

Western Kentucky University

TopSCHOLAR®

Dissertations

Graduate School

Fall 2019

Superintendent Recruitment: Effects of Superintendent Job Status, School Councils (Principal Selection Models), District Wealth, and Signing Bonus on Applicant Rating of the Job

Mark Jeffery Martin

Western Kentucky University, mark.martin@meade.kyschools.us

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/diss>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Gender Equity in Education Commons](#), and the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martin, Mark Jeffery, "Superintendent Recruitment: Effects of Superintendent Job Status, School Councils (Principal Selection Models), District Wealth, and Signing Bonus on Applicant Rating of the Job" (2019). *Dissertations*. Paper 176.
<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/diss/176>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

SUPERINTENDENT RECRUITMENT: EFFECTS OF SUPERINTENDENT JOB
STATUS, SCHOOL COUNCILS (PRINCIPAL SELECTION MODELS), DISTRICT
WEALTH, AND SIGNING BONUS ON APPLICANT RATING OF THE JOB

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

By
Mark Jeffery Martin

December 2019

SUPERINTENDENT RECRUITMENT: EFFECTS OF SUPERINTENDENT JOB STATUS, SCHOOL COUNCILS (PRINCIPAL SELECTION MODELS), DISTRICT WEALTH, AND SIGNING BONUS ON APPLICANT RATING OF THE JOB

Date Recommended Aug 30, 2019

Gary Houchens
Gary Houchens, Chair

Kimberlee Everson
Kimberlee Everson

John Millay
John Millay

Cheryl O. Davis 9/23/19
Dean, Graduate School Date

This dissertation is dedicated to others who influenced me. My dad, Jeff Martin, positioned me for success through his sacrifices and example of overcoming adversity. Jim Valvano once said, “My father gave me the greatest gift anyone could give another person, he believed in me.” My father has always believed and loved me unconditionally.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Kimberlee Everson, Dr. John Millay, and committee chair Dr. Gary Houchens for their support throughout all phases of the dissertation process. I have grown from working with all of you, and it has been a true pleasure to work with outstanding scholars.

I would like to thank my wife, and best friend, Rachael Martin for her loving support during the past 11 years of graduate school and 10 years of marriage. Rachael has empowered me to chase my dreams, and I love the trust she has in me. I also want to recognize our three children Quinn, Jude, and Claire who inspire me to be a better person. A wish for my children is that you always display courage. Courage is daring to take the first step, or a different path. It is the decision to place your dreams above your fears.

There were three men outside of my dad who positioned me for success. The first person is my cousin, Paul Ashburn, who is like an older brother and has been my best friend. Next, Dan Crume has been a father-like mentor who taught me to dream beyond my surroundings. Finally, Dr. John Millay has provided me with life changing opportunities that have grown me as a professional and person. His encouragement, friendship, and guidance in all aspects of my life are special. These three men have been instrumental in my life and motivated me to start and finish my doctorate.

To my late grandmother, Dorothy Martin, who gave me a childhood home. She provided structure and discipline during a difficult time. I would not have experienced success without her sacrifices. Dorothy Martin prioritized her family above all, and I will forever be grateful for her selflessness.

To the entire Martin family, who went above and beyond for me, I thank you for showing me what *family* truly means. To my brother, Jason, and sister, Erica, I am lucky

to have grown up with you, and I am so proud of what you have both overcome and accomplished in your lives.

I am indebted to the excellent, caring teachers that I have had throughout my years of academic training, particularly the following Cheryl Shrewsbury, Kim Sanders, Chuck Adams, Amy Miller, Ann Render, Dr. Hope Marchionda, Dr. Janet Applin, Dr. Bruce Battles, Dr. Janice Ferguson, and Dr. John Millay. I would be remiss if I did not thank Jonathan Schroader and Bob Hunt for their friendship and being terrific classmates. Weekend classes were more fun when taking them with you.

I would like to thank Allison Coomes for hiring me into Daviess County Public Schools and providing me with countless opportunities to grow during my first 6 years as a teacher. During my time in Meade County Schools, I have been fortunate to work with many outstanding people, specifically Dr. John Millay, Bill Adams, Marc Adams, Amy Berry, Donna Foushee, Susan Fackler, Rikki Hanger, Debbie Whelan, Christy Livers, Cara Esarey, Joan Cooke, Travis Scott, David Phillips, Garrett Frank, and Jeanette Schmidt. I would like to acknowledge two Meade County School ladies who have been vital to my career and personal growth. First, working with Kellianne Wilson expedited my growth in terms of efficiency and leading with command. I strive to be a humble leader in her image. I thank Kellianne for believing and investing in me. Gloria Bertrand has been a motherly figure who has made me a better husband, father, and overall person. Gloria has taught me the influence a relationship can have, and I love her for this gift. The patience and investment of all of these individuals in me was genuine.

I would like to thank my mother, Tonja St. Clair, who has been a tremendous help during graduate school with watching my children so I could attend class and my wife

could work. You're great to my children, and they love you very much.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of Cohort XIX. I learned an invaluable amount about myself through our discussions and reflection. I will always remember your example and friendship.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
The Job of Superintendent	2
Superintendent Recruitment in Kentucky	3
Problem	7
Purpose	9
Definitions	10
Summary	13
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Introduction	14
Recruitment	15
Private Sector Recruitment Research	18
Recruiter Effects	20
Recruitment Practice Effects	24
Recruitment Source Effects	32
Applicant Characteristics	33
Realistic Job Previews	35
Person Organization Fit	39
Monetary Benefits	46
Summary of Private Sector Research	49
Educational Recruitment Research	52
K-12 Recruitment Research	52

Higher Education Recruitment	72
Summary of Educational Research.....	82
Rynes and Barber Applicant Attraction Model	82
Rynes Framework for Recruitment Research.....	84
Summary of Literature Review.....	86
Research Questions	87
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	90
Theoretical Framework.....	94
Participants.....	95
Superintendent Participants	96
Superintendent Certified Participants	97
Sampling Procedures	98
Independent Variables	99
School Councils	99
District Wealth.....	101
Signing Bonus.....	102
Dependent Variable	103
Data Collection Procedures—Current Study	104
Data Analysis	105
Study Limitations.....	106
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS	107
Study Participants	107
Instrument Response Rate.....	110
Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity.....	111
ANOVA Data Analysis.....	111
School Governance Preference	115
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS	118
Practical Implications.....	119

Implications for Future Research.....	127
Conclusion	131
REFERENCES	132
APPENDIX A: IRB Approval Letter	146
APPENDIX B: Implied Consent	147
APPENDIX C: Testing Instruments	148

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Superintendent	97
Table 2. Superintendent Certified	98
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics.....	108
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics.....	109
Table 5. T-Test Participant Age Comparison	110
Table 6. Response Rate	110
Table 7. Mauchly's Spehericity Test	111
Table 8. Interview without Interactions	111
Table 9. Interview with Interactions	112
Table 10. Job without Interactions.....	112
Table 11. Job with Interactions.....	113
Table 12. Interview Interaction Bonus#Status.....	113
Table 13. Job Interaction Wealth#Status	114
Table 14. Job Interaction Wealth#Council	114
Table 15. Three-Way Interaction Interview Wealth#Bonus#Status	114
Table 16. Three-Way Interaction Job Wealth#Bonus#Status.....	115
Table 17. Superintendent Candidate Likelihood to Accept an Interview	115
Table 18. Superintendent Candidate Likelihood to Accept the Job.....	116
Table 19. Certified Candidate Likelihood to Accept an Interview	116
Table 20. Certified Candidate Likelihood to Accept the Job.....	117
Table 21. Differences in How Certified & Superintendents Rated Variables	126

SUPERINTENDENT RECRUITMENT: EFFECTS OF SUPERINTENDENT JOB
STATUS, SCHOOL COUNCILS (PRINCIPAL SELECTION MODELS), DISTRICT
WEALTH, AND SIGNING BONUS ON APPLICANT RATING OF THE JOB

Mark J. Martin

December 2019

176 Pages

Directed by: Gary Houchens, Kimberlee Everson, and John Millay

Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research

Western Kentucky University

This nearly perfect replicated study (Millay, 2003) was a superintendent recruitment simulation with the purpose of investigating factors that influence recruiting qualified individuals to serve as district superintendents of public schools. The study was a factorial experiment involving a four-way $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times (3 \times S)$ fixed-factor between-within analysis of variance (ANOVA) which yielded 24 cells. The participants in the study were Kentucky Superintendents ($N = 72$) and individuals in Kentucky certified to be a school superintendent ($N = 72$) but employed in another position.

The between-groups variables were superintendent job status (superintendent, certified), district wealth (high, low), and signing bonus (yes, no). The within-groups repeated measures variable was school councils (decentralized, centralized, and hybrid). Each study participant rated three jobs; one job located in a district with decentralized school governance conducted through school councils; a second with centralized school governance conducted through the district central office; and finally a hybrid model where the superintendent joins the school council with a single vote for the position of principal. The dependent variable was an additive composite score of applicant rating of the job of superintendent.

Descriptive statistics revealed a small representation of minorities and females. Superintendents rated jobs in centralized districts much higher than hybrid and

decentralized districts. Certified participants rated jobs in hybrid districts slightly higher than centralized districts. Job status, signing bonus, and school councils were all three highly statistically significant for likelihood to interview and accept a superintendent position. Three two-way interactions were statistically significant for the likelihood to interview when signing bonus and job status variables were in the job description, the likelihood to accept a superintendent position when district wealth and job status were in the job description, and the likelihood to accept a superintendent position when district wealth and school council were in the job description. There was a three-way interaction among job status, district wealth, and signing bonus.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Maxwell (1998) argued that the success of an organization is contingent on the limits of the leader when he advocated, “If a person’s leadership is strong, the organization lid is high. But if it’s not, then the organization is limited. That’s why in times of trouble, organizations naturally look for new leadership” (p. 7). In the K-12 education setting, no leader is more important than the superintendent in this regard. Therefore, the focus of the present study was recruiting qualified individuals to serve as district superintendents of Kentucky School Districts.

Winter, Rinehart, Keedy, and Bjork (2007) advocated that one of the greatest challenges that school board members experience is recruiting qualified personnel to fill superintendent vacancies. Glenn, Hickey, and Sherman (2009) suggested that superintendent selection is one of the most critical decisions made by a school board. Kamrath and LaFee (2014) detailed that rural school districts are often training grounds for administrators who transition to larger districts with greater resources. According to Winter et al. (2007), “Such limited attraction to the superintendency among principals may result in inadequate applicant pools for superintendent vacancies in the future as the ‘baby boom’ retirements escalate (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000)” (p. 49).

The educational research that does exist barely begins to address recruitment practices and policies concerning K-12 administrators and faculty and administrators at both community colleges and four-year institutions. Rynes (1991) operationally defined recruitment this way: “Recruitment encompasses all organizational practices and decisions that affect either the number, or types, of individuals who are willing to apply

for, or to accept, a given vacancy” (p. 429). Recruitment involves decisions made by organizational representatives and job applicants and is an integral part of effective human resource management; it performs the necessary function of drawing an important resource, human capital, into the organization (Barber, 1998). Barber (1998) added that the success of later human resource efforts, such as selection, training, and compensation, depends in part on the quality and quantity of new employees identified and attracted through the recruitment process.

The Job of Superintendent

Similar to Maxwell’s (1998) theories on organizational success being aligned to the leader’s potential, multiple Kentucky educational leaders agree that a comprehensive superintendent positions a school district to experience excellence and longevity. Fred Carter, Kentucky Association of School Administrators (KASA) Director of Coaching and Mentoring, noted:

The selection of a quality superintendent is easily the most important decision that any Board of Education will ever make. The ideal superintendent is well versed in all aspects of leadership including the importance of culture, relationships, strategic planning, curriculum and assessment, finances, personnel, district maintenance, and school/business partnerships (F. Carter, personal communication, November 16, 2018).

Superintendent of Simpson County Schools (Kentucky) Jim Flynn noted, “The overall focus of the superintendent role has evolved from a manager to a learning leader and hiring a quality superintendent is critically important if a school district wishes to sustain success” (personal communication, November 28, 2018). Former Superintendent of

Hardin County Schools (Kentucky) and current KASA Evidenced-Based Leadership Coach, Nanette Johnston, claims “Funding, board dynamics, changing academic standards, and clientele of family contribute to the greater demands and higher turnover of the superintendent position” (N. Johnston, personal communication, December 11, 2018).

Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) delineated nine responsibilities/duties of the superintendent: (a) the chief executive officer to the board of education, recommending policies to the board and an operating budget for the school system; (b) provider of good information to the board of education for effective decision making; (c) provider of daily leadership to the entire district, encompassing established policies of the district; (d) manager of the entire educational program (e.g., curriculum, instruction, co-curricular, textbook adoption, field trips); (e) person responsible for personnel matters (e.g., hiring, assigning, evaluating, developing, firing); (f) developer and administrator of the district budget; (g) manager of bids and financial issues, bids and contracts, facilities, and transportation; (h) developer and supporter of district-level teams of faculty and staff to improve teaching and learning, and supporting local school councils of staff, parents, and students; and (i) the overseer of day-to-day management and administrative tasks, including student discipline and personnel matters. With the position of superintendent playing such a crucial role in the success of a school district, school boards should consider empirical research in the area of superintendent recruitment.

Superintendent Recruitment in Kentucky

Empirical research in the area of superintendent recruitment in Kentucky is scarce (Winter, Millay, Bjork, & Keedy, 2005). (Millay, 2003) researched the perspectives of

potential job applicants regarding their attractiveness of a superintendent job posting based on the applicant's job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), district wealth, signing bonus, and school councils (centralized and decentralized). Millay (2003) found that based on the alpha level used in his study ($p < .05$), a significant main effect was discovered for school councils: $F(1, 136) = 12.92, p < .0001$. Study participants rated jobs in districts without school councils significantly higher than jobs in districts with school councils. The results implied that current and prospective superintendents preferred a centralized model for selecting the school principal where the decision is made by the superintendent as opposed to the decentralized model where a council has autonomy.

Millay (2003) found three significant findings in related to job status.

Superintendents rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 8.13$) significantly higher than jobs in districts with school councils ($M = 6.74$): $F(1, 142) = 18.22, p < .0001$. Superintendents rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 8.13$) significantly higher than superintendent certified personnel rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 7.36$): $F(1, 136) = 4.66, p < .05$. Superintendents rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 8.13$) higher than superintendent certified personnel rated jobs in districts with school councils ($M = 7.10$): $F(1, 142) = 8.08, p < .05$.

There was also a two-way interaction between school councils (yes and no) and job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), and a three-way interaction among job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), district wealth (high, low), and bonus (yes, no). Superintendents had a strong preference ($\omega^2 = .10$) for jobs in districts without school councils. Superintendents rated jobs in high wealth districts highest when

the job had an initial signing bonus of \$20,000. Winter et al. (2005) advocated for future research “Because this study revealed significant findings, it would appear the above models have utility for guiding the selection of independent variables for future recruitment studies” (p. 451).

Millay (2003) inferred that states without school councils would have an advantage over Kentucky districts in recruiting talented superintendents. Millay (2003) speculated that if Kentucky was already at a disadvantage with its decentralized hiring model, it would be more difficult than ever to recruit quality superintendents to Kentucky districts. Millay (2003) posed the following question for state policymakers: “Is having school councils worth the possible negative impact councils may be having on superintendent recruitment?” (p. 236). When referring to how school superintendents outside of Kentucky view our decentralized school governance model, Greg Schultz (personal communication, December 21, 2018), Superintendent of Oldham County Schools (Kentucky), said “The fellow superintendents I have talked to while at national conferences think how Kentucky handles principal selection (and really the entire SBDM concept) as ineffective and slightly insane.”

In summary, in the decentralized model the local school councils in Kentucky once implemented maintained the majority of the decision-making responsibilities pertaining to the school, whereas in a centralized model, the decision-making authority for the district, and all the schools within the district, is maintained by the superintendent. All the decision-making authority given to Kentucky school councils prior to 2011 under the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) of 1990 runs counter to a traditional, centralized mode practiced outside of Kentucky. Millay (2003) found that

superintendents preferred a centralized model where they would be afforded autonomy on the selection of the principal as opposed to the decentralized model they were experiencing during that time.

In addition to studying job statuses and school councils, Millay (2003) analyzed the three-way interaction among status (superintendent, superintendent certified), district wealth (high, low), and signing bonus (yes, no). Data were collected by asking participants to rate the desirability of various job descriptions on a Likert scale. Millay (2003) found the effects of district wealth and signing bonus to be non-significant. There were also interaction effects between district wealth and signing bonus. According to Millay (2003), “Superintendents rated jobs in high wealth districts significantly higher when a signing bonus was offered than when a signing bonus was not offered” (p. 236). Millay (2003) concluded district wealth is not a major factor for recruiting experienced or certified superintendents. When a signing bonus was offered in a high wealth district versus a high wealth district that did not offer one, they chose the signing bonus. The same is not true for low wealth districts as a signing bonus was not significant.

Kentucky law and procedures regarding principal selection changed in 2011. According to KRS 160.345 2.a.i. (2017), “If the vacancy to be filled is the position of principal, the outgoing principal shall not serve on the council during the principal selection process. The superintendent or the superintendent’s designee shall serve as the chair of the council for the purpose of the hiring process and shall have voting rights during the selection process” (p. 838). Kentucky superintendents once again have principal selection influence, though still in collaboration with the school’s SBDM Council.

Problem

There is little research about superintendent recruitment practices. Empirical research about K-12 administrators is scarce. According to Tallerico (2000), “The superintendency is the primary position in K-12 educational administration for which school boards often engage the services of outside facilitators” (e.g., headhunters/executive search agencies) (p. 18).

In 2011, the Kentucky law changed to a hybrid model that remained decentralized in a SBDM setting, but local school superintendents (or their designee) now are a member of the committee during the principal hiring process. The superintendent now has one vote on a six member SBDM council. The other votes are in the hands of three teachers and two parents. No empirical research has been conducted since this adjustment to the SBDM council for school principal.

