistant superintendent was reported as always being
a member twice, occasionally a member once and never a member
once. Twenty board members indicated that members of the
board were always represented on such a committee; two
members indicated that members of the board were frequently
represented while one indicated that board members were
occasionally represented on this selection committee. In
one division it was reported that members of the supervisory
staff were always part of the selection committee while it
was reported by four respondents that such personnel were
occasionally part of the selection committee. One school
board member reported that members of the supervisory staff
were never represented on the committee. Many divisions in
this province did not have any supervisory staff except
for the superintendent (and in a few cases, an assistant
superintendent). Only three school board members indicated
that school principals were included in the selection
committee and this was only occasionally.

While 68 per cent of the school board members report-
ed that the superintendents always made the final selec-
tion of candidates who were to be recommended to the board,
only 30.5 per cent of the school board members answered

likewise. Forty-eight per cent of the superintendents stated
that they were never required to select more than one candi-
date in their final selection; only 18.9 per cent of the
board members reported that their superintendents were
never required to select more than one candidate. Accord-
ing to 30.5 per cent of the school board members and 72
per cent of the superintendents the principalship was always
filled by the or one of the candidates recommended by the
superintendent. It seems reasonable to conclude that
there is some disagreement between superintendents and
school board members as to the methods of selection actually
used by school divisions in the hiring of principals.

Application Forms. Application forms or letters of
application are one way a division can proceed to seek
candidates for the vacant administrative positions. For
candidates from inside the division, thirteen (52 per cent)
superintendents stated that application forms were always
used while twelve (48 per cent) superintendents reported
that application forms were never used. For candidates
from outside the division, twenty-four (96 per cent) super-
intendents stated that application forms were always re-
quired while one (4 per cent) stated that they were never
used.

For candidates from within the division, twenty-
three (62.2 per cent) school board members reported that
application forms were always used; eight (21.6 per cent)
stated that they were frequently used and two (5.4 per cent)

that they were used occasionally while four (10.8 per cent) stated that they were never used. For candidates from outside the division, twenty-eight (80 per cent) members stated that application forms were always required; four (11.4 per cent) stated that their divisions required application forms frequently and one (2.9 per cent) occasionally while two (5.7 per cent) reported that they were never used.

The reported frequency of usage of application forms as a selection procedure for candidates from within the division is presented in Table XVI. While 48 per cent of the superintendents stated that such forms were never used only 10.8 per cent of the school board members reported alike.

TABLE XVI

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY
OF USAGE OF APPLICATION FORMS AS A
SELECTION PROCEDURE FOR CANDI-
DATES FROM WITHIN THE
DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	52	0	0	48
School Board Members	62.2	21.6	5.4	10.8

Table XVII presents the reported frequency of usage of application forms as a selection procedure for candidates from outside the division. While 96 per cent of the superintendents reported that application forms were always used by their divisions, only 80 per cent of the school board members reported alike.

There is a difference in the replies given by the superintendents and their school board members.

TABLE XVII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY
OF USAGE OF APPLICATION FORMS AS A SELEC-
TION PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES FROM
OUTSIDE THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	96	0	0	4
School Board Members	80	11.4	2.9	5.7

Interviews. Five (20 per cent) of the superintendents reported that interviews were never used for candidates from within the division; one (4 per cent) reported that they were occasionally used and another (4 per cent) that they were used frequently while eighteen (72 per cent) reported that interviews were always used. It should be noted that in the twenty-four divisions where applications were accepted for administrative positions from the outside the division, the interview was always used except in one division

where it was frequently used. The interview was not as widely used for candidates who came from within the school division. The superintendent was always responsible for interviewing the candidates in eleven of the school divisions. The superintendent's assistant always interviewed candidates in two divisions. The members of the school board always interviewed candidates in eight divisions and occasionally in two. Committees were always used in fourteen divisions and occasionally in one. The superintendent was always a member of the committee while in all divisions where committees were used, these committees always consisted of the superintendent and some board members. Assistant superintendents were always members of the committee in three divisions and frequently in one division. (It is to be noted that most rural school divisions do not employ an assistant superintendent.) Principals were never included in the committee and in only one division were members of the supervisory staff included. Only one division was reported to have used a prepared rating form during the interview. All the other divisions were reported to never have used such a scale.

Twenty-four (64.9 per cent) school board members reported that their divisions used interviews for candidates who came from within the division; six (16.2 per cent) reported frequent use of interviews for such candidates; six (16.2 per cent) reported occasional use of interviews for these candidates while one (2.7 per cent) reported that

interviews for candidates from within the system were never used. For candidates from outside the system, thirty-two (82 per cent school board members reported that interviews were always a part of the selection procedure. Four (12.8 per cent members indicated that interviews were frequently used for candidates from outside the system while one (2.6 per cent) reported that they were occasionally used. One (2.6 per cent member reported that interviews were not used for such candidates.

Twenty-seven school board members reported that the interviews were always conducted by the superintendent while five members reported that they were frequently conducted by him. The assistant superintendent was always involved in the interviewing process according to two school board members. Two other board members reported that the assistant superintendent was frequently involved while four members indicated that assistant superintendents were never involved. Nine school board members reported that the interviews were always conducted by members of the school board; three reported that this was frequently the case; two reported that this was occasionally the case while four members reported that such was never the case. Ten school board members reported that committees were always used when interviewing candidates for the principalship; three members reported that they were occasionally used while two members reported that committees were never used for conducting interviews with candidates for a principalship.

Nineteen school board members stated that super-
intendents were always members of the interviewing committee
while two indicated that superintendents were frequently
members of such a committee. One school board member
reported that the assistant superintendent was always a
member of the committee conducting interviews during the
selection process while another member reported that the
assistant superintendent was occasionally a member. Two
board members indicated that the assistant superintendent
was never on the interviewing committee. Twenty-one school
board members indicated that members of the school board
were always part of the interviewing committee, two members
indicated frequent representation by board members on such
a committee while one board member indicated occasional
representation by school board members on such a committee.
According to three school board members, principals were
given occasional representation on the interviewing committee
while according to two other board members, members of the
supervisory staff were also occasionally represented on this
committee.

Three school board members stated that a prepared
rating form was always used by the interviewers during the
interview. Three others reported frequent use of the rating
form while twelve others reported occasional use of such a
form. According to sixteen school board members, a pre-
pared rating form was never used during the interview.

While 20 per cent of the superintendents stated that

interviews were never used by their divisions as a selection procedure for candidates from within the division, only 2.7 per cent of the school board members reported in a similar fashion for such candidates. Table XVIII shows the frequency of usage of interviews as a selection procedure for candidates from within the division. It seems reasonable to conclude that there is a difference of opinion between the two groups as to the use of interviews for candidates from within the divisions.

TABLE XVIII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY
OF USAGE OF INTERVIEWS AS A SELECTION
PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES FROM
WITHIN THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	72	4	4	20
School Board Members	64.9	16.2	16.2	2.7

Table XIX, showing the reported frequency of the use of interviews as a selection procedure for candidates from outside the division, indicates that there is a greater agreement between the two groups on interviewing as a selection procedure for candidates from outside than within the division.

TABLE XIX

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY OF
USAGE OF INTERVIEWS AS A SELECTION PROCEDURE
FOR CANDIDATES FROM OUTSIDE THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	92	4	0	4
School Board Members	82	12.8	2.6	2.6

Generally speaking, there was agreement between the
two groups as to who was doing the interviewing. However,
while prepared rating forms were reported used only once by
superintendents, less than half the school board members
reported that such forms were never used. It can be con-
cluded that there is a considerable difference of opinion
between the two groups as to the use of such forms during
the interviewing process.

University Transcripts. For candidates from within
the division, eighteen (72 per cent) superintendents reported
that university transcripts were always used; one (4 per
cent) reported that they were frequently used; two (8 per
cent) reported occasional usage, and four (16 per cent)
superintendents reported that their divisions never used
them. For candidates from outside the division, twenty
(80 per cent superintendents reported that university
transcripts were always used; one (4 per cent) reported
frequent usage, two (8 per cent) reported occasional usage

while two (8 per cent) superintendents stated that university transcripts were never used by their school divisions.

For candidates from within the system, twenty-one (55.2 per cent) school board members reported that university transcripts were always used; eleven (29 per cent) members reported frequent usage, two (5.3 per cent) occasional usage while four (10.5 per cent) board members stated that university transcripts were never used by their divisions for internal candidates. For candidates from outside the division, twenty-eight (77.8 per cent) school board members reported that university transcripts were always used; four (11.1 per cent) reported frequent usage, three (8.3 per cent) occasional usage while only one (2.8 per cent) board member reported that university transcripts were never used for candidates from outside the division.

Seventy-two per cent of the superintendents reported that their divisions always referred to the university transcripts of candidates from within the division during the selection process while 55.2 per cent of the school board members reported use of this same policy as is shown in Table XX. Sixteen per cent of the superintendents reported that university transcripts were never used for candidates from within the division; 10.5 per cent of the school board members reported the same policy.