Fred Carter, KASA Director of Coaching and Mentoring, stated, “If questioned, most superintendents would tell you that you they are satisfied with the current model and they do feel they now have sufficient input into the process as opposed to the previous selection process” (F. Carter, personal communication, November 16, 2018). Jim Flynn, Superintendent of Simpson County Schools (Kentucky), acknowledged the new hybrid model works better than the past decentralized model and feels it is an inclusive process that gives accountability to all stakeholders. Flynn still sees value in a centralized model and stated “If given a choice as an applicant between the three options (centralized, decentralized, hybrid), I would choose a centralized school governance model. I would prefer to still consult with the SBDM council similar to an advisory council” (J. Flynn, personal communication, November 28, 2018). Nanette

Johnston, former Superintendent of Hardin County Schools (Kentucky) and current KASA Evidenced-Based Leadership Coach, prefers the new hybrid model of principal selection by stating “The new model is inclusive and creates a powerful team atmosphere that provides accountability for all stakeholders” (N. Johnston, personal communication, December 11, 2018). Will current and certified superintendents respond differently to this adjusted decentralized (hybrid) model or will they prefer the centralized (traditional) model that superintendents favored in 2003?

This replicated study also addressed the independent variables of wealth and signing bonus. Nanette Johnston compared leading a low wealth district to “Fighting to stay alive because of losing enrolled students that translates to losing funding and ultimately losing teachers. It can be a challenge just to make payroll in a low wealth district” (N. Johnston, personal communication, December 11, 2018). On the other hand, there is adversity in leading a high wealth district. Greg Schultz leads Oldham County schools which is one of the highest wealth districts in Kentucky and claims, “Oldham County Schools is a high wealth district. Sometimes we battle over expectations from our parents and sometimes a sense of entitlement” (G. Schultz, personal communication, December 21, 2018). Regarding a signing bonus of \$40,000 to take job in a high or low wealth district, Dr. Jim Flynn stated, “It would signal a school district is serious, but it would not greatly impact my decision on whether or not to apply” (J. Flynn, personal communication, November 28, 2018). While it is possible similar results will surface regarding wealth and signing bonus, there is also a chance of a new results being yielded with changing cultural dynamics since 2003.

Purpose

This study focused on applicant decisions to apply for the superintendent position and accept an initial job interview. Such decisions are critical because, as Rynes (1991) noted, if qualified applicants do not apply for employment vacancies, then organizational recruitment activities are ineffective. The purpose of this investigation was to assess the impact of superintendent status (current superintendent, superintendent certified), district wealth (high, low), school councils (yes, no, and hybrid), and signing bonus (yes, no) on applicant rating of the job of school superintendent.

This study focused on superintendent recruitment in Kentucky. According to KASA (F. Carter, personal communication November 16, 2018), Kentucky averages 25-35 openings annually over the last 8 years and a current average tenure of 3.5 years.

Carter noted the following:

I have been involved in the training of new superintendents for the past 8 years.

During that time, I have served as the executive coach for 163 of the 173

superintendents in Kentucky. In other words, there are only 10 superintendents in

Kentucky who currently have over 8 years of experience. When schools opened in

august, 46% of Kentucky superintendents had two or fewer years of experience.

A large number of individuals currently possess superintendent certification but are not serving as superintendents. One part of this investigation was to determine if specific variables influence applicants' decisions to apply for a superintendent vacancy.

Moreover, are various superintendent vacancies more or less appealing to an experienced superintendent than to an individual who possesses certification but is not presently employed as a superintendent?

Definitions

The following list of terms and their respective definitions provide the readers of this study with information helpful for understanding this research and its design.

1. Applicant attraction - the positive attitudinal and behavioral reactions of applicants to components of the recruitment process (Heneman, Heneman, & Judge 1997).
2. Board of Education – “Each board of education shall have general control and management of the public schools in its district and may establish schools and provide for courses and other services as it deems necessary for the promotion of education and the general health and welfare of pupils, consistent with the administrative regulations of the Kentucky Board of Education. Each board shall have control and management of all school funds and all public school property of its district and may use its funds and property to promote public education. Each board shall exercise generally all powers prescribed by law in the administration of its public school system, appoint the superintendent of schools, and fix the compensation of employees.” (2010, KRS 160.290).
3. Certified - possessing the qualifications and credentials for a specific employment position.
4. District wealth - poverty level determined by the percentage of students in a district that qualify for free or reduced lunch. According to Payne (2001) a working definition of poverty is “the extent to which an individual does without resources” (p.16).

5. Hybrid - "Personnel decisions at the school level shall be as follows: If the vacancy to be filled is the position of principal, the outgoing principal shall not serve on the council during the principal selection process. The superintendent or the superintendent's designee shall serve as the chair of the council for the purpose of the hiring process and shall have voting rights during the selection process." (2018, KRS 160.345).
6. Job attributes - characteristics of jobs such as duties, benefits, and salary.
7. Job message - information received by the applicant from the organization regarding a vacancy within the organization.
8. Job offer - an employment agreement offered by an organization to an applicant.
9. Person-job fit - the compatibility between an individual and a specific job (Lauver & Kristoff-Brown, 2001)
10. Person-organization fit - the compatibility between individuals and organizations that occur when (a) at least one of the parties (individual or organization) provides what the other needs, (b) each share similar fundamental characteristics/qualities, or (c) both (Kristoff, 1996).
11. Realistic job preview - a recruitment practice designed to present applicants with both positive and negative information about the job (Wanous, 1980).
12. Recruiter effects - the behaviors, actions, or characteristics of recruiters or interviewers that may influence an applicant's rating of a job.

13. Recruitment - “. . . all organizational practices and decisions that affect either the number, or types, of individuals who are willing to apply for, or to accept, a given vacancy” (Rynes, 1991, p. 429).
14. Recruitment advertisement - a written announcement of a job opening designed to optimally stimulate qualified individuals to join the applicant pool for the position (Heneman, Heneman, & Judge 1997).
15. Recruitment message - information or attributes about the job or organization that recruiters/interviewers convey to applicants.
16. Recruitment practices- tasks, procedures, and actions undertaken to attract qualified individuals to the organization (Barber, 1998).
17. Recruitment source - methods such as employee referrals, recruitment advertisements in newspapers or journals, direct applications, and employment agency referrals which individuals use to become part of the applicant pool for a job vacancy.
18. School council – “Except as provided in paragraph (b) 2. of this subsection, each participating school shall form a school council composed of two (2) parents, three (3) teachers, and the principal or administrator. The membership of the council may be increased, but it may only be increased proportionately. A parent representative on the council shall not be an employee or a relative of an employee of the school in which that parent serves, nor shall the parent representative be an employee or a relative of an employee in the district administrative offices. A parent representative shall not be a local board member or a board member's spouse. None of the members shall have a

conflict of interest pursuant to KRS Chapter 45A, except the salary paid to district employees” (2017, KRS.160.345).

19. Signing bonus - a financial incentive offered to an applicant by the recruiting organization to obtain the applicant’s agreement to accept employment or perform services for the organization.

20. Superintendent – “in Kentucky, the superintendent is the executive agent of the board of education and is responsible for the general conduct of all the district’s schools, course of instruction, discipline of students, and the management of all business activities of the Board of Education. The Board of Education hires the superintendent and the superintendent is responsible for the hiring and dismissal of all other employees of the school district” (KRS 160.370).

21. Traditional job preview - a recruitment practice designed to present applicants with only the positive aspects of a job or organization (Wanous, 1980).

Summary

Scholars and practitioners agree that leadership drives the success of the organization. The superintendent is the leader of the school district, and attracting the most talented candidates should be a priority for local board of education members. To recruit the premium for the superintendent position, it is necessary for local board of education members to be informed on the current empirical research. This study provides informative data for these crucial decisions. A review of the literature that framed this study appears in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

It is generally accepted that the employer's level of success is aligned with the individuals it employs (Dineen & Soltis, 2011). It is becoming more difficult to find quality candidates to fill superintendent vacancies in public school systems. It is more important than ever that the position of superintendent is attractive to quality candidates.

There have been multiple law changes since 1990 that have influenced the superintendent position in the state of Kentucky. In 2003, Millay examined a law change of how Kentucky school site based decision-making councils (SBDM) were given autonomy to select the school principal in a decentralized model (Millay, 2003). A centralized model that afforded the superintendent autonomy of hiring the principal existed prior to the law change and is the traditional model used across the country. Millay found that superintendents preferred the centralized model for principal selection. In 2011, the law changed to a hybrid model that remained decentralized in an SBDM setting, but the principal now is a member of the committee during the principal hiring process. The superintendent now has a vote. The question now is are current and prospective superintendents are satisfied with this new hybrid model, or do they prefer the traditional centralized model where they selected the principal in isolation?

The literature review that follows emanates from empirical studies conducted in industrial and organizational psychology and in educational administration. The review includes research from both the applicant's and the organization's point of view. The review has the following overall objectives:

1. To review recruitment research from the private sector;
2. To review recruitment research from the educational sector;
3. To describe and discuss recruitment models; and
4. To describe and discuss recruitment theories and methods.

Recruitment

The process of seeking out and attracting individuals from the external labor market who are capable of, and interested in, filling job vacancies has long been the definition of organizational recruitment (Heneman, Schwab, Fossum, & Dyer, 1983). The term *recruitment* includes a wide variety of activities and characteristics, ranging from giving out organizational literature, such as brochures, to characteristics and behaviors of the organization's recruiter (Taylor & Bergmann, 1987). Rynes (1991) noted that "Recruitment encompasses all organizational practices and decisions that affect either the number, or types, of individuals who are willing to apply for, or to accept, a given vacancy" (p. 429). Breaugh (2008) defined external recruitment as

an employer's actions that are intended to (1) bring a job or opening to the attention of potential job candidates who do not currently work for the organization, (2) influence whether these individuals apply for the opening, (3) affect whether they maintain interest in the position until a job offer is extended, and (4) influence whether a job offer is accepted. (pp. 103-104)

Recruitment involves decisions made by organizational representatives and job applicants and is an integral part of effective human resource management; it performs the necessary function of drawing an important resource, human capital, into the organization (Barber, 1998). Barber (1998) added that the success of later human resource efforts,

such as selection, training, and compensation, depended in part on the quality and quantity of new employees identified and attracted through the recruitment process. For example, Boudreau and Rynes (1985) verified that selection utilities could fluctuate dramatically as a function of recruitment practices, in one figure, by a factor of 10.

With respect to educational recruitment, Rebore (1995) noted, “It is a mistake to assume that the correct mix of people will be available to fill vacancies without making a concerted effort to find the most qualified individuals to fill specific human resource needs” (p. 79). This statement attests to both the need and importance for organizations to have sound recruitment practices and strategies in place. Breugh (2013) advocates that organizations need to decide in the beginning of the recruitment process the types of individuals they need to recruit to fit their needs.

Technology, and especially tech-mediated communication with potential job applicants, has become a major tool for recruitment and has changed how private and public sectors recruit. In 2007, a study found that organization websites that provide the most detailed job opening information were viewed more positively by prospective applicants (Allen, Mahto, & Otondo, 2007). A simulation study manipulated whether an employee testimony was present or absent. It was discovered that the inclusion of the testimonial positively impacted the amount of time the participant used the media (Walker, Field, Giles, Armenakis, & Bernerth, 2009). Braddy, Meade, and Fleenor (2009) concluded that website content would influence perceptions of organizational culture when individuals viewed fictitious websites that featured employee testimonials, awards received, pictures of employees, and stated organizational policies. Selden and

Orenstein (2011) found that websites that are more easily navigated will generate more applicants.

Social media recruiting can also be utilized to recruit and select candidates (Tufts, Jacobson, & Stevens, 2014; Wolf, Sims, & Yang, 2014). Companies incorporate LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter to post job ads and recruit candidates (Caers & Castelyns, 2010). Baur, Buckley, and Bagdasarov (2014), stated the following:

Another technological advance we may see in the near future is the development of a website that allows potential applicants to view RJP's for numerous jobs prior to actually applying for the jobs. Potential applicants would be able to view a preview for any job within his or her profession and decide, based on the preview, whether he or she is a good fit for each job. (p. 215)

Research literature in the field of recruitment has increased substantially since the late 1970s. Guion (1976) noted that as of 1976 little recruitment research existed, and that which was available was not described as a search for understanding. Conceptual advancements noted by Rynes (1991) addressed by research since then have included the following: (a) theoretical models pertaining to recruitment practices in general (e.g., Rynes & Barber, 1990; Schwab, 1982; Schwab, Rynes, & Aldag, 1987; Winter, 1996), (b) specific recruitment practices, such as the choice of recruitment sources (e.g., Breugh, 1981; Schwab, 1982), (c) the effects of using a realistic versus a traditional job preview (e.g., Breugh, 1983; Reilly, Brown, Blood, & Malatesta, 1981; Wanous, 1977, 1980), and (d) potential outcomes, such as expectancies of receiving offers or effects of new hires on current employees (e.g., Boudreau & Rynes, 1985; Schwab, 1982; Sutton & Louis, 1987).

Winter (1996) noted three premises about recruitment that were supported by both private sector and education sector research: (a) recruitment is more effective when approached as a two-way process, involving decisions made by both organizational representatives and by job applicants; (b) job attributes described in recruitment messages are among the most salient satisfiers of applicant job related needs; and (c) recruitment can be cast as “job marketing” to enhance the effectiveness of the recruitment effort.

Private Sector Recruitment Research

The private sector informs the public sector regarding creative recruiting techniques. The private sector enjoys autonomy that the public sector rarely experiences. The public sector should be well versed in the methods of private sector recruitment and consider how their organization can replicate similar successful strategies within their framework.

A study of job applicants concluded that when individuals were asked to relocate for a job opportunity, they were less likely to accept an offer (Becker, Connolly, & Slaughter, 2010). Breaugh (2009) noted that the strategy of using current employees to recruit new individuals with desirable personal attributes into the organization as the most beneficial recruiting method.

Realistic job previews have generated a large volume of research. Research concluded whether individuals apply for a job opening is correlated to its perceived attractiveness (Ehrhart & Ziegert, 2005). Wanous (1980) defined a realistic job preview (RJP) as a recruitment practice designed to present applicants with both positive and negative information about the job. Rynes (1991) explained that the main focus of realistic recruitment theory is employee retention, as opposed to applicant attraction. The

organization's intent is that of providing an applicant with a realistic job preview in the recruitment process will decrease future turnover rates. Organizational and job attributes are determining factors for individuals when evaluating the attractiveness of a position (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin, & Jones, 2005).

Rynes (1991) noted that in terms of independent variables, three types of recruiter characteristics had been examined: (a) recruiter demographics (sex, race, age), (b) functional area (personnel versus line recruiter, recruiter versus job incumbent), and (c) personality traits. The four major dependent variables were (a) overall impressions of recruiters, (b) expectancies of receiving offers, (c) perceived job or organizational attractiveness, and (d) probabilities of pursuing or accepting offers (Rynes, 1991). In regard to recruitment sources, Barber (1998) listed traditional sources such as employee referrals, employment agencies (including campus placement offices and executive search firms), newspaper or radio advertisements, and unsolicited applications "walk-ins" as the most commonly used sources. Glickstein and Ramer (1988) reported an increase in alternative recruitment sources, such as on-line (Internet) hiring services, job fairs, and competitors' layoffs/outsourcing programs as ways of discovering prospective applicants.

Overall, the main focus of private sector recruitment research has been the effect of recruiter characteristics on the decisions of job applicants to accept or reject organizational employment opportunities. The majority of criticisms of existing private recruitment research suggest that it does not adequately capture the complexity of recruitment as it occurs in the real world (Barber, 1998). Rynes and Barber (1990) noted that "in most cases existing studies are extremely simplistic when evaluated against real-world complexities. In particular, most studies have examined single strategies and

limited dependent variables at single phases of the attraction process” (p. 305). Minimal empirical research directly relevant to recruitment targeting exists (Dineen & Soltis, 2011).

Recruiter Effects

This subsection describes recruitment research conducted primarily from the applicant perspective about the recruitment practices of organizational recruiters. Recruitment researchers who examined recruiter effects hypothesized that recruiter behaviors signal the applicant about whether or not job pursuit efforts will be successful (Rynes, 1991). Many of these studies addressed the influence of the recruiter by using applicant responses on dependent variable measures such as (a) overall reaction to the recruiter conducting the interview, (b) attractiveness of the job and the organization, and (c) impression of the interview process.

In one of the earliest studies about the recruiter, Alderfer and McCord (1970) examined the effects of interviewer traits, behaviors, and attitudes of job candidate’s interview evaluations and subjective probabilities of accepting a job offer. First and second-year master’s degree students at Cornell Graduate School of Business and Public Administration were the study participants ($N = 112$). Of the 112 participants looking for summer employment, 47 were first-year students and the remaining 65 were second-year students. Field theory, which proposes that behavior and attitudes are a function of the people and the situation in which they find themselves framed the study.

The participants completed a two-part questionnaire. The first part included two 11-item lists of job attributes such as salary, a predictable future, and opportunities for advancement. On the first list, the participants ranked the job attributes in order of

importance. On the second, the participants distributed 100 points among all 11 factors, with a higher number of points distributed to the most preferred attributes. Numerous items appeared in both lists; however, two were of particular interest in this investigation: (a) helpful and cooperative associates and (b) a boss that provided autonomy, assistance, and recognition. The correlations between the points received on each of the lists were .723 for the associate item and .760 for the boss item. Spearman-Brown reliability estimates were used on the summed scale for workers and boss and were noted as .839 and .864, respectively. The Spearman-Brown estimate shows the reliability of the summed scales, because the total score was the sum of two separate measures of the items' point totals, one from each list (Alderfer & McCord, 1970). The researchers used these two scales to operationalize definitions for interpersonal need strength.

The independent variable for a series of independent-samples *t*-tests was interview type (best interview, worst interview). The participants noted their reactions to the best, worst, and average recruitment interview they had attended in part two of the questionnaire. Seventeen 6-point Likert- scales (1 = *strongly agree*, 6 = *strongly disagree*) served as dependent variables for the *t*-tests. The questionnaire also contained items for the probability that an interviewee would receive a job offer, and the probability that the interviewee would accept a job offer if it were made. The participants circled 1.0 for the first question if they had received an offer, and 0.0 for the second question if they had not received an offer. For the second question, the respondents circled 0.0 if they turned down an offer and 1.0 if they accepted an offer.

The researchers performed a series of Pearson correlations for the 17 attitude scales to determine: (a) the average correlation among best, average, and worst interviews

and (b) the correlation between each attitude scale and both receiving an offer and accepting an offer. Independent samples *t*-tests were used to test for significant group mean differences between best and worst interviews.

Independent-samples *t*-tests revealed significant group mean differences for the following fifteen dependent variables: (a) interviewer willing and able to answer questions, (b) interviewer interest in candidate, (c) applicant uncomfortable at some point during interview, (d) interviewer understood the viewpoint of the M.B.A. applicant, (e) interviewer spoke of careers of other MBAs in company, (f) interviewer instilled a sense of trust with the interviewee, (g) technical questions were asked in interviewee's field of interest, (h) liked the interviewer, (i) interested in getting a job offer, (j) interviewer interest in the contribution the interviewee could make to the company, (k) interviewer indicated potential for a high salary, (l) interviewer was familiar with applicant's background, (m) interviewer seemed like a successful, younger man, and (n) interviewee felt he could handle anything the interviewer asked.

Additionally, Alderfer and McCord (1970) found significant correlations among candidates' desires for mutually trusting and qualities of their recruitment interviews, their perception of the interpersonal qualities of their recruitment interviews, and their evaluation of the interviews. Certain traits and behaviors were related to the stated likelihood of a candidate accepting of a job offer. If the applicants were told that a higher salary was a possibility, talked to about the careers of other MBA's within the company, and if the applicants were interviewed by a younger man, it appeared that the applicants had a higher probability of saying they would accept a job offer.

Thirty-five years after Alderfer and McCord's (1970) empirical study, a meta-analysis by Chapman et al. (2005) revealed that recruiters who were rated as personable, competent, informative, and trustworthy demonstrated a strong correlation of the job opening being more attractive to the applicant. These results support that personal job characteristics are still significant factors.

Liden and Parsons (1986) examined the factors that related to applicant intentions to accept a job if offered, as well as how the race (black, white) and sex of applicants and interviewers related to perceptions of the interviewers' behaviors and overall reactions towards the interview. The participants ($N = 422$) in the study were job applicants (mean age = 17.2, mean education level = 12.2 years) seeking low-level seasonal positions at a large amusement park in the Southeast. After completing a 10-minute interview with one of eight interviewers, participating applicants anonymously completed a two-page questionnaire that took approximately 10 minutes to complete. The questionnaire items measured applicants' perceptions of the interviewer, general affect concerning the interview, general affect concerning the job, external influences, and intentions of accepting a job offer.

The independent variables for the study were (a) interviewer sex (male, female), (b) applicants perceptions on the competence of the interviewer (defensive, lost train-of-thought, difficult to get along with, slouches in chair, spoke softly, ineffective, interrupted applicant, poor conduction of interview, unsatisfactorily answered questions, self-conscious), (c) interviewer personableness (warm personality, interested in applicant's outside interest, sincere, enthusiasm, believable), and (d) interviewer informativeness (told about possible promotions, stressed variety and change in jobs,

gave information about supervision). The researchers used 20 items to measure applicant perceptions of the interviewer on a 5-point Likert scales (1 = *does not describe the interviewer behavior very well*, 5 = *describes the interviewer behavior very well*). The dependent variables were applicant affect toward the interviewer (2 items), applicant affect toward the job (1 item), external influences (4 items), and applicant intention to accept a job offer (1 item).

Pearson correlations revealed significant bivariate relationships between applicant race, applicant sex, interviewer sex, and perceptions of the interviewer. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) revealed statistically significant relations among demographic variables and perceptions of the interviewer and perceptions of the interview and overall reactions toward the interview. Univariate effects confirmed the following: (a) female applicants tended to see the interviewers as more competent and personable; (b) black applicants had a propensity to see the interviewers as less competent; and (c) female interviewers were seen as more personable and informative. Liden and Parsons (1986) noted no significant multivariate two-way or three-way interaction effects. A hierarchical multiple regression revealed the relationship between job acceptance intentions and general interview affect, general job affect, parental pressure, friends' pressure, and alternative job opportunities on applicant job acceptance intentions. The influences of parental and friend pressure had a statistically significant impact on applicant intentions.

Recruitment Practice Effects

The general proposition of recruitment practices is that recruiters influence job applicants by either signaling behaviors about the organization or influencing applicants'

expectancies of receiving a job offer (Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab 1980). Recruitment policies and practices have practically escaped the attention of previous researchers (Rynes, 1991). Rynes (1991) added that areas receiving some attention included (a) timing of recruitment follow-ups, (b) policies regarding recruitment expenses (e.g., reimbursement policies), (c) nature of the application process, and (d) realism of recruitment messages (e.g., Rynes & Boudreau, 1986; Schwab, 1982; Taylor & Bergman, 1987). The following investigations represent methods or practices used to share information about employment opportunities or the organization itself.

Barber and Roehling (1993) used the verbal protocol analysis (VPA) technique to investigate individual's decisions of whether or not to apply for jobs. VPA theory states that verbal protocols are observable behaviors that accurately reflect the underlying cognitive processes of the decision maker (Ericsson & Simon, 1980, 1984). The participants in the experimental VPA study ($N = 49$) were undergraduate students enrolled in upper-level business courses at a large Midwestern university. Participants in the control (written response) sample ($N = 38$) were undergraduate students enrolled in a different section of the same upper-level business course as the participants in the experimental sample.

The independent variables in this study were: (a) organizational characteristics (firm size, type of industry or product line, geographic location); (b) job characteristics (job title, compensation including salary and benefits); (c) employment process characteristics that included recruiter characteristics (gender, title), equal opportunity practices, and number of job openings; (d) information adequacy (differences in information availability across postings, information missing from all postings); and (e)

probability-of-hire expectancy (if applicants make and rely on inferences when deciding to interview). Methodological questions focused on: (a) whether VPA impacted decision outcomes, and (b) whether prompts used during the protocol process impacted decision-making. The dependent variables noted were (a) rating of job attractiveness, and (b) applicant's willingness to interview. Five-point Likert scales captured participant rating of job attractiveness (1 = *very unattractive*, 5 = *very attractive*).

When participants chose more than one rating, an average of the ratings was noted. The participants responded to a question asking whether or not they would sign up to interview with the company noted in the vacancy ad (coded as *yes* or *no* with a section for a written response). Lastly, the researchers created a third category to code conditional responses. Negative responses were coded 1, conditional responses 2, and positive responses 3. Barber and Roehling (1993) randomly assigned participants, in both the experimental study and the control group, to one of two experimental conditions: a long-form condition that included prompts for inferences and a short-form condition that did not include prompts for inferences. All study participants completed a post-exercise questionnaire.

Barber and Roehling (1993) utilized two multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) to assess whether the verbal protocol methodology had influenced the primary decision task by examining differences across the experimental (verbal protocol) and control (written protocol) on the decision outcome variables. The researchers used a MANOVA to test for significant differences across conditions in job attractiveness, willingness to interview, and the number of unprompted inferences made between participants in the long-form and short-form conditions on decision outcomes. Barber and

Roehling (1993) concluded the following: (a) with respect to the VPA on decision outcomes, MANOVA results indicated no significant difference between the experimental and the control groups on the decision to interview and on position attractiveness; (b) significant multivariate differences existed in tendencies to make inferences when prompted; and (c) in regard to the influence of prompts on decision outcomes, no significant differences existed between the long-form and short-form conditions on position attractiveness, willingness to interview, and number of unprompted inferences made.

Barber, Wesson, Roberson, and Taylor (1999) advanced the knowledge of how recruitment practices of larger firms differ from that of smaller firms. The research was important because a vast majority of recruitment research has dealt with samples from large businesses; therefore, the generalizability of the findings to small firms may not always be relevant/useful. Barber et al. (1999) examined differences in recruitment practices as a result of firm size and whether job seekers modified their search behavior as a function of the kind of employer preferred (small firm, large firm). Barber et al. (1999) stated two research questions: (a) “Do job seekers hold distinct preferences for large versus small employers in conducting job search? Do they restrict their search to specific sectors of the labor market, that is, to large firms?” and (b) “Do those job seekers preferring employment with large firms engage in different job search behaviors than those job seekers preferring small firm employment?”

The researchers used two data sets: one that contained data of firms’ recruitment practices, and another that contained data on individual searchers’ attitudes and behaviors. The firm data set consisted of businesses ($N = 624$), both small employers ($n =$

300) and large employers ($n = 324$). Barber et al. (1999) defined small businesses as those with less than 500 employees and large businesses as those with more than 1,000 employees. Human resources managers/representatives completed a survey instrument containing questions that involved the factors of recruitment practices, selection, and attraction. When appropriate, the researchers conducted factor analyses using principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Barber et al. (1999) used Kaiser's (1960) criterion (factor loadings, cross loadings) to select factors.

The participants rated employee recruiting, measured by asking participants the extent of involvement of certain organizational members in the recruitment of recent college graduates, using 5-point Likert scales (1 = *not at all involved*, 5 = *extensive involvement*). A single composite score, derived from an 8-item measure of *amount* and *type* of training, assessed recruiter training. The participants rated recruitment planning and cycle with three questions (e.g., "How much time typically elapses between the time you make an offer and the deadline for accepting that offer?"; "How far in advance of the of the needed hire date do you typically begin to recruit college graduates?"; "How much time typically elapses between the time you make an offer and the date the new hire begins work?") measured on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *no flexibility*, 5 = *give or take 4 weeks or more*). The participants rated recruitment sources, measured by the extent employers used various sources when recruiting college graduates (e.g., campus, brochures, campus placement, internships/co-ops, internal networking [employee referrals, networking], and external agencies [temporary agencies, private employment agencies]) on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *We do not use this source at all*, 5 = *We use this source on a regular basis*).

Barber et al. (1999) assessed important applicant qualifications through participant rating of five factors using 5-point Likert scales (1 = *not important at all*, 5 = *extremely important*) (e.g., motivation [10 items], interpersonal skills [6 items], activities [7 items], academic record [4 items], experience [1 item]). Employer participants rated screening devices by completing an 11-item checklist of items (e.g., campus interviews, other initial screening interviews, site visits, psychological tests, medical examinations, physical abilities tests, drug tests, group interviews, work samples) typically used in the hiring process (coded 1 if checked, coded 0 if not checked). A single open-ended item (e.g., *By what means is the effectiveness of your recruiting program evaluated? Please describe whatever procedures are used?*) provided Barber et al. (1999) with information on how companies actually evaluate recruitment effectiveness.

The second data set involved random selection of graduating seniors ($N = 212$) from two major universities (Midwest, East Coast) majoring primarily in business and engineering. In addition to the variables listed below, study participants complete Rosenberg's (1965) 10-item measure of self-esteem, and listed their GPA, work experience, and gender. The survey instrument involved measures of four variables (size preference, actively searching for size, level of search activity, sources used). Barber et al. (1999) assessed size preference by asking participants if they preferred to work for small or large firms when they graduated, using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly prefer small*, 5 = *strongly prefer large*). The participants rated how actively they searched for employment with large and small companies on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *not at all actively*, 5 = *very actively*). The researchers assessed participant rating of level of search activity using Blau's (1994) preparatory and active search behavior scales. Items included

asking participants to rate (a) how many hours per week they spent searching for a job on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *1 hour*, 5 = *more than 20 hours*); (b) how many employers they thought they would contact on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *1 or 2*, 5 = *more than 20*); and (c) the amount of effort they applied to their job search on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *very little effort*, 5 = *a great deal of effort*). Participants rated the extent to which they used various sources (e.g., campus placement office, private employment agency, newspaper/journal ads, internet, professional networking, informal networking) on 5-point Likert scales (1 = *I have never used this source*, 5 = *I use this source every day*).

Barber et al. (1999) used hierarchical multiple regression to test most differences in organizational hiring practices and cluster analysis (using average-linkage hierarchical analysis as the starting point for subsequent nonhierarchical testing) to further analyze the data. In relation to firm analyses, the results indicated that (a) larger firms were more likely than smaller firms to use human resource (HR) staff; (b) small firms were more likely to involve line management in recruitment; (c) significant differences existed in recruiter training as a function of firm size with larger firms providing more recruiter training; (d) larger firms initiated recruitment farther in advance of the desired hire date and allowed more time for applicants to accept positions and to begin work as compared to smaller firms; (e) large firms offered more flexibility on the start date; (f) larger firms were more likely to use sources related to campus placement (e.g., brochures, campus placement visits, internships, co-ops) and smaller companies were more likely to use internal sources, external employment agencies, and newspaper ads; (g) larger firms attached more importance to academic records, extracurricular activities, and drug testing; and (h) larger firms were more likely to use goal attainment to measure

recruitment effectiveness, whereas smaller firms considered new hire performance and retention to measure organizational recruitment effectiveness.

In relation to job seeker analyses, Barber et al. (1999) found that (a) a significant number of job seekers partitioned themselves into one segment of the job market or another (small firm, large firm); (b) participants actively sought different employers; (c) participants seeking small firm employment began earlier than those seeking large firm employment; (d) significant group differences existed between the groups related to the search activity variable, greater activity occurred in large firm employment searches; (e) participants seeking large firm employment reported more employer contacts, spent more hours searching, and exerted more effort than participants seeking small firm employment; and (f) participants seeking work with large companies reported using more recruitment sources (e.g., campus placement offices, Internet) than participants seeking small firm employment.

Based on numerous investigations, one can conclude that recruitment practices have achieved mixed results for organizational policy-makers. The importance of changing and adapting recruitment practices to positively affect recruitment outcomes (e.g., the number of job applicants) merits an increased level of attention from administrators/policy makers. Additionally, a plethora of recruitment practice variables exist which deserve increased review and investigation to assist both recruitment researchers and administrators in increasing their understanding of the recruitment practices that are most effective in promoting higher applicant acceptance rates and longer employee tenure with an organization.

Recruitment practices such as timing, follow-ups, hiring practices, recruitment message, and required applicant qualifications had mixed reactions on the applicant pool. In sum, recruitment practices warrant additional research (Rynes, 1991). Another substream of the private sector literature addresses the impact of applicant source on recruitment.

Recruitment Source Effects

Research on recruitment sources has been less prevalent than research in other areas of recruitment (Breugh, 1992, Rynes, 1991). Recruitment source is the medium utilized by individuals to become part of the applicant pool. Various sources include employee referrals, recruitment advertisements in newspapers and journals, direct applications, and employment agency referrals. Breugh (2009) stated, “The use of current employees is generally viewed by employers as the best method for reaching individuals who possess desirable personal attributes” (p. 398).

Moser (2005) conducted the first recruitment source study that takes into account the mediator effect of unmet expectations. In this cross-sectional study, Moser (2005) investigates a sample of engineers in a single organization in terms of their post-hire outcomes and unmet expectations. Close to 1200 questionnaires were distributed with 806 questionnaires returned. The independent variables were unmet expectations, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The dependent variables were the recruitment sources of internal versus external recruitment. The control variables were for respondents to indicate their sex, age, and tenure.

The results revealed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are strongly correlated (Moser, 2005). In tenure, unmet expectations increased as job

satisfaction and organizational commitment decreased. A difference was also found in the post-hire outcome investigation. Individuals hired via internal recruitment sources were more satisfied in their positions and were more committed to organization than those recruited by external recruitment sources. In addition, individuals recruited by internal sources experienced a lesser amount of unmet expectations. Moser (2005) concluded the following:

Internal recruitment sources (in comparison with external recruitment sources) are accompanied by less unmet expectations, more job satisfaction and higher organizational commitment. In addition, expectations turned out to be a mediator between recruitment source and two post-hire outcomes, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. (p.188)

The vast majority of recruitment sources studied have been at college placement offices and have focused on new college graduates. Data provided by the preceding studies tend to support Rynes (1991) conclusion that more research needs to be conducted both conceptually and empirically before sound inferences can be offered concerning recruitment sources.

Applicant Characteristics

According to Breaugh (2013), “Attracting the attention of potential job applicants is the first step in the recruitment process” (p. 394). After targeting populations and recruitment sources, the organization persuades individuals to apply for the employment vacancy. Various reasons affect applicant decisions to make application to an organization, namely, applicant characteristics. Schwab (1982) noted that most of the research on organizational evaluation criteria focused on applicant characteristics such as

job qualifications (e.g., GPA, experience, psychological test scores), personal characteristics (e.g., sex, race, age), and nonverbal communication (e.g., gesturing during interview). Thus, increasing understanding of applicant characteristics is an important part of organizational recruitment research.

Barber (1998) noted that continued pursuit of employment necessitates the trait of persistence, and persistence can vary as a function of many factors, including self-esteem. Ellis and Taylor (1983) examined (a) the role of self-esteem in the job search process and job search outcomes experienced by job applicants and (b) the differences between global and specific measures of self-esteem. The participants in the study were graduating business students ($N = 86$) majoring in accounting, finance, management, or marketing in the career placement office at a large Midwestern university. The researchers achieved a response rate of 50%.

The two independent variables were participant demographic information (age, degree, GPA, full- and part-time work experience, major, marital status, sex) and self-esteem (respondents used a 4-point Likert scale to report their level of agreement with 10 items addressing self-liking and self-approval). The dependent variables were (a) job search satisfaction measured with 5-point Likert scales (5 being more favorable than 1); (b) job sources (direct application, friends or relatives, private employment agencies, public employment agencies, newspaper ads); (c) goals for applications filed (number of applications participants planned to have filed by the semester's end); (d) actual applications filed; (e) search satisfaction (extremely satisfied, very dissatisfied); and (f) job search outcomes (total number of offers received, whether they had accepted a position, length of tenure expected with current employer). Tenure was measured by

participant completion of a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *less than a year*, 5 = *5 years or more*).

Pearson correlations were used to analyze the data. Ellis and Taylor (1983) concluded the following:

It appears that self-esteem may affect the outcomes of individuals' job search in at least three ways. First, the variable may influence the sources people use to find jobs, with low self-esteem seekers being more likely to use formal job sources that traditionally have not yielded the best search outcomes. Self-esteem also seems to directly affect the extent to which searchers attain self-set goals for search intensity, a correlate of favorable search outcomes in past studies. Finally, low levels of self-esteem may weaken applicant's social skills, resulting in lower interviewer evaluations and fewer job offers. (p. 638)

Applicant characteristics research reveals that a congruence between applicant and organizational work values affected job applicant decisions. Effective communication was a critical component of applicant success in the interview process. The following subsection added a considerable amount of knowledge to the body of recruitment research literature.

Realistic Job Previews

Recruiting and retaining talented employees remains a priority issue for organizations (Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010). According to Earnest, Allen, and Landis (2011), "Organizations strive to attract, recruit, and retain qualified and productive employees, as human capital is essential for organizational effectiveness" (p. 865). Over the past six decades the concept of providing a realistic job preview (RJP)

received a considerable amount of attention. Rynes (1991) stated, “No recruitment issue has generated more attention than realistic job previews” (p. 423). Wanous (1980), the leading researcher in this area of recruitment research, defined an RJP as a recruitment practice designed to present applicants with both the positive and the negative information about the job, as opposed to a traditional job preview (TJP), which accentuates only the positive aspects. Proponents of using RJP’s contend that those who accept a job after receiving an RJP will be more satisfied with their job and will experience a longer tenure with the organization (Breugh, 1983).