Table XXI shows the reported frequency of the use of university transcripts as a selection procedure for candidates from outside the division. There is a fairly

TABLE XX

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY
OF USAGE OF UNIVERSITY TRANSCRIPTS AS A
SELECTION PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES FROM
WITHIN THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	72	4	8	16
School Board Members	55.2	29	5.3	10.5

complete agreement between the two groups in this section.

It seems reasonable to conclude that there is more agreement between the two groups on the use of university transcripts for candidates from outside the division than for candidates from within the division.

TABLE XXI

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY
OF USAGE OF UNIVERSITY TRANSCRIPTS AS A
SELECTION PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES
FROM OUTSIDE THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	77.8	11.1	8.3	2.8
School Board Members	80	4	8	8

Physical Examinations. It was assumed that the
most accurate way the physical fitness of a candidate could
be assessed was by requiring that the candidate undergo a
physical examination. For candidates from both inside and
outside the division only one (4 per cent) superintendent
reported that candidates always had to undergo a physical
examination. The other twenty-four (96 per cent) superintend-
ents reported that candidates from either within or outside
the division were never required to undergo a physical
examination.

In no case did board members report that candidates
were always required to undergo a physical examination.
For candidates from within the division, one (2.6 per cent)
board member reported that candidates were frequently
required to undergo a physical examination; seven (18.4
per cent)reported that candidates were occasionally
required to undergo such an examination while thirty (79
per cent of the thirty-eight respondents to this question
stated that physical examinations were never required.
For candidates from outside the division three (8.1 per cent)
board members reported that their divisions frequently
required candidates to undergo a physical examination;
nine (24.3 per cent) reported that such an examination was
occasionally required while twenty-five (67.6 per cent)
respondents reported that a physical examination was never
required.

Table XXII refers to the reported frequency of

usage of physical tests as a selection procedure for candidates from within the division. While 96 per cent of the superintendents reported that these were never used by their division, only 79 per cent of the school board members reported likewise.

TABLE XXII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY
OF USAGE OF PHYSICAL TESTS AS A SELECTION
PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES FROM WITHIN
THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	4	0	0	96
School Board Members	0	2.6	18.4	79

Ninety-six per cent of the superintendents reported that candidates from outside the division were never required to undergo a physical examination; the percentage of school board members that reported likewise was 67.6 as is shown in Table XXIII.

It seems reasonable to conclude that school board members attribute more importance to this selection procedure than do the superintendents.

Ability and Personality Tests. All superintendents interviewed reported that neither mental ability tests nor personality tests were ever used in the selection process.

TABLE XXIII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY
OF USAGE OF PHYSICAL TESTS AS A SELECTION
PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES FROM OUTSIDE
THE DIVISION

| Respondents | Frequency | | | |
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	4	0	0	96
School Board Members	0	8.1	24.3	67.6

According to the school board members, no one
reported that mental ability tests were always used by
their division. One (2.8 per cent) indicated frequent usage
of such tests; four (11.1 per cent) indicated occasional
usage while thirty-one (86.1 per cent) reported that their
divisions never used such tests.

One (2.7 per cent) school board member reported
that personality tests were always used as part of the
selection process; seven (18.9 per cent) reported frequent
usage of these by their divisions; four (10.8 per cent)
reported occasional usage while twenty-five (67.6 per cent)
board members indicated that personality tests were never
used by their divisions.

As shown in Table XXIV all superintendents reported
that mental ability tests were never used by their divisions
as a selection procedure while 86.1 per cent of the school
board members reported likewise. Table XXV reporting on
the frequency of usage of personality tests as a selection
procedure, indicates that according to the superintendents

TABLE XXIV

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF USAGE
OF MENTAL ABILITY TESTS AS A SELECTION
PROCEDURE AS REPORTED BY
SUPERINTENDENTS AND
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	0	0	0	100
School Board Members	0	2.8	11.1	86.1

such tests are never used. However, only 67.6 per cent of
the school board members reported that mental ability were
never administered as part of the selection process. There-
fore, while superintendents report no use of mental and
personality tests, some school board members report that
they are in effect used in varying degrees.

TABLE XXV

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF USAGE
OF PERSONALITY TESTS AS A SELECTION
PROCEDURE AS REPORTED BY SUPER-
INTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	0	0	0	100
School Board Members	2.7	18.9	10.8	67.6

Recommendations. For applicants from within the division, five (20 per cent) superintendents stated that letters of recommendation were always used; one (4 per cent) reported frequent usage while nineteen (76 per cent) superintendents reported that such letters were never used as part of the selection process. For candidates from outside the division all (100 per cent) superintendents stated that letters of recommendation were always used.

Twenty-four superintendents stated that letters of recommendation were always confidential and sent directly to the divisional office by the person making the recommendation; one superintendent reported that frequently the letters were sent this way but that occasionally the letters were forwarded by the applicant. Twenty-four superintendents replied that the letters were never sent directly by the applicants.

Fourteen (56 per cent) superintendents reported that standard forms were used for these recommendations while eleven superintendents reported that standard forms were not used. When standard forms were used they generally were in the form of both rating scales and anecdotal reports.

Telephone calls inquiring about prospective candidates were also made by all superintendents. The belief was expressed by many of the respondents that information related by telephone was more likely to be accurate and clearly stated than the information gathered from letters.

References were usually obtained from superinten-

dents of the divisions formerly employing the candidate and from the candidate's former principals. Recommendations were occasionally sought from inspectors employed by the Department of Education, from the faculties of education and from colleagues teaching on the same staff as the principal. The majority of superintendents used only the names submitted by the candidate for such purposes. A few superintendents stated that they did not accept references from members of the clergy or ministers.

For candidates from within the division, seven school board members (19.5 per cent) reported that letters of recommendation were always requested. Six (16.6 per cent) school board members reported that such letters were frequently requested. Six (16.6 per cent) board members reported that letters of recommendation for candidates from within the division were occasionally requested while seventeen (47.3 per cent) reported that their divisions never requested letters of recommendation for such candidates. Letters of recommendation were used more for candidates from outside the division. Twenty-seven (69.2 per cent) school board members stated that their divisions always requested letters of recommendation for candidates from outside the division; nine (23.1 per cent) members reported frequently requesting such letters while three (7.7 per cent) members reported that letters of recommendation were never requested for these candidates.

Seven school board members reported that the letters

of recommendation were always forwarded directly by the
applicant; ten members that the letters were frequently
forwarded by the applicant; five members that they were
occasionally forwarded by the applicant and ten that such
was never the procedure. Fifteen school board members
reported that the letters of recommendation were always
considered confidential and sent directly to the division
office by the person making the recommendation; seven board
members reported that such was frequently the case while
seven reported that this was occasionally the case. Five
school board members indicated that the letters of recommenda-
tion were never confidential and sent directly to the divi-
sional office by the person making the recommendation.

According to twenty-four (67 per cent) school board
members, a standard form was not used for the letters of
recommendation while according to twelve (33 per cent) others
however, a standard form was used. When standard forms were
used, four school board members indicated that these forms
were always in the form of rating scales; two members
reported that they were frequently in this form and one
that they were occasionally in this form. It was reported
by three members that letters of recommendation were never
in the form of rating scales. Anecdotal reports were always
used according to six school board members. One board
member indicated that anecdotal reports were occasionally
used while two members reported that such were never used.

According to the school board members, references

were mostly requested from representatives of the former employing division. These employers were often the super-intendents and the principals. Other references mentioned were Department of Education inspectors, board chairmen, members of the faculties of education, secretary-treasurers and teaching colleagues. Usually divisions contacted only referees listed by the applicant.

The use of the telephone to inquire about prospec-tive candidates was popular. Thirty-one (79.5 per cent) school board members stated that their divisions made use of this form of inquiry while only eight (20.5 per cent) reported that no use was made of the telephone for inquiring about prospective candidates.

Table XXVI refers to the use of letters of recom-mendation as a selection procedure for candidates from within the division. While both superintendents and school board members agree on the extent that letters of recom-mendation are always used, there is less agreement as to the extent that such letters are never used. Seventy-six per cent of the superintendents state that their divisions never use such letters for candidates from within the divi-sion; only 47.3 per cent of the school board members report-ed likewise.

As is shown in Table XXVII all superintendents reported that their divisions always used letters of recommendation as a selection procedure for candidates

TABLE XXVI

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY OF
USAGE OF RECOMMENDATIONS AS A SELECTION
PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES FROM WITHIN
THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	20	4	0	76
School Board Members	19.5	16.6	16.6	47.3

from outside the division while only 69.2 per cent of the
school board members indicated that such letters from out-
side candidates are always used.

TABLE XXVII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF REPORTED FREQUENCY OF
USAGE OF RECOMMENDATIONS AS A SELECTION
PROCEDURE FOR CANDIDATES FROM OUTSIDE
THE DIVISION

Respondents	Frequency			
	Always	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Superintendents	100	0	0	0
School Board Members	69.2	23.1	0	7.7

It seems reasonable to conclude that there is some
divergence of opinion between the two groups as to the use
of letters of recommendation as a selection procedure for
candidates both from within and outside the division.
There is also a considerable divergence of opinion between
the two groups as to how these letters are forwarded to

the divisional office.

While 56 per cent of the superintendents stated that a standard form was used for letters of recommendation, only 33 per cent of the school board members reported likewise. It would appear that there is a difference in the replies given by both groups.

All superintendents stated that their divisions made telephone calls to inquire about prospective candidates. However, only 79.5 per cent of the school board members reported that telephone calls were made by their divisions for this purpose. There is some disagreement between the two groups as to the practice followed by the divisions in this matter.

Observations of Candidate in Present Position (Field Checks). The observation of the candidate in the position held by him when he is applying for a new position could give the prospective employer valuable information about the candidate. However, only four superintendents (16 per cent) indicated that this procedure was used by their divisions while twenty-one (84 per cent) superintendents indicated that their divisions made no use of it. In divisions where field checks were used, they were always done by the superintendents.

Twenty (57.1 per cent) school board members reported that their divisions made use of this procedure while fifteen (42.9 per cent) reported that their divisions did not use it. Of the twenty who reported that field checks were used, thirteen stated that they were always made by

the superintendent; six that they were frequently made by
the superintendent and one they were occasionally made by
him. One school board member reported that field checks
were always made by the assistant superintendent; another
that they were frequently made by this officer and another
that they were occasionally made by him. A few board mem-
bers indicated that others were either frequently or occasion-
ally involved in this work.

While 84 per cent of the superintendents reported
that their divisions did not use field checks as a part of
the selection procedure, only 42.9 per cent of the school
board members reported likewise as is shown in Table XXVIII.
It can be concluded that there is a serious difference of
opinion between the two groups as to the use of field
checks.

TABLE XXVIII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF USAGE OF
FIELD CHECKS AS A SELECTION PROCEDURE AS
REPORTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

	Frequency	
	Yes	No
Superintendents	16	84
School Board Members	57.1	42.9

Relative Importance of the Selection Procedures.
Table XXIX shows the variance of the ranks assigned by the superintendents and school board members to the six selection procedures.

TABLE XXIX

VARIANCE OF THE RANKS ASSIGNED BY
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS TO SIX SELECTION
PROCEDURES

Procedure	Superintendent	School Bd. Members
Interviews	.73	1.36
References	.53	1.01
Applications	2.58	1.63
University Transcripts	.66	2.61
Field Checks	2.89	1.86
Individual Tests	.59	1.74

Table XXX shows the median ranks assigned by superintendents and school board members to the six selection procedures and the rank order based on median ranks.

The complete degree of agreement in the ranks assigned by both groups would tend to indicate that the importance of the various selection procedures is perceived very similarly by both superintendents and school board members.

TABLE XXX

MEDIAN RANKS AND RANK ORDER ASSIGNED BY
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEM-
BERS TO SIX SELECTION PROCEDURES

| | Median | | Rank | |
Procedure	S.	S.B.M.	S.	S.B.M.
Interviews	1.8	1.4	1	1
References	2.1	2	2	2
Applications	3.6	3.1	3	3
University Transcripts	4.2	4.2	4	4
Field Checks	4.6	4.6	5	5
Individual Tests	5.8	5.4	6	6

However, using the formula for the computation of
the variance from a frequency distribution found in Young
and Veldman, it is clear that the degree of agreement
within the groups is not as high. In the superintendents
group, there is a very high variance for two of the proced-
ures, applications and field checks. Thus, there is a
considerable difference of opinion amongst the superintend-
ents as to the importance of applications and field checks.
While some superintendents ranked these two procedures very
highly, others attributed little importance to them. There
is much closer agreement amongst superintendents in regards
to the other four procedures. Amongst the school board
members all procedures recorded a variance greater than one
while the variance of university transcripts was 2.61.

This indicates a fairly wide divergence of opinions amongst school board members in regards to all six selection procedures. The procedure which attracted the most agreement was the use of references.

III. CRITERIA USED IN SELECTING PRINCIPALS

The purpose of this section is to present a descriptive analysis of the perceived importance of certain criteria used in the selection of principals. Comparisons will be made between the perceptions of the superintendents and those of the school board members.

Age. When asking superintendents or trustees to state from what age group they preferred to appoint principals, no distinctions were made as to the size or type of school. Such distinctions could have influenced their preferences.

Thirteen (52 per cent) of the twenty-five superintendents preferred to appoint principals in the thirty-one to forty age category. Seven (28 per cent) superintendents preferred appointees to be between the ages of twenty-five to thirty while five (20 per cent) superintendents expressed no preference as to age category.

Thirty-two (80 per cent) school board members preferred to appoint principals in the thirty-one to forty age range. Six (15 per cent) school board members preferred appointees to be between the ages of twenty-five to thirty while two (5 per cent) preferred them to be in the forty-one to fifty age category.

Table XXXI refers to the age ranges preferred by superintendents and school board members for candidates to the principalship. While the majority of respondents in both groups prefer candidates to be in the thirty-one to forty age group, the percentage is remarkably higher in the school board member group where 80 per cent favour it compared to only 52 per cent of the superintendents. Twenty-eight per cent of the superintendents favoured the twenty-five to thirty age group while only 15 per cent of the school board members favoured this same group. Five per cent of the school board members preferred the forty-one to fifty age group while no superintendents indicated such a preference. Twenty per cent of the superintendents were undecided.

TABLE XXXI

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF AGE RANGES PREFERRED BY
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Age Groups	Superintendents	School Board Members
Below 25	0	0
From 25 - 30	28	15
From 31 - 40	52	80
From 41 - 50	0	5
Above 50	0	0
No preference	20	0

Sex. Twenty-three (92 per cent) superintendents
preferred to appoint men as administrators in secondary and
junior high schools while two (8 per cent) indicated no
preference. No superintendent reported preferring females
for such positions. However, all participating superinten-
dents were male.

At the elementary level, ten (40 per cent) super-
intendents stated their preference for male administrators
while one (4 per cent) preferred females. Fourteen (56 per
cent) superintendents indicated no preference.

Thirty-three (84.6 per cent) school board members
reported preferring male administrators at the secondary and
junior high levels while none indicated a preference for
women. There were six (18.4 per cent) board members who
expressed no preference. Four of these forty respondents
were women.

At the elementary level, twenty-one (53.8 per cent)
board members indicated a preference for male administrators
while six (15.4 per cent) expressed their preference for
females. Twelve (30.8 per cent) of the thirty-nine respond-
ents to this question showed no preferences.

The overwhelming preference indicated by both super-
intendents and school board members for the male sex when
considering candidates for the principalship agree with the
findings of Asper.[1] The great percentage of both super-

_____

[1] Linda B. Asper, "Factors Affecting the Entry of
Women Teachers into Administrative Positions of the Manitoba
Public School System" (Unpublished Master's thesis, The
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1974), p. 5.

intendents and school board members preferred male appli-
cants for the principalship of both junior and senior high
schools. No member in either group preferred women at this
level. At the elementary level a greater percentage of
school board members preferred men; 53.8 per cent of the
school board members preferred men while 40 per cent of the
superintendents preferred men. Only 4 per cent of the super-
intendents and 15.4 per cent of the board members preferred
females at this elementary level. The percentage of persons
with no preferences for candidates at the elementary level
was however substantial in both groups.

Experience. Twenty (80 per cent) of the twenty-five
superintendents preferred appointees with five to ten years
of teaching experience. Four (16 per cent) preferred
appointees with eleven to fifteen years of experience while
one (4 per cent) stated that the amount of teaching experience
was not a factor considered when selecting principals.

Twenty (80 per cent) superintendents preferred
appointees with previous administrative experience while
four (16 per cent) indicated that they preferred appointees
with no administrative experience. One (4 per cent) super-
intendent stated that administrative experience was not a
factor considered in the selection of candidates.

Twenty-four (96 per cent) of the twenty-five super-
intendents considered administrative experience outside
the division to be valuable to the selected candidate while
one (4 per cent) superintendent did not consider such ex-

perience valuable.

Out of thirty-nine respondents to this question, one (2.6 per cent) school board member indicated preference for appointees with less than five years of teaching experience. Twenty-seven (69.2 per cent) board members preferred appointees with from five to ten years of experience. Eleven (28.2 per cent) school board members expressed a preference for appointees with from eleven to fifteen years of experience.

Thirty (76.9 per cent) school board members indicated a preference for appointees with previous administrative experience. Seven (18 per cent) school board members preferred appointees with no administrative experience while two (5.1 per cent) members did not consider it a factor.

Administrative experience from outside the division also seemed to be considered an asset by most school board members. Twenty-nine (76.3 per cent) school board members considered such experience valuable while six (15.8 per cent) did not. Three (7.9 per cent) school board members expressed no opinion as to experience.

Table XXXII refers to the number of years of experience preferred by superintendents and school board members for candidates for a principal's position. The majority in both groups preferred candidates to have between five and ten years of experience. There was however a greater minority of school board members preferring between

eleven and fifteen years of experience; 28.2 per cent of the
school board members preferred this range while only 16
percent of the superintendents preferred it.

TABLE XXXII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
PREFERRED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Years of Experience	Superintendents	School Board Members
Less than 5	0	2.6
5 - 10	80	69.2
11 - 15	16	28.2
16 - 25	0	0
More than 25	0	0
Not a factor	4	0

Both groups agreed fairly closely that previous
administrative experience is desirable. However, while
96 per cent of the superintendents considered experience
outside the division to be valuable, only 76.3 per cent
the school board members considered it in the same light.