Wanous (1973) conducted a longitudinal field experiment to assess the effects of job previews on job acceptance, initial job expectations, and job survival. The participants in the study ($N = 80$) were telephone operators who had been offered a job, but had not yet accepted the position. The participants volunteered to view one of two 15-minute job preview films. The first film depicted positive information about the job (TJP). The second film portrayed both positive and negative information about the job (RJP).

The independent variable was a job preview (TJP, RJP). The dependent variables in the study were job acceptance, initial job expectations, and job survival. The researcher administered The Job Description Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) with modified directions to assess the influence of the job previews on job acceptance and initial job expectations. To measure job acceptance, Wanous directed the study participants to think in terms of *preferences* for each item. To measure initial job expectations, Wanous directed the study participants to think in terms of *preferences* for

each item. To measure initial job expectations, Wanous directed the study participants to think in terms of *realistic expectation when I became an operator*. The self-reported thoughts of leaving the job after one month of employment as well as continued employment three months after being hired measured job survival.

Wanous (1973) used independent-samples *t*-tests to assess the data. The researcher reported that exposure to a traditional recruitment message versus a realistic recruitment message had no effect on the rate of job acceptance. The varied recruitment message content influenced job expectations and job survival significantly. The participants that viewed the realistic recruitment film had lower expectations than those that viewed the traditional film. Wanous (1973) found two significant findings related to job survival: (a) participants viewing the realistic film reported fewer thoughts of leaving the job after one month on the job than participants who viewed the traditional film; and (b) after three months' work experience, 62% of the participants who viewed the realistic film were still employees as compared to 50% of the participants who viewed the traditional variance.

Earnest, Allen, and Landis (2011) conducted a meta-analytic path analysis linking RJP's with turnover. The researchers hypothesized that certain mechanisms mediate the RJP-voluntary turnover relationship. The independent variables were job acceptance, expectations, perceptions of honesty, role clarity, and organizational attraction. The dependent variables were RJP and applicant characteristics and RJP timing (pre-hire, post-hire). The researchers utilized 18 unique studies and $N = 52$ studies overall. The studies produced 75 unique effects. The sample size of the study was roughly 17,000.

Each study was coded for overall turnover, voluntary turnover, the independent variables, and the dependent variables.

Earnest et al. (2011) expected RJP's post-hire to have a weaker relationship with their independent variables due to exposure effects to the job and organization. In fact, the results showed that post-hire RJPs were more effective than pre-hire RJPs in terms of impacting voluntary and total turnover. This result is contrary to prior research. Other findings were longer RJPs were found to be more effective at influencing voluntary and involuntary turnover than shorter RJPs.

Honesty was the lone independent variable that demonstrated a significant relationship between mediating RJPs and voluntary turnover (Earnest et al., 2011). Earnest et al. (2011) stated, "Perceptions of organizational honesty refer to applicants' perceptions that the organization is honest in the information it portrays and the level to which it can be trusted" (p. 875). It was found that RJPs lower voluntary turnover ($r = -.07$), decreased overall turnover ($r = -.04$), and increased acceptance ($r = .02$).

The RJP will and should evolve in the future (Baur, Buckley, & Bagdasarov, Dharmasiri, 2014). The role of RJPs has not yet reached its potential in a changing workplace. The use of internal recruitment and focusing RJPs not only on entry-level employees, but all levels of candidates have not been thoroughly researched (Baur et al., 2014). Researchers could potentially study how internal RJPs are administered and if the employee had sufficient prior knowledge of the effectiveness of RJP (Breugh, 2008). A quality RJP for an executive role would be quite different than an entry-level RJP (Baur et al., 2014). According to Breugh (2008), "More research is needed into the

effectiveness of realistic job previews for higher-level and executive positions in the organization” (p. 213).

In conclusion, several studies revealed evidence that an RJP influenced applicants’ initial job expectations. Some studies indicated that individuals who received an RJP had lower absenteeism, lower turnover, and fewer thoughts of leaving than did individuals who did not receive an RJP. Applicants receiving RJPs had lower job expectations than those who did not receive an RJP. Current research surprisingly revealed that a post-hire RJP is more effective than a pre-hire RJP regarding honesty. Collectively, the RJP studies verified the importance of job messages received by potential employees during the recruitment process. Job applicants received job messages through such recruitment media as position advertisements and recruitment interviews. Over time, the concept of person–organization fit began to receive research attention.

Person-Organization Fit

Based on a moderate amount of research, Kristoff (1996) defined person-organization (P-O) fit as the compatibility between individuals and organizations that occurs when (a) at least one of the parties (individual or organization) provides what the other needs, (b) each shares similar fundamental characteristics/qualities, or (c) both. Chatman (1991) offered a similar definition of P-O fit as “the congruence between patterns of organizational values, defined here as what an individual values in an organization, such as being team-oriented or innovative” (p. 459). An added dimension to this area is person-job (P-J) fit. “Whereas P-J fit is relevant to an individual’s compatibility with a specific job, P-O fit pertains to how an individual matches an organization’s values, goals, and mission” (Lauver & Kristoff-Brown, 2001, p. 455).

Kristoff (1996) noted that a review of P-O fit research revealed different conceptualizations and operationalizations of fit; the following subsection adds credence to that statement. The P-O features the assumption that actions in the workplace result not from the working environment or person, but instead the relationship between both parties (Morley, 2007). According to Ng and Burke (2005), “Achieving a high degree of P-O fit is viewed in many quarters as desirable in terms of positive work related-outcomes, especially in the context of a tight labor market and the war for talent and in buttressing organizational culture” (p. 111). It is suggested an employee’s attitudes and behaviors are impacted by the compatibility of the organization and person on particular characteristics (Silva, Hutcheson, & Wahl, 2016).

Rynes and Gerhart (1990) used regression analyses to determine the kinds of applicant characteristics within three categories (objective characteristics, physical characteristics, interviewer assessments of traits) that might predict interviewer evaluations of P-O fit. The results revealed three evidences of a firm-specific component in interviewer evaluations: (a) recruiters appeared to be more stringent in their evaluations of firm-specific employability (P-O fit) than of general employability; (b) firm-specific evaluations exhibited greater variability across (between-firm) recruiters than do general employability assessments; and (c) within-firm interrater reliabilities were higher than across-firm interrater reliabilities for the same applicant (Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). The objective qualifications possessed by the participants contributed little to the interviewer’s assessments of applicant fit.

Sarac, Meydan, and Efil (2017) conducted a study on the relationship between person-organization fit P-O fit and work attitudes for blue-collar and white-collar

employees. Sarac et al. (2017) defined employees fitting their organizations in either a supplementary fit or a complementary fit, which is a mutually fulfilling relationship. They referred to a normative commitment which is based on a sense of obligation to the organization. The researchers hypothesized that a PO-fit related to (a) organizational affective commitment, (b) organizational normative commitment, (c) job satisfaction (d) organizational identification and (e) be negatively related to intention to leave? In addition, the researchers also hypothesized that status moderates the relationship between PO-fit and work attitudes and the effects on job satisfaction. In summary, they hypothesized that the intention to leave will be stronger for blue-collar employees than for white-collar employees. The researchers ultimately believed that the relationship between P-O fit and attitudes towards work commitments would show a statistical difference between the two groups.

Data for the study were obtained from a supermarket chain and three automotive industry companies in a questionnaire which was distributed via email to white-collar employees (Sarac et al., 2017). Blue-collar employees received a printout survey. The employees were selected at random based on their name.

Results of the study revealed that P-O fit was significantly positively related to organizational affective commitment, organizational normative commitment, job satisfaction, organizational identification, and intention to leave in both employee groups (Sarac et al., 2017). The results supported the researcher's hypothesis that P-O fit on work attitudes differs for blue-collar and white-collar employees. It was initially thought by the researchers that effects would be stronger for blue-collar employees than for

white-collar employees. The opposite was found to be true as it was found to be a stronger effect on white-collar employees.

Blue-collar employees who perceived their work values similar to the organization they worked for showed a higher level of normative commitment than their white-collar employee counterparts. Findings revealed that blue-collar employees who perceive their values to be similar to the organization's values show a higher level of job satisfaction than white-collar employees. White-collar employees were more impacted by the work they do, whereas blue-collar employees' job satisfaction was impacted by the context as they were more sensitive to work environment settings. Blue-collar employees were found to have a yearning to value congruence in their organization. According to Sarac et al. (2017), "The impact of P-O fit on positive work attitudes, particularly on job satisfaction, is much stronger among blue-collar employees" (p. 1094).

A unique study examined the fit between the individual and the organization by specifically focusing on organizational strategy (Silva, Hutcheson, & Wahl, 2010). Silva et al. (2010) used the strategy of (a) guide the organization in its relationship with its environment, (b) affect the internal structure and processes of the organization, and (c) centrally affect the organization's performance (Hambrick, 1980). The study featured ($N = 284$) participants who completed the survey from a variety of industries (Silva et al., 2010).

Silva et al. (2010) hypothesized that the relationship between employees' perceptions of organizational strategy fit and organizational commitment would be moderated by the employees' perceptions of other job alternatives. Secondly, they hypothesized the relationship between employees' perceptions of organizational strategy

fit and intention to stay is moderated by the employee's perceptions of other job alternatives. Ultimately, both hypotheses were supported.

Silva et al. (2010) provided two questions for the strategy fit variable with one being "Which of the following descriptions most closely fits your organization compared to other firms in the industry" and "Which of the following descriptions would best fit the type of organization you would like to work for" (p.150). The researchers utilized a 3-item measure for the job alternatives variable. The items were (a) "Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire"; (b) "I feel I have too few options to consider leaving this organization"; and (c) "One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives" (p. 151). A 7- point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* was used for the three scaled items. The variable of organizational commitment was assessed by four high-loading items. An example of one of the items was "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me" (p. 151). Just as with the job alternatives variable, organizational commitment opted to use the same 7- point Likert scale rating. A single-item measure was used to determine employees' intention to stay with their current company. The item asked participants, "How many years do you plan on staying in the organization" (p. 151). The response options were limited to *less than one year* to *more than five years*.

The results supported both hypotheses for the researchers (Silva et al., 2010). Strategy fit was positively correlated with organizational commitment ($r = .33, p < .01$). Findings found that the more congruent respondents' perceptions of their organization strategy aligned with their idea strategy, the more committed the individuals were to the

organization, and they were more likely to remain in that organization. On the other hand, job alternatives were not statistically significantly correlated with strategy fit ($r = .13$, *ns*), organizational commitment ($r = .06$, *ns*), or intention to stay ($r = -.05$, *ns*).

In summary, Silva et al. (2010) concluded the following:

When employees perceived they had other job alternatives, the relationship between strategy fit and intention to stay was positive, with the employees who perceive a strategy fit having higher intentions to stay in the organization than their misfit counterparts. However, when there were few perceived job alternatives, there was little relationship between strategy fit and intention to stay. (p. 155)

Zhang and Gowan (2012) conducted a P-O fit perspective study on the corporate social responsibility regarding applicant traits and organizational attraction. The researchers were attempting to discover if applicants are attracted to organizations whose corporate social responsibility are higher.

The researchers hypothesized that higher levels of corporate economic performance, legal performance, and ethical performance will increase applicant attraction to organizations (Zhang & Gowan, 2012). A second hypothesis of the relationship between economic responsibility and applicant attraction would be stronger when both legal and ethical responsibility are high. It was hypothesized the relationship would be weaker when levels are lower. The next hypothesis was the relationship between economic, legal, and ethical aspects of corporate social responsibility and organizational attraction is stronger for strong formalists than for weak formalists. The final hypothesis was the relationship between economic, legal, ethical aspects of

corporate social responsibility and organizational attraction is stronger for low Machiavellian personality type.

Undergraduate business students ($N = 201$) from Northeastern University who were approaching graduation were study participants. The participants used a 7-point Likert scale rating 13 character traits ranging from 1 (*not important to me*) to 7 (*very important to me*).

The results showed support for the hypothesis of the researchers (Zhang & Gowan, 2012). It was found that high legal and ethical responsibility strengthened the association between pay level and applicant attraction. Zhang and Gowan (2012) discovered that a positive association existed between economic responsibility and applicant attraction was strongest when legal and ethical responsibilities were high. On the other hand, there was not a positive association with applicant attraction when legal and ethical responsibilities were low. Machiavellianism was found to moderate the relationship between pay level and applicant attraction. Applicants with different ethical predispositions and Machiavellian personality type were affected by the corporate social responsibility message. Zhang and Gowan (2012) advocated that socially responsible companies are more attractive to applicants than less socially responsible companies.

In summary, it is critical that organizations and applicants consider the importance of “fit” and the implications it has on job performance, employee tenure, recruitment efforts, and organizational success. A review of P-O fit literature revealed that work value congruence between applicants and recruiters were significant predictors of recruiter ratings of general employability and P-O fit. Individuals placing added emphasis on P-O fit in their job choice decisions demonstrated greater P-O fit after

employment by the organization than did job applicants that placed less emphasis on P-O fit. In the private sector, more emphasis began to be placed on the distinction of P-J fit and P-O fit. Regarding job seekers and employees, Lauver and Kristoff (2001) recommended that dissatisfied employees should distinguish between P-J and P-O fit to determine whether they should apply for a different job within the same organization or seek employment elsewhere.

Monetary Benefits

The signing bonus is a regularly used incentive for executive employee compensation plans. This monetary benefit has garnered minimal empirical research (Van Wesep, 2010). Van Wesep (2010) stated the following:

The signing bonus is a way for firms to signal their perception of match quality to employees. This serves two complementary purposes. First, because the bonus signals that the employee will succeed at the firm, she will accept a lower wage. Second, the signing bonus induces new employees to work harder than they otherwise would. (p. 3813)

Pouliakas (2010) noted empirical research supports “that monetary incentives may have a positive effect on workers’ utility and performance as long as they are large enough” (p. 618). Varkkey, Korde, and Wadhvaniya (2017) noted:

The basic purpose of having a performance incentive-based bonus plan for executives is to motivate them to perform their best, and in turn, help the firm increase profits and achieve sustained growth. To achieve this goal, it is necessary that the bonus plans should be properly designed so that the executives are able to enjoy their benefits. (p. 69)

The manner in which firms and organizations establish earning targets in their incentive plans has been an important topic in accounting research (Indejikian, Matejka, Merchant, & Van der Stede., 2014). Indejikian et al. (2014) examined past performances regarding establishing earning targets as a part of their bonus plans. The researchers surveyed American Institute of Certified Public Accountants members from the corporate or business-unit levels of the industry. The procedure yielded a sample of 1,517 respondents.

Indejikian et al. (2014) hypothesized that earning targets are revised upward following prior-year performances exceed the target and revised less or not at all following prior-year performance that do not meet the target. The second hypothesis was dedicated to high-profitability managers' earning targets not being revised upward following a prior-year performance that exceeds the target and is revised downward if it fails to achieve the target. The final hypothesis was for low-profitability managers' earning target being revised upward following prior-year performance exceeding the target and not revised downward when the performance does not achieve the target. The survey featured 5-point scales that gauged the respondent's answers in multiple areas of sales growth, need for capital, and retention concerns in financial performance measures.

The results found that successful entities revise earning targets downward and are reluctant to revise targets upward based on prior-year performance relative to the target. On the other hand, struggling entities revise earnings targets upward following their targets being met and are reluctant to revise earnings targets downward following falling short of meeting their performance target. Loss-making entities were found to share this reluctance (Indejikian et al., 2014).

Choi (2014) conducted a study on whether offering a signing bonus motivates an individual to give more effort. The study explored the effect of labor market competition and the links among signing bonus offers, trust, and worker effort. Choi (2014) made two hypothesis stating, “Signing bonus offers positively affects worker beliefs regarding the employer’s trust in them to a greater extent when there is an excess supply of labor than where there is an excess demand for labor” and “Signing bonus offers positively affect worker effort to a greater extent when there is an excess supply of labor than when there is an excess demand for labor” (p. 551).

Choi (2014) utilized a 2 x 2 fully-crossed experimental design in which he varied the labor market by including two employers and one worker (excess demand) or a single employer and two workers (excess supply). The ($N = 201$) participants were recruited via undergraduate business courses from a business school. Choi (2014) tested the hypothesis with questions about trust, motivation, and monetary benefits.

The results revealed that offering a signing bonus did have a positive effect on workers belief regarding their employer having faith and trust in them (Choi, 2014). The effect was strong when excess labor was available as opposed to excess demand. When an excess demand for labor was present, signing bonuses did not positively affect worker effort. On the other hand, if excess supply of labor was present, a signing bonus did positively affect worker effort. Choi (2014) rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the alternative hypothesis. The results do suggest that organizations that offer a signing bonus will receive positive effects from their employees in initial and overall effect. This positive effect was magnified when an excess supply of labor is present.

Varkkey et al. (2017) conducted a survey study from 2008-2016 in India on changes in the executive bonus payment patterns. Data were collected from ($N = 41,742$) executives during an 8- year period. These executives held entry-level managers, senior managers, and supervisor roles. A voluntary website by Paycheck India was used for participants to upload the questionnaire. Bonus types examined were performance bonus, end-of-year bonus, festival bonus, profit-share bonus, and other annual bonuses.

Results revealed that India's top executive's bonuses are contingent on the success for the firm primarily (Varkkey et al., 2017). Four types of compensation are primary in the United States: base salary, performance bonus, stock options, and long-term incentive plans. A gradual decrease in individual bonus payments has been the trend in India. This can be attributed to an emphasis on group and department bonuses. Performance bonus was the preferred compensation choice and profit-sharing the least favored by study participants. Varkkey et al. (2017) brought attention the idea of doubling a bonus by concluding the following:

Hence, we can say that labor legislations, such the Payment of Bonus Act, have positive implications on the well-being of the workers; for example, in 2015, the central government decided to double the bonus ceiling for 25 million factory workers, especially during festivals such as Diwali. The employees earning INR 21,000 a month would be eligible for a bonus compared with the earlier cutoff of INR 10,000 a month. (p. 66)

Summary of Private Sector Research

Numerous advancements were made in the area of private sector recruitment research over the past six decades. Areas receiving the most attention by researchers were

(a) recruiter effects, (b) recruiter practice effects, (c) recruiter source effects, (d) applicant characteristics, (e) realistic job previews, (f) person-organization fit, and (g) monetary benefits. In most cases, researchers investigated the effect of numerous independent variables, such as organizational recruiters, recruitment sources, and individual differences/preferences on the applicant's rating of an employment opportunity (dependent variable). Rynes (1991) concluded, "To date, recruitment research has concentrated primarily on three topics: recruiters, recruitment sources, and realistic job previews" (p. 399).

Research revealed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are strongly correlated (Moser, 2005). Internal recruitment sources (in comparison with external recruitment sources) are accompanied by less unmet expectations, more job satisfaction and higher organizational commitment. It is suggested an employee's attitudes and behaviors are impacted by the compatibility of the organization and person on particular characteristics (Silva, Hutcheson, & Wahl, 2016).

Regarding the organizational recruiter, numerous studies revealed that characteristics (e.g., warmth, competence, informativeness) were related to overall impressions of the employing organization and applicant intentions of pursuing a job with the organization. Barber (1998) noted that although some studies indicated recruiters' demographics (e.g., gender, race, age, organizational level) influenced applicant reactions to organizations, the support was weak due to the low number and low replication across studies. Recruitment sources most often utilized by applicants to become part of the applicant pool included employee referrals, recruitment advertisements in newspapers and journals, direct applications, and employment agency referrals. Applicants recruited

by employee referrals tended to have longer employment tenure than those recruited by other sources. A quality RJP for an executive role would be quite different than an entry-level RJP (Baur et al., 2014). A quality RJP will provide applicants with an accurate representation of a particular job within an organization (Earnest et al., 2011). According to Breugh (2008), “More research is needed into the effectiveness of realistic job previews for higher-level and executive positions in the organization” (p. 213).

Considering we are now a global workforce and expect our executives to have skills that can relate to all populations internationally, monetary benefits have a significant bearing. Private and public sectors are charged with attracting the most talented individuals and also those that bring an element of diversity to the organization. More current research revealed that offering a signing bonus did have a positive effect on workers belief regarding their employer having faith and trust in them (Choi, 2014). These results suggest that organizations that offer a signing bonus will receive positive effects from their employees in initial and overall effect. International results revealed that India’s top executives’ bonuses are contingent on the success for the firm primarily (Varkkey et al., 2017).

Another stream of recruitment research involves the educational sector, an area of primary concern to the current study. In contrast to the large quantity of recruitment research conducted in the private sector, the education sector studies are few but increasing in number. The participants in these investigations range from individuals currently working in an educational setting (e.g., elementary teacher, high school teacher, K-12 administrators, post-secondary instructors, post-secondary administrators) to college students interested in gaining employment in a related area.

Educational Recruitment Research

The recruitment of competent, effective individuals demands the utmost concern of all educational administrators (K-12 or higher education). It is a responsibility/task that directly affects the future success of any educational agency. Of primary interest to this stream of research were various independent variables affecting applicants' decisions to apply for a job/educational position.

K-12 Recruitment Research

Researchers in the K-12 sector of educational research used three primary mediums to investigate applicant reactions: (a) video-taped interviews, (b) hypothetical résumés of employment vacancies, and (c) role-play simulations. The samples used consisted of teachers at various grade levels, administrators, and college graduates. Applying methodologies used in the private sector, K-12 researchers made numerous advancements in recruitment research.

Young, Rinehart, and Heneman (1993) examined the effects of job and organizational attributes, applicant characteristics, and recruiter characteristics on applicant attraction to an elementary school teaching position. The participants in the study ($N = 48$) were education majors who role-played the part of job applicant for the teaching position. Twenty-four participants were experienced teachers; the remaining 24 were inexperienced individuals preparing to enter the teaching profession. Experienced administrators (three males, three females) role-played the part of the interviewer. The administrators rehearsed three interview scripts (for videotaping) emphasizing either economic job attributes (e.g., salary, life insurance), intrinsic job attributes (e.g., action-centered school, growing community), or work-context attributes (e.g., curriculum

program support, class size). The researcher held the interview setting, the distance between the recruiter and the camera, and the posture of the administrator constant in all three recruitment films to control for unwanted variance. The participants observed a videotape with three separate recruitment messages depicted by a different interviewer each time.

Young et al. (1993) used the job attribute conditions to serve as the independent variable. The dependent variable was applicant attraction to the job and was an additive component score composed of three items measured on 5-point Likert scales (5 being more favorable than 1). The items were (a) the likelihood of receiving a job offer, (b) the likelihood of accepting a job offer, and (c) the overall attractiveness of the position.

Young et al. (1993) used a split-plot factorial design comprised of two between-subjects factors (applicant job experience, recruiter sex) and one within-subject factor (job attribute categories). A between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated significant effects for applicant experience and the job attribute category. Analysis of cell means indicated the following: (a) experienced applicants rated the job opportunity as less attractive than inexperienced applicants, and (b) both experienced and inexperienced applicants responded more favorably to recruitment messages emphasizing intrinsic or work context as opposed to recruitment messages emphasizing economic job attributes.

Using the Rynes and Barber (1990) job attraction model to frame their study, Winter, Keedy, and Newton (2000) investigated teacher attraction to the job of serving on local school councils. Although there had been empirical studies conducted concerning teacher attraction to the traditional role of classroom teacher, this study represents the first study of teacher attraction to the positions on school councils. The study participants

were experienced school teachers ($N = 318$) who role-played teachers evaluating a teacher vacancy on the local school council.

The independent variables in the study included seven personal characteristics of the teacher: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) race, (d) number of dependent children, (e) years of teaching experience, (f) level of school assignment (elementary, middle, high), and (g) experience as a school council member (yes, no). Two additional independent variables, role of principal (chair, member only with a teacher serving as chair) and job attributes (management, instructional leadership), were experimentally manipulated factors in the job descriptions. The dependent variable was teacher rating of a school council position, measured by an additive composite score composed of two items with 5-point Likert scales (5 being most favorable): (a) “How likely would you be to pursue the job of school council member described?” and (b) “How likely would you be to run for the job of school council member if nominated by other teachers?”

Winter et al. (2000) used hierarchical multiple regression analysis to analyze the data. Holding all other variables constant, the number of dependent children a teacher had, resulted in a significant negative impact on teacher ratings. Having previous experience serving on a school council also had a significant negative impact on teacher ratings. Teachers who had served on school councils rated the job less favorable than teachers with no prior council member experience.

A study of Kentucky principals ($N = 587$) was conducted to determine the degree of attraction they had towards the position of superintendent (Winter, Rinehart, Keedy, & Bjork., 2007). This superintendent recruitment research study was conducted with principals because they are a population of potential candidates for future superintendent

vacancies. In fact, 97.9% of newly hired superintendents were principals at some point in their career.

Winter et al. (2007) assessed a statewide cadre of principals to gauge their attraction to superintendent positions. Two assumptions the researchers acknowledged were the participants capability to become a superintendent impacts participant attraction to the job and the principal satisfaction in their current jobs, and their expected satisfaction compared to the same job facets of superintendent would give an indication if they would pursue the superintendent position in the future. Winter et al. (2007) had four study objectives including (1) develop a profile of participants, (2) document satisfaction ratings for 20 job characteristics that overlap with principal and superintendent, (3) align superintendent certification and if it is an indicator of the participants interest in the superintendent position, and (4) identify potential predictors of principal attraction to the job of superintendent.

Winter et al. (2007) posed the following three research questions:

1) To what degree do principals indicate they either are more satisfied with 20 specified job facets in their current jobs, or expect to be more satisfied with those same 20 job facets in the job of superintendent? 2) Which persona characteristics or job-related factors impact whether or not principals earn superintendent certification? 3) Which personal characteristics or job-related factors predict principal likelihood of pursuing the job of superintendent? (p. 38)

A field survey was utilized as the method and the response rate was 58.8%. The survey featured a demographic section that provided researchers with personal characteristics of the principal cadre meetings. The survey utilized a 5-point Likert scale.

In addition, the survey was an information source for two variables via the inferential analysis of how likely the participant was to pursue a superintendent position from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 5 (*very likely*) and self-reporting the participants confidence in their ability to become a superintendent from 1 (*not at all capable*) to 5 (*extremely capable*). A second section of the survey featured items measuring 20 overlapping facets of the principal and superintendent positions. The survey asked if the superintendents would have the same level of satisfaction in a prospective superintendent role answering a Likert survey from 1 (*not at all satisfied*) to 5 (*extremely satisfied*).

The independent variables were principal personal characteristics (age, gender, ethnicity, self-reported capability to become a superintendent) and additive composite scales of the principal expected satisfaction levels of the 20 job facets. The dependent variable was participant status regarding possessing their superintendent certification (*yes, no*).

Results for variable of participants reporting their own capability averaged to be a 3.2 on the 5- point scale if they felt they were equipped for the role of superintendent (Winter et. al, 2007). When participants were asked if they would pursue a vacant superintendent position, 68.1% indicated they were either *not at all likely* or only *somewhat likely* to pursue the job at some point. Descriptive statistics revealed that the majority of principals have not earned their superintendent certification or do not intend too, have not taken a superintendent position within five years of earning the degree, and rate their self-capability to become superintendent or pursuing the position from low to moderate likelihood.

The discriminant analysis revealed that individuals who earned certification were not as likely to pursue future superintendent positions (Winter et al., 2007). This would suggest that certified candidates are turned off from the role after learning about the position during their graduate program work. Principals who rated time with their family higher have yet to earn their superintendent certification. It was also discovered that older principals were less likely to pursue the position of superintendent. One would imply from those results that recruiters and school boards should target younger candidates as targets for their vacant superintendent positions.

Winter et al. (2007) conducted a multiple regression analysis and findings indicated educators and decision makers conducting a superintendent search should focus on age, earning the superintendent certification, and self-reported capability of becoming a superintendent when considering candidates. Winter et al. (2017) noted, “It may be necessary for education policymakers to establish incentives to stimulate more principals to earn superintendent certification and to reassess the degree to which existing superintendent certification curricula increase, rather than decrease, principal attraction to the job” (p. 49).

In conclusion, Winter et al. (2007) advocates for future superintendent recruitment research by stating the following:

Despite the importance of recruiting qualified individuals to lead public school districts, virtually no empirical data exist relative to assessing the viability of members of the applicant pool for superintendent vacancies, an applicant pool members of the applicant pool that includes practicing principals. Without this information, educational recruiters cannot estimate the viability of components of

the applicant pipeline and adjust recruitment strategies accordingly. It is hoped other researchers will continue the line of investigation initiated by this study and replicate this study in other regions of the country. (p. 51)

Person-organization fit and person-job fit has received relatively few educational studies in recent years (Ellis, Skidmore, & Combs, 2017). According to Ellis et al. (2017), teacher satisfaction has reached the lowest point in the past 25 years. Ellis et al. (2017) conducted a study on the role of person-job and person-organization fit regarding teacher satisfaction in Texas public schools. A mediation model was developed along with a created questionnaire by the Texas Public Research Network. The questionnaire targeted how well teachers were able to attain a quality understanding of what their position would entail prior to accepting the position. Superintendents from 27 districts were invited to participate and 13 accepted the offer. In all, the districts were comprised of 591,669 students and 863 campuses. The participation in this study featured ($N = 1,430$) teachers who had been hired within two years of the study. The teacher participants varied from experienced to inexperienced. The teacher participants were selected from the highest and lowest performing schools with differing levels of socioeconomic statuses in their student population.

Findings revealed that accurate job previews did predict future person-organization fit and person-job fit (Ellis et al., 2017). Teacher satisfaction rates were linked to stronger levels of person-organization fit and person-job fit. Teachers from schools with greater than 50% percent of their student population being identified as a lower socioeconomic status were less satisfied ($p = .50$, $\eta^2 = .07\%$). On the other hand,

there was a statistical significance for teacher satisfaction on campuses with less than 50% lower socioeconomic status ($p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .58\%$).

Ellis et al. (2017) noted that providing accurate job previews during the induction process led to higher teacher satisfaction rates. Another study implication was that district administration should strategize methods to improve candidate's knowledge during the hiring process about specific school and student needs.

Another survey study targeted superintendent search consultants in Texas (Glenn, Hickey, & Sherman, 2009). The purpose of the study was to inventory search consultants on their perceptions of what skills Texas School Boards value in superintendent applicants. Incorporating a snowball sampling technique, 108 superintendent search consultants were identified, and 61 responses were provided totaling a 56.5% rate of return. Glenn et al. (2009) implemented a modified Organizational and Leadership Effectiveness Inventory (OLEI) instrument to collect their data. The two OLEI modifications were to alter questions in an effort to specifically address the superintendent search consultants and add open-ended questions. A Cronbach's reliability analysis yielded an alpha of .986 for internal consistency.

The components of the survey were leadership management behavior (30 items), leadership behavior (24 items), external forces (17 items), organizational structure (12 items), and search consultants' perceptions of the values, attitudes, and beliefs of school boards (5 items) (Glenn et al., 2009). In all, 96 items were administered to superintendents. A Likert scale was used ranging from *strongly agree* to *disagree*.

Findings revealed top indicators in all components of the study (Glenn et al., 2009). The top three most important management applicant traits were *communicator*,

effective, and leads by example. The top three most important interpersonal traits were *people oriented, strong interpersonal skills, and consensus builder.* The three least important management traits were *lifelong learner, persistent, and utilizes participatory management.* The three least important traits for the interpersonal behavior section were *emotionally expressive, nurturing, and combines social talk with administrator talk.*

The top three important traits for external forces was *promotes community and cooperation, school board supports their philosophy, and their leadership is affected by the expectations of the community* (Glenn et al., 2009). The three least important traits of external forces were *utilizes a system of rotating leadership, emphasis on reflective practice, and power sharing.* The top three most traits for organizational structure were *has well-defined goals, promotes community and cooperation, and recognizes ability or expertise.* The three least important traits for organizational structure were *utilizes system of rotating leadership, power sharing, and promotes subordinate empowerment.*

Glenn et al. (2009) noted the following implication:

For school boards, the goal is to hire a superintendent who possesses the skills to be successful as the chief executive officer. The superintendent must possess conceptual, technical, and human relations skills. . . . The importance of this research is the greater understanding of consultant perceptions of traits that school boards find important. Institutions of higher education, superintendent candidates, and school boards can use the information identified in this study in preparing and securing individuals who will succeed as school superintendents. (p.19)

Search consultants and superintendent searches continued to be researched during the first decade of the new millennium in a different part of the United States. Kalmer (2009)

conducted a qualitative longitudinal study over a 10-year period (1995-2005) examining the superintendent search consultants' process in Long Island, New York. The study researched the social, political, and economic factors during the 10-year period to determine similarities and differences. Search consultants were selected for interviews, predominant strategies identified, and tape-recordings collected for analysis to ultimately discover emerging trends. There were 19 search consultants selected in 1995 and then 14 in the 2005 study. At the time of the study, the average superintendent salary in Long Island was just under \$200,000. Kalmer (2009) stated the following:

Increased expectations and mounting political pressures have diminished the appeal of the superintendency across the United States. These concerns, coupled with a sizable number of baby boomer retirements, have resulted in a shrinking talent pool, thereby prompting more prevalent use nationally of search consultants or headhunters by boards of education to conduct superintendent searches. (p.136)

Findings revealed school boards in the Long Island area primarily choose retired local superintendents and neighboring district superintendents to fill their vacancies (Kalmer, 2009). The search consultants also noted that part of their role was to neutralize negativity among school board members as tension could be heightened during the search process. Kalmer (2009) highlighted that progress was made during the 10-year period in terms of women attaining superintendent positions, but there were no gains for people of color. Kalmer (2009) concluded, "Mandatory board training targeting effective group decision making and values certification, use of data, mentoring and advocacy of under representative aspirants, and succession planning appear advisable to attract a broader talent pool and increase diversity in the superintendency" (p. 115).

There are varying beliefs of whether more resources should be allocated towards teacher preparation or recruitment of the most talented individuals. Ronfeldt, Reininger, and Kwok (2013) investigated the effects of teacher characteristics and student teaching experiences. The sample population was ($N = 1,002$) prospective teachers from a large urban district. The average age of the participants was 31 years old. The participants were surveyed prior to and after their student teaching experience. This study occurred during a two-year period from 2008-2010. In all, 295 schools were selected as field placement sites. Ronfeldt et al., (2013) acknowledged the underlying assumption that individuals who experience better student teaching outcomes will make for stronger prospects for district recruitment.

The research question concerned which characteristics of student teaching preparation most accurately predict the teacher candidate's self-perceived quality and career plans (Ronfeldt et al., 2013). Features of the student teaching were put into two groups of field placement characteristics and features of student teaching across field placement. A linear regression model was used to examine factor scores. The persistence measures required an ordinal logistic regression. The researchers' strategy was to examine specific characteristics that predict outcomes prior to and following student teaching. The researchers were interested in analyzing if characteristics predict outcomes after they are administered in a realistic job preview situation of student teaching.

The results yielded much data to be analyzed for future considerations. Ronfeldt et al., (2013) found teacher candidates from races, age categories, income levels, parental statuses, work experiences, genders, and high school locations felt no more or less instructionally prepared prior to or after exiting student teaching. For the most part,

teacher characteristics were unrelated to teacher efficacy. Prior substitute teaching experience and attending the high school of the district where an individual student taught were the two exceptions. Participants with these two experiences had a one-quarter of a standard deviation higher efficacy score than those participants that did not. White teacher candidates had less of a desire to work with underserved students at student teaching entry and exit. Those individuals with prior public school teaching experiences had more of a desire to work with underserved student populations at student teaching entry and exit. An implication for school district recruitment considerations in underserved population areas is to seek candidates of color and prior public school experiences.

In terms of career plans, results revealed that African American teacher candidates planned to spend fewer years in teaching than their white teacher candidates at both student teaching entry and exit (Ronfeldt et al., 2013). At the student teaching entry, respondents with higher family income levels and those who attended high school outside of the district they taught in planned to teach for fewer years. In contrast, teacher candidates from households of less income, had at least one dependent, or attended high school in the district they taught in planned to spend more years in that particular district. Teacher candidates that attended high school within the district they taught in were three times more likely to remain in the district when compared to those that attended high school outside of the district where they taught. Individuals with higher GPAs planned fewer years in the district. This would suggest higher attrition rates could be experienced with candidates with higher-quality academic credentials.