Training. Nine (36 per cent) superintendents prefer-
red candidates to have a minimum of four years of university
education at the time of their appointment. Fourteen (56
per cent superintendents expressed their preference for
candidates with a minimum of five years of university educa-
tion. One (4 per cent superintendent preferred candidates

with at least six years of university education while one (4 per cent) indicated his preference for candidates with at least seven years of such education.

All but one of the twenty-five responding superintendents preferred appointees to an administrative position to have taken courses in educational administration. Twenty-three superintendents preferred appointees to have taken courses in curriculum. One superintendent preferred appointees not to have taken a course in curriculum while another stated that he had no preference in this respect. Twenty-three superintendents preferred appointees to an administrative position to have taken courses in supervision while one indicated a preference to the opposite. One superintendent had no preference as to whether appointees had followed a course in supervision. Twenty-three superintendents preferred appointees to have taken courses in organizational theory. One superintendent preferred appointees not to have taken courses in organizational theory while one showed no preference in regards to courses in this field.

Ten (25.6 per cent) school board members preferred candidates with at least two years of university education. Sixteen (41.1 per cent) school board members indicated a preference for candidates with at least four years of university education. Nine (23.1 per cent) members preferred candidates with a minimum of five years of university education while one (2.5 per cent) member preferred at least six years. Three (7.7 per cent) board members indicated

that in their view, no minimum preparation by way of university education was necessary for candidates aspiring to an administrative poisition.

Thirty-three school board members preferred appointees to have taken courses in educational administration while four such members preferred that appointees not have taken courses in this subject. One board member indicated no preference.

Twenty-three school board members preferred appointees to an administrative position to have taken courses in curriculum while ten school board members showed a preference to the opposite. One school board member expressed no preference.

Thirty school board members preferred appointees to an administrative position to have taken courses in supervision. Five school board members preferred appointees not to have taken courses in supervision while one member indicated no preference.

Twenty school board members preferred their appointees to an administrative position to have taken courses in organizational theory while eleven members preferred appointees not to have taken courses in this subject. One school board member expressed no preference in regards to appointees to an administration position having taken courses in organizational theory.

Table XXXIII refers to the years of training preferred by superintendents and school board members for candi-

TABLE XXXIII

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF YEARS OF TRAINING
PREFERRED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Years of Training	Superintendents	School Board Members
No minimum preparation	0	7.7
Less than 2 years	0	0
2 years, less than 4	0	25.6
4 years, less than 5	36	41.1
5 years, less than 6	56	23.1
6 years, less than 7	4	2.5
7 years or more	4	0

dates at the time of their appointment. There is a considerable difference in the preferences expressed by superintendents and those expressed by the school board members. While 33.3 per cent of the school board members preferred less than four years of training, no superintendents preferred less than four years. Four years of university training entitles a person to receive a degree. Sixty-four per cent of the superintendents expressed a preference for five or more years of training while only 25.6 per cent of the school board members expressed a similar desire. The proportion of both superintendents and school board members preferring at least four years of training was quite similar.

All four courses, educational administration, curriculum supervision and organizational theory were highly recommended by superintendents for appointees to any administrative position. Educational administration and supervision were preferred by a greater percentage of school board members than were curriculum and organizational theory.

Knowledge. While all (100 per cent) superintendents considered a broad, general knowledge of educational theory and practice to be of major importance, none (0 per cent) of the twenty-five responding superintendents considered written examinations administered during the selection process to be an important factor in the selection of appointees.

Twenty-one (84 per cent) superintendents preferred candidates with a good knowledge of educational theory and practice rather than good knowledge in a specific subject matter field. Three (12 per cent) superintendents preferred the reverse. One (4 per cent) superintendent had no preference.

Fourteen (38.9 per cent) school board members considered a broad general knowledge of educational theory and practice as measured by written examinations during the selection process to be an important factor in the selection of appointees; twenty-two (61.1 per cent) school board members did not consider such knowledge as measured by written examinations to be an important factor in the selection of appointees.

Thirty (76.9 per cent) school board members prefer-
red candidates with a good knowledge of educational theory
and practice rather than competence in a specific subject
matter field. Nine (23.1 per cent) school board members
preferred the reverse, competence in a subject matter
field.

When interviewed, all superintendents agreed that
a general knowledge of educational theory and practice was
important for prospective principals, although none of them
considered it important that this knowledge be measured by
written examinations. However, 38.9 per cent of the school
board members considered such knowledge as measured by
written examinations to be important.

While both groups generally preferred a good know-
ledge of educational theory and practice to a good knowledge
of a subject matter field, the percentage was higher in the
superintendent's group. Eighty-four per cent of the super-
intendents preferred a sound knowledge of educational theory
and practice while 76.9 per cent of the school board members
expressed a similar preference.

Scholarship. Ten (40 per cent) superintendents
considered scholastic achievement attained by candidates
during their period of university an important factor when
selecting the appointee to an administrative position.
Fourteen (56 per cent) superintendents had no preference
with respect to scholastic achievement while one (4 per cent)
superintendent expressed no opinion on the matter.

Of the ten superintendents who considered scholastic achievement as important, six (60 per cent) preferred their candidates to have attained a superior level of scholarship. The other four (40 per cent) superintendents preferred an above average level of scholarship.

Board opinions were not sought on this matter.

Intelligence. Nineteen (76 per cent) superintendents did not consider a candidate's I.Q. (as measured by standardized tests) to be an important factor in the person to be selected for the principalship. Six (24 per cent) superintendents did consider this factor to be an important one however.

Of the six superintendents who did consider the candidate's I.Q. as being an important factor, five preferred appointees with I.Q. scores of 120 and above while one preferred appointees with I.Q. scores above 130.

The opinions of school board members were not sought on this criterion.

Personal Factors. To obtain the perceptions of both superintendents and school board members on personal qualities important for candidates appointed to the principalship, all were requested to select seven personal factors from a list of twenty-three and then rank the seven factors chosen in order of importance. Table XXXIV shows how these personal factors were ranked by both groups. The median was used to rank the twenty-three personal factors. Eighteen

TABLE XXXIV

COMPARISON OF MEDIAN RANKS AND RANK ORDER ASSIGNED
BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS TO
TWENTY-THREE PERSONAL FACTORS

Personal Factors	Median		Rank	
	S^a	S.B.M.[b]	S^a	S.B.M.[b]
Good judgement and common sense	2.30	1.60	1	2
Leadership	2.50	2	2	3
Interest in and liking for children	2.83	3.17	3	6
Intelligence	3	4.50	4	10.5
Cooperativeness	3.50	5.75	5	16
Initiative and willingness to work	4	4.25	6.5	9
Communication skills	4	5	6.5	13.5
Tact and diplomacy	4.17	4	8	8
Organizing and executive ability	4.83	3	9	5
Interest in community affairs	5	5.25	11	15
Self confidence	5	3.83	11	7
Verbal facility	5	4.50	11	10.5
Praise and emotional stability	5.50	6	13	19
Ability to teach	5.83	2.39	14.5	4
Flexibility	5.83	5	14.5	13.5
Good health	6	4.75	17	12
Sense of humour	6	6	17	19
Active participation in professional organizations	6		17	22.5
Sociability		1.50	21	1
Appearance		6	21	19
Persistence			21	22.5
Popularity		6	21	19
Originality		6	21	19

[a]Superintendents.

[b]School board members.

of the twenty-three personal factors received a rank from
at least one of the superintendents while twenty-one of
the twenty-three personal factors received a rank from at
least one of the school board members. In compiling the
ranks assigned to the twenty-three factors by the superinten-
dents, the five factors which had not been ranked were con-
sidered a tie and were assigned the rank of 21. In compil-
ing the ranks assigned by the school board members to the
same twenty-three factors, the two factors which had not
been ranked were also considered a tie and assigned a rank
of 22.5

Referring to Table XXXIV the superintendents ranked
good judgement and common sense, leadership, an interest in
and liking for children, intelligence and cooperativeness
as the five most important factors in that order. Initia-
tive and willingness to work and communication skills were
tied in rank and constituted the remaining two most impor-
tant personal factors. Sociability, good judgement and
common sense, leadership, the ability to teach, organizing
and executive ability, an interest in and liking for children
and self-confidence were assigned the first seven ranks in
that order by the school board members. Using the formula
for tied ranks found in Siegel, Spearman's rho was computed
at 56. With N = 23, this rank correlation is significant
at the .01 level.[2]

---

[2]Sidney, Siegel, Non-Parametric Statistics for the
Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw Hill Inc., 1956),
pp. 202 - 210.

Relative Importance of Criteria. Table XXXV shows the median ranks assigned by the superintendents to nine selection criteria and the rank order based on the median ranks. Table XXXVI shows the median ranks assigned by the school board members to seven selection criteria and the rank order based on the median ranks. While it is difficult to compare the results because the superintendents were ranking nine criteria while the school board members were ranking only seven, certain observations can be nonetheless made. Both superintendents and school board members selected the same criteria for their first four ranks. Excluding personal factors, which in one case was assigned the first rank and in the other the fourth, experience, training and breadth of knowledge all followed each other.