Implications of Ronfeldt et al., (2013) suggest the decision of whether to invest resources towards recruitment or teacher preparation depend on the desired outcome of the school district. The results of the study revealed that when examining self-perceived quality, clinical preparation is more effective than the type of teacher candidate. Also, if one examines career plans, teacher characteristics predicted outcomes more efficiently. According to Ronfeldt et al. (2013), “Given the challenges that underserved schools face in staffing classrooms, these results support preparation program and district recruitment policies that aim to increase the diversity of the labor force and that target individuals with stronger commitments to urban education” (p. 333).

Newton (2006) investigate the question as to whether recruitment message content normalizes the superintendency as male. Newton (2006) conducted a 2 x 3 x 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) designed with all 18 cells featuring an equal number ($N = 360$) of men (180) and women (180) principals in Alabama to answer this question. The independent variables were gender (male, female) and roles pertinent to the superintendent (instructional leadership, managerial leadership, political leadership, and district size between 1,500 and 3,000 students). The dependent variable was an additive composite score of a 3- item participant response regarding a measure of job attraction.

The major finding from the ANOVA was that the superintendent roles accounted for 14% of the variance in attraction for the superintendent position for the men and women principals’ rating announcements (Newton, 2006). The participants rated the instructional leadership role in a more positive context than alternate position announcements that emphasized the managerial leadership or political leadership role.

Winter, Rinehart, Keedy, and Bjork (2007) argued that one of the greatest challenges that school board members experience is recruiting qualified personnel to fill superintendent vacancies. Glenn, Hickey, and Sherman (2009) suggested that superintendent selection is one of the most critical decisions made by a school board. In Kansas, 77% of current superintendents believe that turnover will increase in the future (Gibson, 2016). Gibson (2016) reveals the number one reason; Kansas superintendents' transition between school districts is due to career advancement with a larger and more successful district. Even successful superintendents are prone to turn over. According to Kamrath and LaFee (2014), rural school districts are often training grounds for administrators who transition to larger districts with greater resources.

According to Winter et al. (2007), limitations exist with potential certified superintendent applicants regarding career experiences. According to Winter et al. (2007), "Such limited attraction to the superintendency among principals may result in inadequate applicant pools for superintendent vacancies in the future as the baby boom retirements escalate (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000)." Brown, Swenson, and Hertz (2007) stated the following:

The role of superintendent of schools has become a hotbed of political focus in recent years. No longer is it sufficient for the designated leader of a school district to be an accomplished educator and respected person. In a climate of high expectations and blame placing, superintendents are expected to be all things to all populations. (p. 5)

According to McNay (2016), females make up 19% of Kentucky superintendents. Superville (2016) also shows that less than a quarter of superintendents in the United

States are female even though 78% of central office administrators are female. The traditional superintendent has been identified as a Caucasian male (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). The traditional path to becoming a superintendent begins as a teacher, principal, district administrator, and then a superintendent (Orloff, 2012). Given the increasing diversity of our student population, the need for recruitment of a more diversified superintendent candidate pool is imperative.

Minimal empirical research exists on superintendent recruitment in Kentucky (Winter, Millay, Bjork, & Keedy, 2005). According to (Winter et. al., 2005), “What is lacking relative to the superintendency are experimental studies about recruiting these essential leaders” (p. 434). Only one study (Millay, 2003) has explored how potential superintendent applicants view the attractiveness of a job posting based on the applicant’s job status (practicing or aspiring superintendent), district wealth, signing bonus, and school councils (principal selection/school governance). Participants for the study were current Kentucky superintendents and certified superintendents ($N = 72$) from Kentucky who were not yet in the role. The researchers implemented a power analysis to decrease the likelihood of a type II statistical error. In 2003, Kentucky was still in the midst of systematic school reform and a shortage of superintendent candidates. This study addressed recruiting qualified individuals to fill superintendent vacancies.

Millay (2003) found that the majority of school districts outside of Kentucky use a traditional centralized model where principals are selected by the superintendent. The alternative is the decentralized model that gives hiring autonomy for the position of principal to the school based decision making council that features appointed teacher

and parent representatives. The Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990, specifically KRS 160.345 (2000), required schools to implement School-Based Decision Making Councils made up of specific stakeholders (a combination of teachers and parents, with the school principal as the normal chairperson of the council. According to KRS 160.345 (2000), when a principal vacancy existed, the school council received training in recruitment and interviewing techniques before carrying out the process of selecting a principal from a list of qualified principal applicants provided by the local school district superintendent. In 2003, these councils served as a decentralized model for selection of the principal.

Millay (2003) used applicant rating of the job as the dependent variable via simulated superintendent position advertisements as an additive composite score. The Likert scale items asked participants how likely they would be to interview for the described superintendent position. The four nominal independent variables were superintendent job status (current, prospective), school council (yes, no), district wealth (high, low), and signing bonus (\$20,000).

Millay (2003) used free or reduced price-lunch as the barometer for district wealth on the dependent variable of applicant ratings of position announcements. If the district had 17% or less of its students on free or reduced-price lunch, they were deemed as a high wealth district. On the other hand, the district that had 88% or more free or reduced-price lunch was deemed as a low wealth district.

Millay (2003) developed the following four hypotheses:

H1: Potential applicants for a superintendent vacancy will rate the position higher when the job is located in a school district without councils than when the job is located in a district with school councils.

H2: Potential applicants with superintendent certification, but not yet in the job of superintendent, will rate a superintendent position higher than will practicing superintendents.

H3: Potential applicants for a superintendent vacancy will rate the position higher when the job has a \$20,000 signing bonus than when the job has no signing bonus.

H4: Potential applicants for a superintendent vacancy will rate the position higher when the job is located in a high-wealth district than when the job is located in a low-wealth district. (pp. 438-439)

Millay (2003) found that based on the alpha level used in his study ($p < .05$), there was a significant main effect for school councils: $F(1, 136) = 12.92, p < .0001$. The participants rated jobs in districts without school councils significantly higher than jobs in districts with school councils. There was also a two-way interaction between school councils (yes and no) and job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), and a three-way interaction between job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), district wealth (high, low), and bonus (yes, no). Superintendents had a strong preference ($\omega^2 = .10$) for jobs in districts without school councils. Superintendents rated jobs in high wealth districts highest when the job had an initial signing bonus of \$20,000.

Millay (2003) utilized job descriptions on a Likert scale to conduct a 2 x 2 x 2 x (2xS) analysis of variance design, the primary analytical technique for his study. Results

revealed that the participants rated job statuses in districts without school councils significantly higher than jobs in districts with school councils (Millay, 2003). Two instruments were completed by participants with the first being a biographical data sheet including demographic information. The second instrument was a simulated position announcement. The position announcements were hypothetical school districts with one featuring school councils and the other not having school councils. A 2 X 2 crossing existed between signing bonus and district wealth variable which yielded four position advertisement versions.

An implication of the study was that superintendent candidates prefer the traditional centralized school governance model (Millay, 2003). According to Millay (2003), the preference of superintendents to apply in districts with a centralized school governance hiring model was only statistically significant in the case of current superintendents. Experienced superintendents prefer jobs in districts where they will have more managerial authority. Prospective superintendents that have yet to experience the role did not have the same negative feelings towards a decentralized school governance model.

Millay (2003) noted an implication that states without school councils would have an advantage over Kentucky districts in recruiting talented superintendents. Millay (2003) speculated that if Kentucky was already at a disadvantage with its decentralized hiring model, it would be more difficult than ever to recruit quality superintendents to Kentucky districts. Millay (2003) posed the following question for state policymakers: "Is having school councils worth the possible negative impact councils may be having on superintendent recruitment?" (p. 236).

In addition to studying job statuses and school councils, Millay (2003) analyzed the three-way interaction among status (sitting superintendent versus holding some other position but possessing superintendent certified), district wealth (high versus low), and signing bonus (yes versus no). These data were also collected by asking participants to rate the desirability of various job descriptions on a Likert scale. Millay (2003) found the effects of district wealth and signing bonus to be non-significant. There were also interaction effects between district wealth and signing bonus. According to Millay (2003), “Superintendents rated jobs in high wealth districts significantly higher when a signing bonus was offered than when a signing bonus was not offered” (p. 236). Millay (2003) said, “This finding would seem to suggest high wealth district attempting to hire experienced superintendents might enhance their recruitment program by using a signing bonus (probably at the magnitude of \$20,000) as a monetary recruitment incentive.” Millay (2003) concluded district wealth is not a major factor for recruiting experienced or certified superintendents. When a signing bonus was offered in a high wealth district versus a high wealth district that did not offer one, participants chose the signing bonus. The same is not true for low wealth districts as a signing bonus was not significant. Despite some of these significant findings, only the variable of school councils yielded a high effect size.

Millay (2003) acknowledged the limitation of all participants being from Kentucky and that participants from other regions could feel differently about the four independent variables. Millay also noted that participants may have reacted differently in a real-life scenario as compared to a simulation study. Millay (2003) along with Winter et al. (2005) noted, “The simulation technique appears to hold promise relative to

future investigations about superintendent recruitment (p. 451).” Winter et al. (2005) concluded the following:

Our recommendation is that policymakers revisit the issue of school council versus superintendent authority to determine if delegating authority in some areas (e.g., hiring) back to the superintendent is warranted in terms of (1) improving school management and (2) making position vacancies more attractive to practicing superintendents. (450)

The current decade has featured a law change that would warrant the further research to which Winter (2005) alluded.

In 2011, Kentucky law and procedures regarding the hiring of principals changed. According to KRS 160.345 2.a.i. (2016),

If the vacancy to be filled is the position of principal, the outgoing principal shall not serve on the council during the principal selection process. The superintendent or the superintendent’s designee shall serve as the chair of the council for the purpose of the hiring process and shall have voting rights during the selection process. (p. 838)

Kentucky superintendents once again have principal selection influence, though still in collaboration with a selection committee made up of the school’s SBDM Council.

School councils continue to be a decentralized model, but the principal selection process is now a hybrid of a traditional centralized school governance model that existed prior to KERA and the decentralized school governance model that existed during Millay’s empirical research 16 years ago. No empirical research exists since the law changed in

2011 to give Kentucky superintendents a vote on the school council for the position of principal.

In summary, K-12 recruitment researchers discovered that organizational characteristics, such as pay, the type of school, and location, as well as attributes associated with a job (e.g., subjective, intrinsic, work context) influenced teacher attraction to employment vacancies. In all cases, experienced and inexperienced applicants rated recruitment messages that focused on intrinsic and work context job attributes higher than economic job attributes. However, experienced applicants responded less favorably to a job vacancy than inexperienced applicants; a contributing hypothesized factor was their current job alternative. Regarding the principalship, elementary and middle school applicants placed more emphasis on instructional leadership job attributes, whereas high school applicants placed more emphasis on management job attributes. Educational researcher's added additional knowledge and advancements in recruitment as noted in the subsequent section of higher education recruitment research.

Higher Education Recruitment

Applying models (e.g., Rynes, 1991; Rynes & Barber, 1990; Schwab, 1982; Schwab, Rynes, & Aldag, 1987) and methodologies used in private sector recruitment research, several researchers sought to discover significant recruitment sources/practices that existed in higher education institutions. Winter (1996) stressed, "Effective faculty recruitment is vital to the success of college and university programs. Institutions failing to be competitive in recruiting talented and motivated faculty are, undoubtedly, placing the educational mission at risk" (p. 187).

Winter (1996) conducted an investigation to provide community college administrators useful information when designing faculty recruitment advertisements. Previous recruitment research underlying the investigation included the following: (a) marketing theory (Drucker, 1974) applied to recruitment, (b) advertising research (Strong, 1923), and (c) applicant job-related needs (Rynes, 1991). Randomly selected experienced male and female business professionals, enrolled in master of business administration (MBA) programs at a large, public southeastern university, served as participants ($N = 180$). The subjects role-played as applicants reacting to recruitment advertisements similar to those commonly used in print ads for the purpose of recruiting faculty. An equal number of each gender ($N = 90$) made it possible to assess two target groups simultaneously, men and women. Winter took specific steps to add realism to the investigation by controlling two essential qualifications for the advertised position: business expertise and a master's degree in the respective academic area.

Nine faculty recruitment advertisements were used to operationalize recruitment messages. Independent variables were the following: gender (male or female), program (academic, career, compensatory), and job attributes (intrinsic, extrinsic, work context). Community college business department chairs and faculty made up a panel that sorted job attributes and instructional program statements into cross-impact matrices (one for attributes, and one for statements). A pilot group assessed perceived importance of job attributes using a 5-point Likert scale. The dependent variable of the study was applicant reaction to the faculty recruitment advertisement quantified by using an additive composite rating of applicant reactions to recruitment advertisements. The evaluation instrument consisted of four items tested with a 5-point Likert scale ($5 = \textit{most favorable}$):

(a) overall attractiveness of the job, (b) likelihood of applying for the job, (c) likelihood of accepting an interview for the job, and (d) likelihood of accepting the job if offered.

The research design was a 2 x 3 x 3 completely crossed, fixed-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA). The coefficient alpha for the investigation was .92. Statistically significant effects were found for (a) instructional program, (b) interaction between sex and job attributes, and (c) interaction among sex, instructional programs, and job attributes. Winter (1996) conducted an analysis of simple effects for the three-way interaction. The results indicated that interaction effects were present only at the academic transfer level of the instructional program variable. In regard to academic program, women rated advertisements that contained intrinsic job attributes significantly higher than job advertisements that contained extrinsic attributes, whereas men rated job advertisements that contained extrinsic job attributes significantly higher than those that contained intrinsic attributes.

Winter (1996) reported three advancements in regard to higher education recruitment research: (a) the integration of recruitment-as-job-marketing theory (Maurer, Howe, & Lee, 1992; Smither, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman, & Stoffey 1993) and advertising theory (Caples, 1974; Ogilvy, 1983, Standfield, 1982) to frame higher education recruitment research; (b) research about a specific marketing practice counterpart (i.e., print advertisement) directed investigation of a specific recruitment practice (i.e., recruitment advertisement); and (c) the examination of a three-way interaction effect (i.e., applicant sex X instructional programs X job attributes).

Winter and Kjørlien (2000a) conducted a factorial experiment that addressed the usefulness of the Rynes and Barber (1990) applicant attraction model and the Byrne

(1971) similarity-attraction hypothesis as theoretical frameworks for empirical investigations about community college faculty recruitment. The researchers investigated the recruitment of qualified applicants to serve as faculty members in community college business administration departments. The two propositions from the Rynes and Barber (1990) applicant attraction model applicable to this investigation were (a) organizational recruiters operate within contingencies that frame the recruitment context and (b) that characteristics of both organizational recruiters and job applicants affect recruitment outcomes, such as the quantity and quality of individuals who become applicants for job vacancies.

The randomly selected participants in this study ($N = 136$) were experienced male ($n = 68$) and female ($n = 68$) business professionals completing a master's of business administration (MBA) degree at a major research university in the Midwest. The participants role-played applicants for a business faculty position. The participants completed three tasks: (a) completion of a biographical data sheet, (b) review of a simulated faculty announcement, and (c) completion of a job evaluation form.

The three independent variables examined were (a) job mobility (relocation, no relocation), (b) recruiter background (business, education), and (c) applicant gender (male, female). The researchers operationalized job mobility and recruiter background by using faculty position announcements constructed from advertisements similar to those regularly published in educational print media (e.g., *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Community College Times*, *Black Issues in Higher Education*, national papers, journals, or state and local newspapers). The dependent variable was applicant rating of a formal position announcement operationalized through an evaluation instrument including the

subsequent items: (a) “How would you rate the overall attractiveness of the teaching job described?”; (b) “How likely would you be to apply for the teaching job described?”; (c) “If offered, how likely you would be to accept an interview for the teaching job described?”; and (d) “If offered, how likely would you be to accept the teaching job described?” Five-point Likert scales captured applicant ratings (1 = *highly unlikely*, 5 = *highly likely*).

Winter and Kjørlien (2000a) used a 2 X 2 X 2 completely crossed fixed factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) with equal cell sizes ($n = 17$). The results indicated a statistically significant main effect for job mobility; applicants rated business faculty jobs more favorably when relocation was not a requirement. Recruiter background produced a statistically significant main effect as well. Winter and Kjørlien (2000a) reported, “Across all levels of job mobility and applicant gender, applicants rated jobs presented by a recruiter depicted as similar (business) more favorably than they rated jobs presented by a recruiter depicted as dissimilar (education)” (p. 561). Winter and Kjørlein’s (2000a) research contributed three particularly noteworthy advancements: (a) further expanded the use of experimental designs relative to research focused on community college faculty recruitment; (b) added job mobility as an independent variable; and (c) made pioneering application of the similarity-attraction hypothesis to community college faculty recruitment. Prior to this study, application of the similarity attraction hypothesis occurred only in private-sector recruitment (Barber, 1998; Byrne, 1971; Rynes, 1991).

Winter and Kjørlien (2000) empirically examined potential applicant reactions to position advertisements for business faculty vacancies at community colleges and identified predictors of applicant decisions, such as the decision to apply for the job, that

happen before the initial employment interview. The randomly selected participants in this study were business professionals ($N = 176$) completing MBA degrees at a major research university located in the Midwest. The researchers asked the participants to role-play as applicants for community college business faculty positions that either required relocation or did not require relocation. Another facet participants considered was a description of the recruiter's background (business or education). Use of the recruiter's background enabled the researchers to further test Byrne's similarity-attraction hypothesis (Byrne, 1971). The participants completed a biographical data sheet, reviewed a business faculty position, and completed a job evaluation instrument.

The independent variables for the study were age, gender, race, marital status, percent of household income earned by the spouse, number of relatives in the area, current job satisfaction, years of business experience, content of simulated position announcements (relocation required, relocation not required), and recruiter background (similar to applicant, dissimilar to applicant). Winter and Kjorlien (2000b) used numerous personal characteristics since applicant characteristics were previously found to influence applicant behaviors like deciding to apply for the job and accepting an initial employment interview (Rynes, 1991; Rynes & Barber, 1990; Schwab et al., 1987). The dependent variable was applicant rating of a faculty job described in a position advertisement. Five-point Likert scales (5 being more favorable than 1) captured applicant responses for the following items: (a) overall attractiveness of the job, (b) likelihood of applying for the job, (c) likelihood of accepting an interview if offered, and (d) likelihood of accepting the job if offered. The ratings produced an additive composite score for each applicant.