Although not in the same order both superintendents and school board members rated physical fitness, age and sex as low in order of priority when considering criteria for the selection of principals. It can be concluded therefore that there is close agreement between the two groups regarding the importance of the various criteria in the selection of principals.

TABLE XXXV

MEDIAN RANKS AND RANK ORDER ASSIGNED BY SUPER-
INTENDENTS TO NINE SELECTION CRITERIA

Criterion	Median	Rank
Personal factors	1.00	1
Experience	2.39	2
Training	3.00	3
Breadth of knowledge	3.70	4
Intelligence	4.70	5
Scholastic Achievement	5.70	6
Physical fitness	6.61	7
Age	7.86	8
Sex	8.87	9

TABLE XXXVI

MEDIAN RANKS AND RANK ORDER ASSIGNED BY SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBERS TO SEVEN SELECTION CRITERIA

Criterion	Median	Rank
Experience	1.67	1
Training	2.00	2
Breadth of Knowledge	2.88	3
Personal factors	3.00	4
Age	4.64	5
Physical fitness	5.42	6
Sex	6.00	7

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I.   SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The research was an attempt to determine the role of the principals as well as the procedures and the criteria used in the selection of principals. The study was limited to the rural unitary school divisions (as of January, 1971) situated south of the fifty-third parallel in the province of Manitoba. The study was intended to compare the perceptions of two groups, the superintendents and the school board members regarding the role of the principal and the various criteria that should be met by successful candidates for the principal's position. Comparisons were made between the reports of both groups regarding the procedures used by the divisions. The related literature surveyed assisted in the formulation of the questionnaire. It also enabled the writer to compare perceptions and actual practices with the recommendations of writers and scholars in this field.

A questionnaire was the instrument used to gather the data. Copies of the questionnaire were mailed to fifty-six school board members; forty completed it and returned it to the writer. The superintendents were interviewed using the same questionnaire; their answers were recorded

by the interviewer. Interviews were conducted with twenty-five of the twenty-eight superintendents. After compilation, the data were reported and analyzed by making comparisons between the superintendents' and the school board members' replies. Conclusions as to the nature and extent of agreement or disagreement were made for each function in the role of the principal, selection procedure and criteria.

Statistical tests were applied to compute the rank order coefficient for the degree of agreement on the relative importance of the personal factors and the various role functions of the principal as assigned by superintendents and school board members. Spearman's rho was computed from the rank order. For the role functions, a chi square test was applied to test the agreement between superintendents' and school board members' distribution of ranks for each of the seven areas. The variance was found to measure the degree of agreement amongst superintendents and amongst school board members regarding the importance of each of the six selection procedures.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As shown by the computation of Spearman's rho, the comparative importance assigned to the seven broad role functions by both superintendents and school board members is fairly similar. The results of the median test applied to the distribution of ranks given to each of the broad functions by both groups reveal significant differences

between the ranks assigned by superintendents and school board members. These were maintaining the school plant and managing the school.

While there is seeming agreement between the two groups regarding the importance of each of the seven broad role functions, there were in fact noticeable dissimilarities. A comparison of percentages allotted by both superintendents and school board members to each broad role function revealed almost total agreement in only two functions, selecting and developing personnel and maintaining the school plant. A greater percentage of superintendents than of school board members believed that the functions of improving the educational program; working with pupils; working with the community; and personal professional development were important while managing the school was perceived more important by the board members than by the superintendents.

Both groups ranked the six selection procedures in the same order of importance thereby agreeing on the comparative importance of the priority of the various procedures. A calculation of the variance for each procedure, however, revealed that the degree of agreement within the groups in regards to the priority ranking was not as high. Amongst the school board members, calculations revealed a variance greater than one for all procedures. Amongst the superintendents, by contrast, only applications and field checks revealed a variance greater than one.

While there was agreement in the priority ranking
of the procedures, there were considerable variations in the
reports of what actually occurred in school divisions when
selecting principals. In the identification of candidates,
considerable differences were reported from the two groups as
to the methods of identification for candidates both from
within and outside the division. A considerable difference
in the reports between the two groups was also noted in the
area of minimum qualification requirements; while the great
majority of school board members reported that there were
minimum qualifications established by their divisions for
prospective candidates, less than half of the superintendents
answered likewise. There also were divergent reports from
the two groups as to the personnel responsible for determin-
ing qualifications. Further there was disagreement between
superintendents and school board members as to the frequency
of usage by their divisions of each of the six selection
procedures outlined to them in the employment of principals.

With the exception of the sex criterion there were
differences between the perceptions of superintendents and
school board members in regards to the importance of the
various criteria used in the selection of principals. Both
superintendents and school board members preferred male
principals at both the secondary and elementary levels,
although the preference was not quite as pronounced at
the elementary level. School board members, however, showed
a preference for older candidates than did superintendents.

Correspondingly, school board members showed a preference for candidates with more experience than did superintendents. Superintendents emphasized training more than did school board members; the superintendents preferred candidates with more years of university training while the preferences of board members in this respect were not as high. While a wide breadth of knowledge was deemed important by both groups, only a minority of board members preferred this to be measured by tests while no superintendent advocated any testing. While the rank order coefficient on personal factors was significant at the .01 level, there were some differences between the two groups in the rank order of these according to their importance. The degree of agreement on the criteria of scholarship and intelligence is unavailable since board perceptions on these were not sought.

III. CONCLUSIONS

1. The study of the perceptions of both superintendents and school board members regarding the importance of each of the seven broad functions of the role of the principal and of each criterion used for selection reveals disagreement amongst and between both groups.

2. Differences of varying degrees in the reports of superintendents and school board members show there is a lack of agreement between the

two groups as to the use of the six procedures in rural divisions. This difference in the reports of the two groups is puzzling. It may be that superintendents or school board members reported as to how they thought their divisions should proceed to select candidates; it may be that superintendents and school board members do not communicate as widely and as openly as possible on such matters, thereby leaving one group in some ignorance as to the actual procedures; or it may be that in some divisions, practices vary for the selection of each successful candidate and that such was reported. The lack of congruence however in the reports of superintendents and school board members in regards to all selection procedures, all of which are very simple in nature, should be further studied for the possible implications are of a serious nature.

3. Both groups assigned a high importance to interviews, references and applications in that order. Yet the literature surveyed cautions against attributing too much importance to these same procedures and indicates that more attention should be allotted to other procedures.

4. A study of the persons involved in the determination of qualifications for principals and

the identification of principals indicates that
the above functions are carried out almost
entirely by top administrative personnel at the
school board office and by school board members.

5. Relatively low expectations regarding the amount
of training deemed necessary for candidates,
especially on the part of school board members,
indicate a lack of complete understanding
regarding the sophisticated nature and complexity
of the role of the principal. This lack of
awareness of the need for specialized academic
and professional training may be significant
in the quality of professional education.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS RESULTING FROM THE STUDY

1. In divisions where policy manuals do not exist
or where such manuals do not clearly delineate
the procedures used for the selection of princi-
pals, such procedures should be established by
school boards in cooperation with their super-
intendents and then clearly outlined in written
for form the use of the board, the administra-
tors, all prospective candidates and faculties
of education. Such action will tend to guide
the superintendents and the school boards in
their selection for they will know the type of
persons desired for the vacant position and

they will also know the methods to be followed
in selecting these persons. Such clear guide-
lines are also likely to help improve teacher
morale.

2. The rural divisions surveyed tended to attribute
much importance to such procedures as interviews,
references and application forms. If these are
so used, they should be used with extreme
caution. Divisions should also study and use
other procedures to gather as much correct
information as possible on prospective candidates.

3. The membership on certain committees relating
to the selection process should be enlarged to
include people other than school board members
and superintendents. The inclusion of princi-
pals, teachers, lay representatives and in some
cases students, in certain selection procedures
might help to ensure the selection of the candi-
date most suited to the position.

4. School board members and superintendents share
the responsibility for the calibre of administra-
tive personnel occupying the leadership posi-
tions in their divisions. To ensure that this
responsibility is adequately met, these two
groups must first reach a common understanding
of the role of the principal in that division.
In determining this role, the board members

and their superintendent must reach agreement
on the priorities to be given to the various
functions of the principal. Before reaching
a decision on the role of the principal, the
divisional principals and representatives of
the teachers should be consulted and their
recommendations carefully reviewed before policy
is formulated.

Once the role has been defined clearly,
the two groups then must decide upon the quali-
fications necessary in a person to assume
properly such a role. When ranking the inventory
of twenty-three personal factors, school board
members attributed high importance to sociability
and low importance to such important factors as
intelligence, cooperativeness and communication
skills. Moreover, many board members did not
consider academic and professional training
very important. This indicates that many
school board members must be made aware of the
importance of academic and professional training
in prospective candidates. Trustees must also
be informed and convinced of the importance of
certain personal factors necessary in prospective
principals. The task of informing board members
on the qualifications necessary for prospective
candidates falls on the superintendent.

Representatives of the school board
and the superintendent should endeavour to
attend various conferences or workshops regard-
ing the role and selection of the principal.
Contemporary literature on the matter should be
circulated to keep abreast of modern and revised
theories.

Discussions and decisions regarding the
role and necessary qualifications of principals
must be held frequently and regularly in order
to evaluate present procedures and philosophy
and to bring about modifications when necessary.
Periodic meetings with divisional principals and
teacher representatives on these topics are also
recommended.

5. The resources of the faculties of education in
the Province remain virtually untapped in the
identification, recruitment and selection of
candidates for the principalship. The two
groups, the university and the school divisions,
must attempt to work in closer harmony. The
university can provide much assistance in
identifying, screening and testing prospective
principals. The university, on a consultative
basis, can also assist boards in the formulation
of policy regarding the role and selection of
the principal. Superintendents should also

seek the assistance of university members in their task of informing and educating school board members regarding the role and qualifications of prospective principals.

6. School board members must ensure themselves that the policy and guidelines set by them regarding the selection of principals will lead to the identification and selection of the most worthy candidates. Implementation of this policy is usually left to the superintendent or to a committee established by the board and on which board members are frequently represented. Except in unusual circumstances, boards should adhere to the established policy by accepting the recommendations of their superintendent and/or the committee, where one was set up.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

134

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

American Association of School Administrators. The Right
Principal for the Right School. Washington: American
Association of School Administrators, 1967.

Baughman, M. Dale, Wendell G. Anderson, Mark Smith and
Earle W. Wiltse. Administration and Supervision of the
Modern Secondary School. West Nyack, New York: Parker
Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally and John A. Ramseyer.
Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston:
Allyn & Bacon, 1966.

_____., and Russell T. Gregg. (eds.) Administrative
Behavior in Education. New York: Harper & Brothers
Publishers, 1957.

Culbertson, Jack. The Selective Recruitment of Education
Leaders. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for
Educational Administration, 1966.

Downie, N. M. and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods.
New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.

Goldhammer, Keith. The Social Sciences and the Preparation
of Educational Administrators. Eugene, Oregon: The
University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

Halpin, Andrew W. (ed.) Administrative Theory in Educa-
tion. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University
of Chicago, 1958.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. Selection of Educational Administrators.
Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational
Administration, 1966.

Morphet, C. L., R. L. Johns and T. L. Reller. Educational
Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs:
Prentice-Hall Inc., 1959.

Ovard, Glen F. Administration of the Changing Secondary
School. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Tope, Donald C., Robert Campbell, Howard Dean, John M. Foskett, Fred Fosmire and Richard A. Littman. The Social Sciences View School Administration. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

University Council for Educational Administration. The Selective Recruitment of Educational Leaders. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.

Young, Robert K., and Donald J. Veldman. Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

B.   PERIODICALS

Anderson, Donald P. "Recruiting Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools." The National Elementary Principal, XLIV (April, 1965), pp. 47 - 52.

Austen, David B. "Thoughts and Predictions on the Principal-ship." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (December, 1968), pp. 141 - 150.

Buckley, James J. "The Determination to Pioneer: Six Ways of Improving the Process of Selecting Urban School Administrators." Phi Delta Kappan, LII (February, 1971), pp. 361 - 362.

Culbertson, Jack A. "Changes in the Preparation of School Administrators." The National Elementary Principal, XLIV (April, 1965), pp. 54 - 59.

Davis, John E. "Selecting Administrators." The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, IX (June, 1963), pp. 94 - 99.

Dunmire, Edwin E. and Paul J. Quigley. "Getting the Right Man for the Job." Nation's Schools, LXXXV (June, 1970), pp. 52 - 53.

Forester, John J. "Selecting and Training Elementary School Principals." The National Elementary Principal, XXXIV (October, 1954), pp. 32 - 35.

Goldman, Harvey. "New Roles for Principals." The Clearing House, XLV (November, 1970), pp. 135 - 139.

Grobman, Hulda and Vynce A. Hines. "What Makes a Good Principal?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XL (November, 1956), pp. 5 - 16.

Hemphill, J. K. "Progress Report: A Study of the Secondary School Principalship, Part II." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVIII (April, 1965), pp. 217 - 230.

Hoyle, John. "Who Shall Be Principal—A Man or a Woman?" The National Elementary Principal, XLVIII (January, 1969), pp. 23 - 24.

Ingram, E. J. "Supervising the Instructional Program: The Role of the Principal." The CSA Bulletin, VI (June, 1967), pp. 23 - 41.

Lipham, James M. "The Role of the Principal: Search and Research." The National Elementary Principal, XLIV (April, 1965), pp. 28 - 33.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. "The Selection of Elementary School Principals." The National Elementary Principal, XLIV (April, 1965), pp. 42 - 46.

Melton, Joseph. "Role Perceptions of the Elementary School Principalship." The National Elementary Principal, L (February, 1971), pp. 40 - 43.

Otto, Henry J. "Principal Preparation at the Crossroads." Educational Leadership, XIII (October, 1955), pp. 28 - 32.

Ratsoy, E. W. "The Principal: Supervisor and Evaluator." The CSA Bulletin, IX (April, 1970), pp. 3 - 22.

Read, Lawrence F. "Appointing the Principal." The American School Board Journal, CXXXIX (July, 1959), pp. 14 - 15.

Riederer, L. G. "Recruiting Leaders in School Administration." Education Canada, X (June, 1970), pp. 34 - 36.

Scott, Frank A. "The Development and Evaluation of an Instrument to Assess the Attitudes of Public School Principals." Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI (March, 1958), pp. 185 - 196.

Thiemann, Francis C. "The Alberta School Administrator's Career So Far, So Good." The Canadian School Administrator Bulletin, IX (February, 1970), pp. 4 - 16.

Tronc, Keith and F. Enns. "Promotional Aspirations and Differential Role Perceptions." The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XV (September, 1969), pp. 169 - 183.

Wiens, John. "Differences Between Influential and Non-
Influential Administrators." The Alberta Journal of
Educational Research, XVI (June, 1970), pp. 103 - 110.

Willis, H. L. "Major Tasks Facing Larger Boards in Selection
of Top Personnel." School Administration, V (November,
1968), pp. 34 - 36.

C.   UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Asper, Linda B. "Factors Affecting the Entry of Women
Teachers into Administrative Positions of the Manitoba
Public School System." Unpublished Master's thesis,
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, 1974.

Owens, Furnan. "A Study of the Role of the Elementary
Principal as Perceived by Parents." Unpublished Doctoral
dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1963.

Peach, J. W. "Procedures and Criteria Used in Selecting
Administrative Personnel in Large Urban School Systems
in Western Canada." Unpublished Master's thesis,
University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.

Warren, P. J. "The Search for Administrative Talent:
Recruitment and Selection of Candidates." Kingston:
Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study
of Education, 1973.

APPENDIX

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, CANADA

St. Vital , Manitoba
March 19, 1971

Dear Fellow Superintendents:

To complete my Master's degree program in Educational Administration, I am conducting a study of the criteria perceived important by school board members when selecting school administrators as compared to the criteria perceived important by their superintendents. To enable me to continue this study, I am soliciting your help.

Firstly, your board chairman and one other board member selected at random have been sent questionnaires to answer. Since their own personal perceptions of the criteria required constitute an important part of the study, I would ask you not to give advice concerning possible answers to the questionnaire if you are consulted. Moreover, could you please encourage your board members selected, _____ and _____ to answer the questionnaire?

Secondly I will be asking you to allow me to take approximately forty-five minutes of your valuable time to interview you on topics identical to those found on the trustees' questionnaires. I will be contacting you by telephone as to the time and place most suitable to you for this interview. Since some of you live at quite a distance from Winnipeg, I would greatly appreciate your notifying me of any plans to visit the city, possibly at Easter; this would be advantageous to me financially and time-wise. If at all possible, I would hope to complete all interviews by April 23.

Thank you for your assistance and the anticipated cooperation in granting me an interview when I call upon you.

Yours truly,

Richard R. Benoit

St. Vital, Manitoba.
March 19th, 1971.

Dear

     As part of my Master's degree program in Educational Administration at the University of Manitoba, I am making a study of the criteria perceived important by <u>school board</u> members when selecting principals as compared to the criteria perceived important by their <u>superintendents</u>. The role of the principal is becoming increasingly important in the modern educational system and I feel that all possible effort should be made to ensure the selection of the best candidate possible. This study would help contribute to this purpose. To enable me to complete my study, I would appreciate it if you would answer the enclosed questionnaire which would probably take 30-40 minutes of your valuable time.

     The offices of your organization, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, is aware of the purpose and design of the study and has been presented with a copy of this questionnaire. They have permitted me to tell you that they fully approve of the study and are most interested in its results.

     Since it is most essential to my study to know your opinions as a trustee, it is very important that each one complete the questionnaire to the best of his ability without consultation with anyone.

     I am fully aware that your additional duties as a trustee make you an extremely busy citizen and another questionnaire will prove burdensome. However, I would be very grateful for your assistance and I hope you will find the time to complete the questionnaire and return it to me by April 8th.

     Thank you again.

               Yours truly,

               Richard R. Benoit.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer <u>all</u> questions to the best of your knowledge and ability.

A. SELECTION PROCEDURES

Please place your answer to the following questions in one of the spaces
to the right of that question. Use the following scale:

1) always   2) frequently   3) occasionally   4) never

Please answer EVERY part of ALL questions.

IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATES

In this part of the questionnaire, it is necessary to make a distinction
between identification and final selection of candidates. Identification,
as used here, means that process by which the identity of possible candid-
ates is secured. Selection refers to the act whereby a candidate is
accepted for appointment.

1. IDENTIFICATION FROM WITHIN THE DIVISION	always	frequently	occasionally	never
	1	2	3	4
Identification is made by:				
a) the superintendent alone;	( )	( )	( )	( )
b) the school board members alone;	( )	( )	( )	( )
c) the superintendent in consultation with other personnel in the system; Please state which personnel _____	( )	( )	( )	( )
d) requesting, by means of a form letter or weekly bulletin, applications from the teaching staff;	( )	( )	( )	( )
e) having names submitted for consideration by supervisory personnel;	( )	( )	( )	( )
f) other. Please specify.	( )	( )	( )	( )

2. IDENTIFICATION FROM OUTSIDE THE DIVISION

Are applications from outside the division
considered? Check YES or NO.   Yes ( )   No ( )

If "yes," identification is made:

		1	2	3	4
a)	from applications received as a result of advertising;	( )	( )	( )	( )
b)	by personal contacts by either the superintendent or school board members with prospective candidates;	( )	( )	( )	( )
c)	by requesting names from faculties of education;	( )	( )	( )	( )
d)	other. Please specify.	( )	( )	( )	( )

_____

3. OTHER POLICIES

a)	Do you attempt to identify candidates before they are actually needed?	( )	( )	( )	( )
b)	Is a list of suitable candidates kept on hand from year to year?	( )	( )	( )	( )

4. DETERMINING THE QUALIFICATIONS NEEDED

Does your division establish a minimum set of educational qualifications a candidate should have before being considered for a principal's position? Check YES or NO.   Yes ( )   No ( )

a) If yes, who determines what qualifications a principal should have? Please check ONE of the following.

1. The school board   ( )
2. The superintendent   ( )
3. A committee   ( )
4. Principals only   ( )
5. The superintendent and the school board   ( )
6. Others. Please specify.

_____   ( )

b) If a committee is used, who sits on that committee? Please check those who do sit on the committee.

1. The superintendent   ( )
2. The superintendent's assistant   ( )
3. Members of the school board   ( )
4. Members of the supervisory staff   ( )
5. School principals   ( )
6. Others. Please specify.

_____   ( )

c) The qualifications for the job of principal may be analyzed either in terms of the requirements of particular schools or on a division-wide basis. Is the job of principal in your division analyzed on an individual or a division-wide basis?

		1	2	3	4
1.	a division-wide basis	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	an individual school basis	( )	( )	( )	( )

SELECTION OF CANDIDATES

5. METHODS OF SELECTION

		1	2	3	4
a)	Is more than one person considered when a position is vacant?	( )	( )	( )	( )
b)	Does the superintendent make the final selection of candidates who are to be recommended to the board?	( )	( )	( )	( )
c)	Does the board require the superintendent to select more than one candidate in his final recommendation?	( )	( )	( )	( )
d)	Is the principalship filled by the candidate or one of the candidates recommended by the superintendent?	( )	( )	( )	( )

e) If a committee is not used as part of the selection process, please check here. _____

If a committee is used, what is its composition?

		1	2	3	4
1.	The superintendent	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	The superintendent's assistant	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	Members of the school board	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	Members of the supervisory staff	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	School principals	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.	Others. Please specify.				
	_____	( )	( )	( )	( )

6. APPLICATION FORMS

Does your division make use of application forms or letters of application for candidates who come from:

		1	2	3	4
a)	within the division?	( )	( )	( )	( )
b)	outside the division?	( )	( )	( )	( )

7. INTERVIEWS

a) Does your division use interviews for candidates who come from:

		1	2	3	4
1.	within the system?	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	outside the system?	( )	( )	( )	( )

b) They are conducted by:

		1	2	3	4
1.	the superintendent	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	the superintendent's assistant	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	a committee	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	members of the school board	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	other. Please specify.				
	_____	( )	( )	( )	( )

c) If a committee is used, it is composed of:

		1	2	3	4
1.	the superintendent	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	the superintendent's assistant	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.	members of the board	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.	school principals	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.	members of the supervisory staff	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.	others. Please specify.				

_____   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )

d) Is a prepared rating form used during the
interview?   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )

8. ASSESSMENT OF UNIVERSITY TRANSCRIPTS

Do you assess the academic records of candidates from:

		1	2	3	4
a)	within the system?	( )	( )	( )	( )
b)	outside the system?	( )	( )	( )	( )

9. PHYSICAL FITNESS

Do you require that candidates undergo a physical examination if they
come from:

		1	2	3	4
a)	within the division?	( )	( )	( )	( )
b)	outside the division?	( )	( )	( )	( )

10. INDIVIDUAL TESTS

a) Do you use any individual mental ability
tests as part of the selective process?   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )
b) Do you use any personality tests as part
of the selective process?   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

a) Are letters of recommendation requested for
candidates from:

		1	2	3	4
1.	within the division?	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.	outside the division?	( )	( )	( )	( )

b) Are the letters:

1. forwarded by the applicant?   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )
2. confidential, and sent directly to
you by the person making the recommend-
ation?   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )

c) Do you make use of a standard form?
    Please check YES or NO.   Yes (_)   No (_)

    If you do, are they in the form of:

                                                      1   2   3   4
    1. rating scales?   (_) (_) (_) (_)
    2. anecdotal reports?   (_) (_) (_) (_)

d) From whom do you usually request references
    or letters of recommendation? Please write in. _____

    _____

    _____

e) Are telephone calls made to inquire about
    prospective candidates? Please check YES
    or NO.
                                                      Yes (_)   No (_)
    If yes, to whom are these made? Please write in. _____

    _____

    _____

12. OBSERVATIONS OF CANDIDATE IN PRESENT POSITION (FIELD CHECKS)

If you do NOT use field checks or special observations, please
check here. _____

If you use field checks, please indicate who makes
the check.

                                                      1   2   3   4
a) the superintendent   (_) (_) (_) (_)
b) the superintendent's assistant   (_) (_) (_) (_)
c) others   (_) (_) (_) (_)

13. The procedures sometimes used in the selection of personnel for a
     principal's position have been incorporated into the foregoing questions.
     Using the numbers 1 to 6, please rank the selection procedures in their
     relative importance to you when you select persons as principals.

     Application forms or letters of application   _____
     Interviews   _____
     University transcripts   _____
     Individual tests   _____
     References or letters of recommendation   _____
     Field checks   _____

B. PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

14. Functions of the Principal

In the following section, the role of the principal has been divided into
seven broad areas. Under each are listed functions relating to that area.
In your opinion, how important do you consider each of these areas and
functions? Please check each ONE according to this scale:

1) important   2) useful   3) not important

	important 1	useful 2	not important 3
a) Improving the Educational Program	( )	( )	( )
1. Conducting personal professional research	( )	( )	( )
2. Evaluating present programs	( )	( )	( )
3. Initiating curricular revisions	( )	( )	( )
4. Motivating the faculty in curriculum improvement	( )	( )	( )
5. Providing the necessary resources for curriculum	( )	( )	( )
6. Planning in-service and orientation sessions	( )	( )	( )
7. Supervising instruction	( )	( )	( )
8. Others. Please specify.			
_____	( )	( )	( )
b) Selecting and Developing Personnel	( )	( )	( )
1. Recruiting new staff members	( )	( )	( )
2. Creating good staff morale	( )	( )	( )
3. Stimulating professional development	( )	( )	( )
4. Stimulating personal development	( )	( )	( )
5. Providing open lines of communication at all times	( )	( )	( )
6. Others. Please specify.			
_____	( )	( )	( )
c) Working with Pupils	( )	( )	( )
1. Maintaining discipline and student control	( )	( )	( )
2. Organizing, administering and improving the guidance program	( )	( )	( )
3. Controlling extra-curricular activities	( )	( )	( )
4. Admitting and orientating new students	( )	( )	( )
5. Counselling students	( )	( )	( )
6. Others. Please specify.			
_____	( )	( )	( )
d) Maintaining the School Plant	( )	( )	( )
1. Supervising and inspecting facilities	( )	( )	( )
2. Planning new buildings	( )	( )	( )
3. Others. Please specify.			
_____	( )	( )	( )
e) Working with the Community	( )	( )	( )
1. Interpreting the educational problems and programs to the public	( )	( )	( )
2. Promoting cooperation with parent and community advisory groups	( )	( )	( )
3. Making personal contact with parents	( )	( )	( )
4. Creating a good public relations program	( )	( )	( )
5. Others. Please specify.			
_____	( )	( )	( )

f) Managing the School   ( )   ( )   ( )

    1. Purchasing equipment and supplies   ( )   ( )   ( )
    2. Distributing equipment and supplies   ( )   ( )   ( )
    3. Determining the school budget   ( )   ( )   ( )
    4. Managing the office   ( )   ( )   ( )
    5. Others. Please specify.

    _____ ( )   ( )   ( )

g) Personal Professional Development   ( )   ( )   ( )

    1. Attending professional meetings   ( )   ( )   ( )
    2. Attending superintendent's conferences   ( )   ( )   ( )
    3. Improving one's professional skills   ( )   ( )   ( )
    4. Others. Please specify.