Winter and Kjorlien (2000b) used stepwise multiple regression to analyze the data. Four significant predictors were revealed: job satisfaction, spousal percentage of household income, recruiter, and relocation. Job satisfaction was the strongest predictor; applicant rating of the job increased as current job satisfaction decreased. As the percentage of household income earned by the spouse decreased, applicant rating of the job increased. Lending some additional support to Byrne's similarity-attraction hypothesis, the researchers noted that applicant rating of a business faculty job was more favorable when the background of the recruiter was similar (business) to that of the applicant and the job did not require relocation. Winter and Kjorlien (2000b) concluded that the adjusted R-square of the four significant predictors accounted for 52.3% of the variance in applicant rating of a business faculty advertisement.

Winter and Kjorlien (2001) used an experimental approach patterned after similar experimental designs used in private-sector recruitment research (Barber, 1998; Rynes, 1991) and the education-sector teacher recruitment research (Young, Rinehart, & Heneman, 1993). The purpose of the study was to address the task of recruiting qualified faculty for community college business departments by examining the reactions of potential job applicants to business faculty positions described in simulated recruitment advertisements. The study participants ($N = 136$) were randomly selected male ($n = 68$) and female ($n = 68$) business professionals completing MBA degrees at two large, urban public universities in the Midwest.

The independent variables were the following: employment status (part-time, full-time), ideal person characteristics (business, teaching), and applicant gender (male, female). Applicant gender was an assigned variable operationalized by the participants'

self-report on a biographical data sheet. Employment status and ideal person characteristics were experimentally manipulated variables operationalized by the simulated recruitment advertisements. The dependent variable was applicant rating of the job, operationalized by a job evaluation instrument. The job evaluation instrument consisted of four summed items to form an additive composite score. A 5-point Likert scale (5 being more favorable than 1) accompanied each item. The items were (a) "How would you rate the overall attractiveness of the teaching job described?"; (b) "How likely would you be to apply for the teaching job described?"; (c) "If offered, how likely would you be to accept an interview for the teaching job described?"; and (d) "If offered, how likely would you be to accept the teaching job described?"

Winter and Kjorlien (2001) used a 2 X 2 X 2 completely crossed fixed-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) design. The ANOVA detected a significant main effect for employment status. The participants rated part-time positions more favorably than full-time positions. Person characteristics and participant gender did not yield statistical significance.

In an exploratory investigation, representing the first attempt to discover which personal characteristics were associated with applicant ratings of jobs in the context of recruiting community college faculty members, Winter and Muñoz (2001) assessed the association between personal characteristics and job ratings of applicants for business faculty positions described in simulated recruitment advertisements. The researchers framed their investigation with two recruitment models (Schwab, 1982; Schwab, Rynes, & Aldag, 1987), both of which postulate that within a recruitment context, personal characteristics of potential applicants are likely to be associated with applicant job choice

decisions. Furthermore, both models propose that a general association between personal characteristics and applicants' job choice decisions exists.

The randomly selected participants in this study were experienced business professionals ($N = 194$) completing a master's of business administration (MBA) degree at a major research university in the Midwest. The participants role-played the part of job applicants for community college business faculty positions. Winter and Muñoz (2001) noted that these individuals were realistic participants because (a) nearly one fourth of community college faculty are recruited from 4-year institution's graduate programs and (b) the two most important job qualifications for community college faculty are job experience and a master's degree in the proposed vacancy position (Higgins, Hawthorne, Cape, & Bell 1994).

The independent variables were (a) applicants' demographic characteristics (gender, race [black, white], marital status [single, married], working status, age, number of dependent children, years lived in the area, hours worked per week, job tenure, total years of work experience, years of business work experience) and (b) applicants' personal satisfaction with facets of their present jobs (extrinsic, intrinsic). Composite scores obtained from the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist (1967) operationalized the job satisfaction variable. The participants rated intrinsic factors, such as the *Chance to try [one's] own method of doing the job*, and extrinsic factors like *The way company policies are put into practice* using 5-point Likert scales (1 = *very dissatisfied*, 5 = *very satisfied*).

Winter and Muñoz (2001) developed the content of the simulated position advertisement from the content of position advertisements for community college vacancies routinely posted in educational news media as *Community College Times* and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. The advertisements contained four relative components: (a) general information about the college (e.g., that the college was part of a statewide system of 14 community colleges); (b) information pertaining to the college's academic programs, including its business programs; (c) information about job duties (e.g., performing classroom instruction and advising students); and (d) instructions about how to apply for the position. The dependent variable was participant rating of a business a business faculty position described in the recruitment advertisement. Three items on a job evaluation instrument operationalized participant ratings: (a) likelihood of applying for the job, (b) likelihood of accepting an interview, and (c) likelihood of accepting the job if offered. Applicant's responses formed an additive composite score used in statistical analyses.

Winter and Muñoz (2001) used ordinary least squares stepwise multiple regression to analyze the data. The researchers found no statistically significant correlations between the dependent variable and gender race, business work experience, job tenure, and satisfaction with intrinsic and extrinsic job characteristics. The two statistically significant variables that entered the stepwise multiple regression equation were marital status and hours worked per week. The results indicated that marital status had a negative correlation; moreover, when participants were not married, their attraction to the job increased. When participants were married, their ratings of the job decreased. The number of hours worked per week produced a positive correlation with the

dependent variable; as hours per week increased, attraction to the job increased. Winter and Muñoz (2001) suggested that community college recruiters might have more success in their recruitment efforts if they target single, experienced business professionals who work high hours per week.

Summary of Educational Research

In summary, like K-12 researchers, higher education researchers grounded their investigations in recruitment theories, models, and methodologies established in the private sector. A particularly noteworthy advancement emanating from higher education recruitment research was the application of the Winter Model (Winter, 1996). The Winter Model, undergirded by recruitment-as-job-marketing theory, proposed that (a) faculty recruitment practices, such as the recruitment advertisement, have marketing practice counterparts, such as the print advertisement and (b) research findings about marketing practice counterparts can inform the design and implementation of educational recruitment practices. Extending the application from the K-12 sector to the higher education sector bridged recruitment commonalities/practices between both areas. An additional area that received detailed attention was the recruitment message. Recruitment scholars devoted considerable effort in identifying attributes associated with jobs and organizations, which offered practical, as well as research-based advice to all educational administrators when developing recruitment messages. The following section provides a more detailed explanation of the recruitment models discussed throughout this review of private and educational recruitment literature.

Rynes and Barber Applicant Attraction Model

Drawing upon multiple literatures, Rynes and Barber (1990) developed a model of applicant attraction from the organization's perspective that (a) outlined three strategies for enhancing applicant attraction, (b) proposed categories of contingency factors that are expected to affect the choice (and potential effectiveness) of alternative strategies, (c) suggested probable interrelationships among the strategies, (d) linked applicant attraction strategies to other human resource practices, (e) outlined dimensions of attraction outcomes, and (f) discussed implications for future research.

The model of the attraction process outlines three different strategies for attracting applicants: (a) altering recruitment practices, (b) targeting nontraditional applicants, and (c) modifying employment inducements (Rynes & Barber, 1990). Numerous contingencies are hypothesized to influence the mix of the three strategies, including the following: labor market conditions (e.g., expected duration of labor shortages), vacancy characteristics (e.g., comparative attractiveness), organizational characteristics (e.g., ability to pay), phase of the attraction process (e.g., job application versus job acceptance stage), and legal considerations (e.g., equal opportunity).

Rynes' and Barber's model also proposes that when conscious decision processes come into play, alternative strategies usually are considered interactively, as opposed to independently. Moreover, decisions about applicant pools and recruitment messages are derived in part on decisions about employment inducements (pecuniary, nonpecuniary). Several other ways in which applicant attraction strategies interact with other human resource (HR) practices were also addressed. The researchers noted that attraction strategies both affect and are affected by HR practices. Rynes and Barber (1990) added that the adoption of new inducement strategies was frequently constrained by current

compensation practices; therefore, decisions to target new applicant pools often caused changes in selection methods, as well as post-hire practices such as socialization and training.

Furthermore, Rynes and Barber (1990) place emphasis on the multidimensionality of attraction outcomes (e.g., there are both short- and long-term implications of attraction practices). Additionally, both quantitative and qualitative dimensions exist within each time frame (e.g., percent job acceptances and signaled productivity characteristics in the short term, retention rates and revealed productivity in the long term). Lastly, the researchers portray that there can be significant spillover effects from attraction activities, both to applicants' decisions other than job choice (e.g. whether to purchase the organization's products) and to individuals other than applicants (e.g., potential applicants, current employees). Rynes and Barber (1990) concluded that the model "provides a tentative framework for organizational decision makers who are confronted with attraction challenges and for researchers who wish to increase our understanding of the overall attraction process" (p. 307).

Rynes Framework for Recruitment Research

Rynes (1991) expanded the existing recruitment domain by identifying contextual, independent, dependent, and process variables to guide future research by developing a recruitment framework. Rynes' (1991) framework for recruitment research places directed research toward new questions of possible interest to organizational decision makers responsible for attraction and retention of qualified applicants/employees. The framework, undergirded by an exhaustive review of recruitment theory and recruitment literature, consists of three parts: (a) a description of

the recruitment domain as it currently exists, (b) recruitment theory, and (c) future research recommendations.

Part 1 of Rynes' framework reveals that previous research consisted of three classifications of independent variables (recruiter characteristics, recruitment sources, administrative policies and procedures) and two dependent variable categorizations (pre-hire, post-hire). The pre-hire dependent variables used most often by researchers were (a) applicant impressions of recruiters, (b) intentions to pursue job offers, (c) expectancy of receiving job offers, and (d) actual job choices. The post-hire dependent variables used most often by researchers were (a) job satisfaction, (b) job commitment, (c) job performance, and (d) tenure.

Part 2 of Rynes' framework indicates that the primary concern for recruitment theory is "psychological processes through which recruitment activities and practices translate into applicant decisions and behaviors" (p. 403). The psychological processes vary for pre-hire and post-hire decisions. The pre-hire outcomes influenced recruitment practices via instrumentality effects related to (a) the applicant's interpretation of aspects related to the recruitment process as signals or cues (Spence, 1973) about the employment opportunity or organization; (b) purposeful manipulation of information given to applicants by the job or organizational representative; and (c) vividness/salience impressions made by the recruiter's behaviors. Rynes (1991) explained that expectancy efforts may influence job choices in the following ways: (a) applicants receiving positive expectancy cues may be more motivated to continue pursuing a job offer (Schwab, Rynes, & Aldag, 1987; Wanous, 1977) and (b) applicants receiving high probabilities of receiving a job offer may cognitively distort their perceptions of its characteristics in a

favorable way (Soelberg, 1967). The post-hire outcomes enable job applicants to either self-select into or out of jobs or adjust to the job. Wanous (1980) noted that applicants self-select based on *fit* between personal needs and organizational climates. Adjustment to the job outcomes indicates that some applicants are better prepared for early work experiences than other applicants are.

Part 3 of Rynes' framework consists of seven recommendations for future recruitment research:

1. Increase the context description in which recruitment research is conducted and use contextual variables as controls when appropriate.
2. Expand the range of recruitment practices examined as independent variables (e.g., vacancy characteristics, employer selectivity, recruitment timing).
3. Afford applicant attraction higher priority.
4. Incorporate pre-hire and post-hire data collection from applicants.
5. Give attention to the qualitative, as well as, the quantitative aspects of post-hire outcomes.
6. Investigate the influence of recruitment processes on members belonging to the organization.
7. Conduct more investigations about time-related processes, information related processes, and interactive processes related to applicant job search and decision-making about employment opportunities.

Summary of Literature Review

The quantity and quality of recruitment research has expanded over the past five decades. While recruitment literature in the educational sector has increased in the past

decade, much is yet to be researched regarding personnel in all areas of education. The research that does exist merely scratches the surface regarding recruitment practices/policies concerning K-12 teachers, K-12 administrators, and faculty and administrators at both community colleges and four-year institutions. Empirical studies pertaining to educator reactions for administrative positions (e.g., principal, superintendent, college president) are either non-existent or minimal at best.

Numerous researchers in both the private and educational sector framed their investigations using theories that produced several widely accepted models to guide future research and recruitment practices. These models and theories enabled academic researchers to investigate the recruitment process from both the applicant and organization perspective. The Rynes and Barber Applicant Attraction Model (Rynes & Barber, 1990) was the most widely used model in the past decades in both sectors of recruitment research. While no one theory or model can solve all complex problems or meaningfully exist without the supplementary effects of the others, each has a unique purpose and together assists both researchers and practitioners to make better informed decisions concerning recruitment practices and policies. The unique needs of organizations and applicants require administrators to combine various attributes/parts of theories and models to attain employees capable of fulfilling an organization's mission.

Research Questions

The following empirical research questions related to superintendent recruitment were used to determine the effects of job status, school councils, district wealth, and signing bonus on applicant rating of the job.

1. How does applicant rating of a school superintendent job

posting vary based on the job status of the applicant

(superintendent, superintendent certified)?

- a. Does the relationship between job status and other independent variables depend on if the applicant is a superintendent or is superintendent certified?
2. How does applicant rating of a school superintendent job posting vary based on the operant school council governance model (yes, no, and hybrid)?
 - a. Does the relationship between school governance model and job status depend if the applicant is a superintendent or superintendent certified?
 3. How does applicant rating of a school superintendent job posting vary based on district wealth (high socioeconomic status versus low socioeconomic status)?
 - a. Does the relationship between district wealth and other independent variables depend on the job status of the applicant and if a signing bonus is present?
 4. How does applicant rating of a school superintendent job posting vary based on whether the district offers a signing bonus?
 - a. Does the relationship between signing bonus and other independent variables depend on the job

status of the applicant?

Finally, the two most prominent designs used in recruitment research are the experimental design using analysis of variance and the correlation design using multiple regression analysis. A description of the research methods used in this study is provided in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the current research is to investigate factors that influence recruiting qualified individuals to serve as district superintendents of public schools. Winter, Rinehart, Keedy, and Bjork (2007) argued that one of the greatest challenges that school board members experience is recruiting qualified personnel to fill superintendent vacancies. According to Kamrath and LaFee (2014), rural school districts are often training grounds for administrators who transition to larger districts with greater resources. According to Nanette Johnston (personal communication, December 11, 2018), former Hardin County Schools (Kentucky) Superintendent and current Evidence-Based Leadership Coach for the Kentucky School Boards Association (KSBA), “The position of superintendent is a more difficult position than ever due to a decline of district funding, clientele of students and families, board member dynamics, and increasing academic expectations.”

Regarding the current personnel data of the superintendency, the KASA Director of Coaching and Mentoring detailed, “The current average tenure for a school superintendent is 3.5 years. When schools opened in August, 46% of Kentucky Superintendents had 2 or fewer years of experience” (F. Carter, personal communication, November 16, 2018). With the number of yearly superintendent vacancies, minimal tenures, high turnover, and a decline in the certified candidate population, it is imperative that superintendent recruitment in Kentucky is researched further with an updated population.

Minimal empirical research exists on superintendent recruitment in Kentucky (Winter, Millay, Bjork, & Keedy, 2005). One study (Millay, 2003) investigated how

potential job applicants view the attractiveness of a superintendent job posting based on the applicant's job status (current or prospective superintendents), district wealth, signing bonus, and school councils (centralized and decentralized). Millay (2003) found, based on the alpha level used in his study ($\alpha < .05$), there was a significant main effect for school councils: $F(1, 136) = 12.92, p < .0001$. The participants rated jobs in districts without school councils significantly higher in attractiveness than jobs in districts with school councils. The results implied that current and prospective superintendents preferred a centralized model for selecting the school principal where the decision is made by the superintendent as opposed to the decentralized model where a council has autonomy.

There was also a two-way interaction between school councils (yes and no) and job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), and a three-way interaction among job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), district wealth (high, low), and bonus (yes, no). Superintendents had a strong preference ($\omega^2 = .10$) for jobs in districts without school councils. Superintendents rated jobs in high wealth districts highest when the job had an initial signing bonus of \$20,000. Winter et al. (2005) advocated for future research: "Because this study revealed significant findings, it would appear the above models have utility for guiding the selection of independent variables for future recruitment studies" (p. 451).

In the current study, the following independent variables will be investigated to determine their effect on the dependent variable, applicant rating of the job: (a) superintendent job status (current superintendent, superintendent certified), (b) school council (yes, no, and hybrid), (c) district wealth (high, low), and (d) signing bonus (yes,

no). The researcher will operationalize the school council, district wealth, and signing bonus variables on simulated position advertisements similar to job advertisements that appear routinely in educational print media (e.g., *Education Week*) read by educational administrators.

This study is a nearly perfect replicated superintendent recruitment simulation (Millay, 2003), with the exception of increasing the signing bonus variable and adding a hybrid model to the school governance variable of principal selection. The study is a factorial experiment (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) involving a four-way $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times (3 \times S)$ fixed-factor between-within analysis of variance (ANOVA) which yielded 24 cells as specified by Kirk (1995). This is a mixed ANOVA since the within-subject variable of school council is being incorporated. According to Field (2013), “When there are two or more independent variables, it’s possible that some variables use the same entities whereas others use different entities. In this case we use the term mixed” (p. 509).

The between-groups variables were superintendent job status, district wealth, and signing bonus. The within-groups variable was school councils. Relative to the school council variable, the study participants rated three jobs, one job located in a district with decentralized school governance conducted through school councils, the second job located in a district with centralized governance conducted through the district central office, and a third job advertisement where the superintendent joins the school council with a vote in a hybrid model.

The mixed ANOVA produced certain results and assumptions. Before detailing the expected results of the mixed ANOVA in this proposal, the components of a one-way ANOVA must be outlined. Repeated-measures are a component of an independent

ANOVA and a mixed ANOVA. Field (2013) describes that repeated-measures with the ANOVA method as an effect of the experiment that appears in the within-participant variance. This variance is a product of the manipulation and difference in participant performance. According to Field (2013), “In repeated measures ANOVA the model and residual sums of squares are both part of the within-participant variance” (p. 549). In this study, the operationalized school council variable, within-subject, accounted for the first side of this variance with the applicant rating of school councils contributing the remainder of the variance. Each participant was exposed to the variable of school councils in their simulated job advertisement. The individual difference in participants, superintendents versus superintendent certified, impacted the within-participant variance.