    _____ ( )   ( )   ( )

h) The various functions often perceived to be part of
the principal's role have been incorporated into the
seven broad areas listed above. In your opinion,
what is the order of importance of these areas.
(Please rank them from 1 to 7.)

    _____ Improving the educational program
    _____ Selecting and developing personnel
    _____ Working with pupils
    _____ Maintaining the school plant
    _____ Working with the community
    _____ Managing the school
    _____ Performing personal duties

C. CRITERIA

Please answer these questions, giving your own opinions, even if these differ
from official policies already established by the division.

15. AGE

From what age group do you PREFER to appoint administrators?
Please check ONE of the following.

    1. Below 25   ( )
    2. From 25 - 30   ( )
    3. From 31 - 40   ( )
    4. From 41 - 50   ( )
    5. Above 50   ( )

16. SEX

a) Which would you generally PREFER to appoint as administrators of secondary and junior high schools? Check MEN or WOMEN.

Men (_)   Women (_)

b) Which would you generally prefer to appoint as administrators of elementary schools? Check MEN or WOMEN.

Men (_)   Women (_)

17. EXPERIENCE

a) How many years of teaching experience do you PREFER your appointees to have had? Please check ONE of the following.

1. Less than 5   (_)
2. 5 - 10   (_)
3. 11 - 15   (_)
4. 16 - 25   (_)
5. More than 25   (_)

b) Do you PREFER your appointees to have had previous administrative experience? Check YES or NO.

Yes (_)   No (_)

If yes, state how many years. _____

c) Do you consider administrative experience outside the division to be valuable? Please check YES or NO.

Yes (_)   No (_)

If yes, please state why. _____

_____

18. TRAINING

a) How many years of university education do you PREFER that your candidates have at the time of their appointment? Please check ONE of the following.

1. No minimum preparation   (_)
2. Less than 2 years   (_)
3. 2 years, less than 4   (_)
4. 4 years, less than 5   (_)
5. 5 years, less than 6   (_)
6. 6 years, less than 7   (_)
7. 7 years or more   (_)

b) Do you PREFER appointees to an administrative position to have taken courses in the following subjects? Please check YES or NO for each item.

1.	Educational Administration	Yes (_)	No (_)
2.	Curriculum	Yes (_)	No (_)
3.	Supervision	Yes (_)	No (_)
4.	Organizational Theory	Yes (_)	No (_)

19. KNOWLEDGE

a) Do you consider a broad, general knowledge of educational theory and practice as measured by written examinations administered during the selection process to be an important factor in the selection of appointees? Please check YES or NO.

Yes (_)   No (_)

b) Comparing knowledge of subject matter and knowledge of educational theory and practice, which one do you consider more important for principals? Check ONE of the following.

1. Good knowledge of educational theory and practice   (_)
2. Good knowledge of a subject matter field   (_)

20. PERSONAL FACTORS

Following are some personal qualities which could be perceived as important for candidates appointed to an administrative position. Please read them carefully.

1.	Sociability	2.	Leadership
3.	Organizing and executive ability	4.	Tact and diplomacy
5.	Good judgment and common sense	6.	Interest in, and liking for children
7.	Ability to teach	8.	Poise and emotional stability
9.	Appearance	10.	Good health
11.	Interest in community affairs	12.	Sense of humour
13.	Persistence	14.	Initiative and willingness to work
15.	Self-confidence	16.	Cooperativeness
17.	Popularity	18.	Flexibility
19.	Verbal facility	20.	Originality
21.	Communication skills	22.	Intelligence
23.	Active participation in professional organizations		

a) You may deem some of the items listed above as being much more important than others. Please list in order of importance those seven items which you PREFER appointees have.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____

21. The criteria sometimes used in the selection of personnel for their first principal's position have been incorporated into the foregoing questions. Usually these criteria do not carry equal weight. Using the numbers 1 to 7, please rank the criteria in their relative order of importance to you when you select principals.

    Age   _____

    Sex   _____

    Experience   _____

    Training   _____

    Personal factors   _____

    Physical fitness   _____

    Breadth of knowledge _____

22. If there are other criteria, procedures, or perceptions of the role of the principal which you believe to be important, please describe them.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

23. If you have any comments about the questionnaire or the research project please feel free to express them below.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

D. GENERAL INFORMATION CONCERNING YOURSELF

24. Age. Check ONE of the following.

    1. Less than 30   ( )
    2. 30 - 40   ( )
    3. 41 - 50   ( )
    4. 51 - 60   ( )
    5. Over 60   ( )

25. Academic Education. Check ONE of the following.

    1. Less than a high school diploma   ( )
    2. A high school diploma   ( )
    3. 1-2 years of university training   ( )
    4. An undergraduate degree   ( )
    5. More than 1 university degree   ( )

26. Years of experience on a School Board. Check ONE of the following.

    1. Less than 3   ( )
    2. 4 - 7   ( )
    3. 8 - 11   ( )
    4. 12 - 15   ( )
    5. Over 15   ( )

27. Occupation. Please state here. _____

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. The size of the division

   a) The number of teachers. Check ONE of the following.

      1. Under 75   (_)
      2. 75 - 100   (_)
      3. 101 - 150   (_)
      4. 151 - 250   (_)
      5. Over 250   (_)

   b) The number of principals. Check ONE of the following.

      1. 5 and under   (_)
      2. 6 - 10   (_)
      3. 11 - 16   (_)
      4. 17 - 21   (_)
      5. Over 21   (_)

2. Are the policies for selecting personnel for administrative positions in your division recorded in written form? Check ONE of the following.

   Yes (_)   No (_)   Partly (_)

3. If the policies are written, are they available to the teaching staff of the division? Check YES or NO.

   Yes (_)   No (_)

   If yes, could you include a copy of these when returning the questionnaire?

SCHOLARSHIP

a) Do you consider scholastic achievement attained by your candidates during their period of university an important factor when selecting the appointee? Please check YES or NO.

   Yes (_)   No (_)

   If yes, what level of scholarship do you PREFER candidates have? Please check ONE.

   1. Outstanding   (_)
   2. Superior   (_)
   3. Above average   (_)
   4. Average   (_)
   5. No preference   (_)

INTELLIGENCE

a) Do you consider a candidates I.Q. (as measured by standardized tests) to be an important factor in the person to be selected for the principalship? Please check YES or NO.

<div align="center">Yes (_)   No. (_)</div>

b) If yes, what range of I.Q. do you prefer your appointees to have? Please check ONE.

1. 100 - 110   (_)
2. 110 - 120   (_)
3. 120 - 130   (_)
4. 130 - 140   (_)
5. Above 140   (_)

26. The criteria sometimes used in the selection of personnel for their first administrative positions have been incorporated into the foregoing questions. Usually these criteria do not carry equal weight. Using the numbers 1 to 9, please rank the criteria in their relative order of importance to you when you select persons for administrative positions.

Age _____

Sex _____

Experience _____

Training _____

Scholastic achievement _____

Intelligence _____

Personal factors _____

Physical fitness _____

Breadth of knowledge _____

IF YOU ARE A SUPERINTENDENT, PLEASE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS:

Length of time as superintendent in the division. Check ONE of the following.

1. Over 4 years   (_)
2. 4 years   (_)
3. 3 years   (_)
4. 2 years   (_)
5. 1 year   (_)
6. Less than 1 year   (_)

Educational background.   Check ONE of the following.

1.   Less than 4 years of university training   (_)
2.   4 years of university training   (_)
3.   5 years of university training   (_)
4.   6 years of university training   (_)
5.   More than 6 years of university training   (_)

Age.   Check ONE of the following.

1.   Less than 30   (_)
2.   31 - 40   (_)
3.   41 - 50   (_)
4.   51 - 60   (_)
5.   Over 60   (_)

Years of teaching experience.   Check ONE of the following.

1.   Less than 10   (_)
2.   10 - 15   (_)
3.   16 - 20   (_)
4.   21 - 25   (_)
5.   Over 25   (_)

Years of administrative experience.   Check ONE of the following.

1.   Less than 5   (_)
2.   5 - 10   (_)
3.   11 - 15   (_)
4.   16 - 20   (_)
5.   More than 20   (_)

St. Vital , Manitoba,
April 11, 1971.

Dear Sir or Madam:

A few weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire relating to your perceptions
of the criteria deemed necessary when selecting principals for the
schools in your division.

To date I have received a 50% response. I wish to thank sincerely
all those who have already completed and returned this questionnaire.
I also appreciate your additional comments.

To those of you who have not yet answered the questionnaire, I wish
to ask you again to please take some time and do so, returning it
in the stamped, self-addressed envelope accompanying it.

It is hoped that this study will be of some future assistance to both
trustees and superintendents in their task of selecting principals.

Thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to participate.

Yours sincerely,

Richard A. Benoit,
Faculty of Education,
University of Manitoba.

RAB:ac

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, CANADA

May 12, 1971

Dear

I am writing to you about the questionnaire I had sent to you
two months ago on your perceptions of the criteria deemed neces-
sary in the selection of principals.

If you could complete and return this questionnaire, the results
of my survey would still be more valid.

Would you please send them to me at the following address:

St. Vital , Manitoba.

Gratefully yours,

Richard R. Benoit.