Multiple means are compared in a one-way ANOVA when the means share the same entities (Field, 2013). In addition to reporting the results of the mixed ANOVA in this study, the degrees of freedom of sphericity is violated. Field (2013) recommends calculating effect sizes to detail a focused effect when a factorial design is present. A factorial design was appropriate in this study because situations arose where only two groups are compared with superintendents analyzed in contrast to superintendent certified.

The assumption of sphericity was considered in this study as well since there are three between-groups of job status, district wealth, and signing bonus. Field (2013) details that researchers must be cognizant of sphericity and homogeneity of variance in a mixed ANOVA because a mixed design features repeated measures and between-groups measures. This study was concerned with sphericity and homogeneity because of the mixed ANOVA component. A homogeneity assessment and a Mauchly Test of sphericity

was conducted due to the mixed ANOVA main analyses component. The main effect of school councils violated the assumption of sphericity if the significance level is less than .05.

Theoretical Framework

Breaugh (2008) defined external recruitment as the following:

An employer's actions that are intended to (1) bring a job or opening to the attention of potential job candidates who do not currently work for the organization, (2) influence whether these individuals apply for the opening, (3) affect whether they maintain interest in the position until a job offer is extended, and (4) influence whether a job offer is accepted. (pp. 103-104)

The theoretical framework used to frame this investigation included the Rynes and Barber (1990) Applicant Attraction Model; Schwab, Rynes, and Aldag's (1987) Model of Job Search and Evaluation; and the Millay (2003) Kentucky Superintendent empirical study. A major underlying assumption of these models is that organizational and job characteristics influence job applicant outcomes, like the applicant's decision to apply for a position/vacancy. To test that assumption, the researcher used two organizational characteristics as independent variables (school councils [yes, no, and hybrid] and district wealth [high, low]). The researcher also used one job characteristic (signing bonus [yes, no]) as an independent variable. Applicant rating of the job of superintendent was the dependent variable.

In the Model of Job Search and Evaluation (Schwab et al., 1987), the researchers hypothesized that search and job choice strategies emerge from two broad factors: (a) characteristics of the individuals seeking employment (e.g., labor force status [employed,

unemployed], occupational preferences/training, cognitive ability) and (b) the labor market (e.g., supply/demand, institutional rules and customs). The present research tested the first part of the above model by using the individual characteristic of superintendent job status (superintendent, superintendent certified) as an independent variable in the analysis.

Superintendent job status is an individual characteristic which may also influence applicant rating of the job of superintendent. Millay (2003) found three significant findings in related to job status. First, superintendents rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 8.13$) significantly higher than jobs in districts with school councils ($M = 6.74$): $F(1, 142) = 18.22, p < .0001$. Second, superintendents rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 8.13$) significantly higher than superintendent certified personnel rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 7.36$): $F(1, 136) = 4.66, p < .05$. Third, superintendents rated jobs in districts without school councils ($M = 8.13$) higher than superintendent certified personnel rated jobs in districts with school councils ($M = 7.10$): $F(1, 142) = 8.08, p < .05$.

Participants

The population of interest for this investigation are all superintendents in the United States. A convenience sample of Kentucky Superintendents and those that are superintendent certified is the focal point for this empirical study due to feasibility. Currently there are 29 female, 142 male, and 3 minority superintendents with two districts not reporting (Kentucky Education Facts webpage, 2018). A study revealed that 76% of superintendents are male and 94% are Caucasian across the United States (Kowalski, McCord, Petersen, Young, & Ellerson 2010).

A superintendent certification query of each individual state school district, conducted on December 9, 2018, via the Educational Professional Standards Board (EPSB) website, revealed that there are currently 938 individuals with superintendent certification in Kentucky. Of this 938, 173 are currently in the role of superintendent. The overall number of individuals possessing superintendent certification has slightly declined from the Millay (2003) study when the number of Kentucky superintendents was approximately 1,000 certified superintendents. From this current population the researcher randomly selected a sample ($N = 144$) that consisted of 72 current superintendents and 72 individuals possessing superintendent certification but employed in other positions. The population was randomly selected. Therefore, a software that has the capacity to find a finite population correction factor was utilized so the p-values are accurate.

Superintendent Participants

The superintendent population is 172 with a random sample ($N = 72$) of participants selected. These participants will receive one of four versions of a job simulated advertisement. The population of 172 was selected because it is divisible by the four job advertisement simulations. This is an approximately balanced sample. The table below displays the four versions that a superintendent participant would have received.

Table 1

Superintendent

Version 1	Version 2
High Wealth Bonus	High Wealth No Bonus
School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)	School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)
$n = 18$	$n = 18$
Version 3	Version 4
Low Wealth Bonus	Low Wealth No Bonus
School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)	School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)
$n = 18$	$n = 18$

The researcher sent the 172 superintendent participants the testing instruments and randomly selected 72 to be included in the study. Each superintendent participant received a number in alphabetical order by school district. The assigned numbers for both populations began with Adair County and ended with Woodford County.

Superintendent Certified Participants

The superintendent certified population is 344 and a random sample ($N = 72$) of participants was selected. These participants received one of four versions of a job simulated advertisement. The population of 344 was selected because it is divisible by the four job advertisement simulations. In addition, a large population was sought for the superintendent certified participants because a lower response rate is expected. Millay (2003) experienced a response rate of 66% from his superintendent certified as opposed to 82% from his superintendent participants. This is an approximately balanced sample.

The table below displays the four versions that a superintendent certified participant received.

Table 2

Superintendent Certified

Version 1	Version 2
High Wealth Bonus	High Wealth No Bonus
School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)	School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)
$n = 18$	$n = 18$
Version 3	Version 4
Low Wealth Bonus	Low Wealth No Bonus
School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)	School Council (Yes, No, Hybrid)
$n = 18$	$n = 18$

The researcher sent the 344 superintendent certified participants the testing instruments and randomly select at least 72 to be included in the study. Each superintendent participant received a number in alphabetical order by school district. The assigned numbers for both populations began with Adair County and ended with Woodford County.

Sampling Procedures

The number of participants ($N = 144$) and the cell size ($n = 18$) were based on a power analysis performed according to procedures developed by Cohen (1988). The specifications of the power analysis included the following: a planned effect size ($\omega^2 = .06$), a predetermined significance level ($\alpha = .05$), and a specified power level of .80 as recommended by Cohen (1988, p. 384). Cohen (1988) described the magnitude of the

above effect size as *medium*. Because one of the variables in the analysis (school council) was repeated measures, the total observations provided by the above sample was 288 (2 X 144). The power analysis also served to minimize the probability of committing a type II statistical error,; that is, failing to detect a significant effect that exists. The researcher acknowledges a large amount of the total is being sampled and will cause the p-values to be overestimated.

Independent Variables

The researcher investigated the effects of four nominal scaled independent variables on participant reactions to superintendent jobs described in position advertisements. The four independent variables were (a) superintendent job status (superintendent, superintendent certified), (b) school council (yes, no, and hybrid), (c) district wealth (high, low), and (d) a signing bonus (yes, no). The superintendent status variable was operationalized by data taken from the general information form, the *2018-2019 Kentucky Schools Directory*, and public records provided by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB). The EPSB provided current, accurate information on names and addresses of the superintendents in each of Kentucky's 173 school districts, as well as the certification held by every certified individual working in the state school system.

School Councils

The school council variable was used because of multiple law changes since 1990 that have influenced the superintendent position in the state of Kentucky. Millay (2003) examined a law change of how Kentucky school site-based decision making councils (SBDM) were given autonomy to select the school principal in a decentralized model. A

traditional centralized model that afforded the superintendent autonomy of hiring the principal existed prior to the law change and is the traditional model used across the country. Millay (2003) found that superintendents preferred the centralized model still used outside of Kentucky for principal selection. In 2011, the Kentucky law changed to a hybrid model that remained decentralized in a SBDM setting, but local school superintendents (or their designees) now are a member of the committee during the principal hiring process. In summary, the superintendent now has one vote on a six-member SBDM council. The other votes are in the hands of three teachers and two parents.

Superintendent of Simpson County Schools (Kentucky), Jim Flynn has served as a superintendent in the decentralized and hybrid model of principal selection. Flynn noted “The new model for principal selection where the superintendent is a team member on the selection committee works much better than the decentralized model where the superintendent only sends names to the committee for consideration because it values input from all stakeholders” (personal communication, November 28, 2018). The question now is if current and prospective superintendents are satisfied with this new hybrid model or if they prefer the traditional centralized model where they selected the principal in isolation.

Each superintendent and superintendent certified participant received three different job advertisements. These operationalized positions derived from school districts that feature a centralized, decentralized, and hybrid model of school governance. As noted in the participant section, there were four versions that a participant could

receive. The four versions of job advertisements had a mixture of components of the two remaining between-variables of district wealth and signing bonus.

District Wealth

The variable of district wealth (high, low) emanated from the examination of the number of students in each school district who qualified for free and reduced lunch. The use of free and reduced lunch (SES) as a measure of district wealth (student SES) is a common proxy for wealth used by education researchers as well as the state and federal government, to determine district eligibility for financial assistance in various programs (e.g., Title I) to serve disadvantaged students. To qualify for free or reduced lunch, individual family need is determined through federal poverty guidelines based on household income and family size (Food and Nutrition Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 2018).

Currently in Kentucky, 60.8% of public school students are eligible for free or reduced lunch (Kentucky Education Facts webpage, 2018) and an easily distinguishable baseline was determined by the researcher to differentiate school districts according to the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Millay (2003) determined a district with 88% or more of its students on free or reduced lunch was categorized as having low district wealth and a district with 17% or less of its students on free or reduced lunch was categorized as having high district wealth. These percentages were developed from the 2000-2001 Kentucky Consolidated State Performance Report submitted annually by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to the United States Department of Education (USDE). These percentages were proven distinguishable in both a pilot and his actual study. These measures still hold true today to clearly

distinguish low wealth and high wealth districts. For the present research study, these percentages remained the same for replication purposes and to eliminate any unintended variability.

Signing Bonus

The variable signing bonus (yes, no) has received little attention in the educational administration literature. Millay (2003) examined both the private-sector and education-sector literature pertaining to the use of a signing bonus in his superintendent recruitment advertisement. The amount of the signing bonus Millay (2003) selected for his study was \$20,000. Millay (2003) found that superintendents rated jobs in a high wealth district with a \$20,000 signing bonus ($M = 8.19$) significantly higher than jobs in a high wealth district with no signing bonus ($M = 6.92$): $F(1, 139) = 4.43, p < .05$. Omega-squared for the above significant effect was .02, a magnitude characterized by Keppel (1991, p. 74) as a *small* effect size.

Millay (2003) studied poverty for the purpose of discovering if superintendents receiving a signing bonus of \$20,000 would help low wealth districts to lure quality superintendent applicants. Millay (2003) found the effects of district wealth and signing bonus to be non-significant and the opposite of his hypothesis was true regarding low wealth districts. According to Millay (2003), "Superintendents rated jobs in high wealth districts significantly higher when a signing bonus was offered than when a signing bonus was not offered" (p. 236). Millay (2003) said, "This finding would seem to suggest high wealth district attempting to hire experienced superintendents might enhance their recruitment program by using a signing bonus (probably at the magnitude of \$20,000) as a monetary recruitment incentive" (p. 236). Millay (2003) concluded district wealth is not

a major factor for recruiting experienced or certified superintendents. When a signing bonus was offered in a high wealth district versus a high wealth district that did not offer a signing bonus, they chose the signing bonus. The same is not true for low wealth districts as signing bonus was not significant.

The researcher increased the signing bonus from \$20,000 to \$40,000 to determine if a larger monetary benefit would produce a larger effect size. Jim Flynn stated, “While a \$40,000 signing bonus would signal a school district is serious about finding a quality candidate, I predict it would not attract a candidate unless it impacted their retirement benefits” (personal communication, November 28, 2018). A large effect size for the increase would suggest districts may have an effective tool to secure talented superintendent candidates.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable was an additive composite score for applicant rating of a superintendent position. The items, scales, and scale anchors were (a) “If offered, how likely would you be to accept an interview for the superintendent position described?” (1 = *Very unlikely to accept*, 5 = *Very likely to accept*) and (b) “If offered, how likely would you be to accept a job offer for the superintendent position described?” (1 = *Very unlikely to accept*, 5 = *Very likely to accept*). The additive composite results were compared to a previous and similar study (Millay, 2003). In addition, the two questions were separated and analyzed in isolation. The question separation provided additional data on the attraction theory model in which the foundation of this empirical study is grounded with regards to psychological processes of applicant behavior (Rynes & Barber, 1991).

The above items derive from past educational studies about personnel recruitment (e.g., Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Rynes & Lawler, 1983; Winter & Dunaway, 1997; Young & Heneman, 1986; Young, Rinehart, & Place, 1989; Young et al., 1993). In the above studies, the coefficient alpha for the composite rating exceeded .80, which is well above the minimum (.60) coefficient alpha recommended for use of a composite score in statistical analysis (Nunnally, 1967). Although some methodologists have asserted that Likert scales should be considered ordinal rather than interval scaled data, many researchers frequently use Likert scales to measure attitudes and other affective reactions with the assumption that such measures are interval scaled (Nunnally, 1967). The justification for using Likert scales to measure the interval scaled dependent variable (i.e., rating of the job) appears above and in the large number of studies reviewed in Chapter II that used the same approach and the same scales used in this study.

Data Collection Procedures—Current Study

The Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board and the *Kentucky Directory of Schools, 2018-2019* provided the researcher with the names, addresses, and phone numbers of all potential study participants. The research protocols consisted of a packet containing the following: a subject informed consent letter, a general information form, a job evaluation instrument containing three superintendent job descriptions, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope for the participant to mail back the instruments. Individual codes were assigned to study participants and their instruments before the mailing to assist in data collection and necessary follow-up contacts only. When necessary to conduct the study in person, scripted procedures were used. Millay (2003) experienced an 82% response rate with superintendents and a 66% response rate with

superintendent certified participants using this data collection method. More samples were taken to have a total of 144 and produce balanced cells.

A second mailing included another subject informed consent letter stressing the importance of the research and their participation, and an additional set of the instrument were sent to all non-respondents two weeks after the first reminder. This letter was sent to all non-responding individuals as a final written attempt to obtain their participation. Additional follow-up contacts were conducted by contacting the participant by phone and email. Additional copies of the instruments were faxed to participants if needed. The span of the data collection was approximately 40 days.

Data Analysis

Data analysis consisted of two steps. Step one involved computing descriptive statistics. Step two involved computing inferential statistics.

Descriptive Statistics

A biographical data sheet assisted the researcher in capturing demographic data for each study participant. To create a profile of study participants, the researcher computed descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistics consisted of frequencies for nominal data, percentages, means, standard deviations, and range statistics.

Inferential Statistics

The inferential statistical procedure used in this study was univariate analysis of variance. The first step in the ANOVA procedure was to compute cell means and standard deviations. The second step was to compute a four-way 2 x 3 x 2 x (2 x S) fixed-factor between-within analysis of variance (ANOVA). The independent variables of interest were (a) superintendent job status (current superintendent, superintendent

certified), (b) school council (yes and no), (c) district wealth (high, low), and (d) signing bonus (yes, no). The results of the data analysis appear in the following chapter and were corrected due to a finite population.

Study Limitations

Limitations exist in all research. This study is a convenience sampling of Kentucky Superintendents and is not indicative of the population of superintendents throughout the United States. It is possible that individuals from other regions of the country will react to the job descriptions differently than the participants in this research. A second limitation was that this study was a recruitment simulation. It is possible that individuals reacting to job announcements under actual recruitment conditions might have reacted differently than did the participants in this study. The instruments used in this study captured self-reported information rather than actual job search information. The results of the data analysis appear in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The participants in the current study were practicing Kentucky school superintendents ($N = 72$) and superintendent certified personnel in Kentucky ($N = 72$) not employed as superintendents. The participants took part in a nearly perfect replicated superintendent recruitment simulation (Winter, Millay, Keedy, & Bjork, 2005). The participants rated three jobs described in simulated position advertisements, one in a district with a decentralized school governance model (council selects the principal), another in a district with a centralized governance structure (superintendent selects principal), and finally where the superintendent joins the school council with a single vote (hybrid model). Superintendent job status, district wealth, and a signing bonus were additional independent variables of this study.

The dependent variable was an additive composite score for applicant rating of a superintendent position. The items, scales, and scale anchors were the following: (a) “If offered, how likely would you be to accept an interview for the superintendent position described?” (1 = *Very unlikely to accept*, 5 = *Very likely to accept*) and (b) “If offered, how likely would you be to accept a job offer for the superintendent position described?” (1 = *Very unlikely to accept*, 5 = *Very likely to accept*).

Study Participants

Descriptive statistics for the study participants ($N = 144$) were conducted (Table 3 & Table 4). The average participant was 48.2 years old and had 1.6 dependent children. The district enrollment for the study participants ranged from 150 students to 100,000 students. Regarding marital status, 14% of the participants were single, and 86% were

married. Males accounted for 71% of the participants with 29% female participants. The study participants were 92% Caucasian, 6% African American, and the remaining 2% identified as Asian or Other.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>
Age	48.22	6.65	34-72
Dependent Children	1.64	1.16	0-4
District Enrollment	10839.65	22724.09	150-100000
Teaching Experience	8.22	4.01	0-23
Administration Experience	15.21	5.07	0-30
Superintendent Experience	2.55	3.63	0-16
Required Salary	136115.90	27637.24	95000-300000

Note. $N = 144$

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Married	124	86.11
Single	20	13.89
Male	102	70.83
Female	42	29.17
White	133	92.36
Black	8	5.56
Asian	1	0.69
Other Ethnicity	2	1.39
Superintendents	72	50.00
Assistant Superintendent	19	13.19
Principal	20	13.89
Director of Pupil Personnel	12	8.33
Supervisor of Instruction	6	4.17
Counselor	1	0.69
Teacher	2	1.39
Assistant Principal	9	6.25
Finance Director	2	1.39
Preschool Coordinator	1	0.69
Master's Degree	110	76.39
Doctoral Degree	34	23.61

Note. $N = 144$

A *t*-test was conducted to determine if a significant difference was present between the means of the average age of participants from the current study and Millay (2003). Table 5 shows the difference of the two means was not statistically significant ($p = 0.33$).

Table 5

T-Test Participant Age Comparison

<i>T-Test Participant Age Comparison</i>				
Study	Mean	SD	t-value	p
Millay 2003 (50.8) Martin 2019 (48.2)	48.2	6.65	-0.55	0.33

Instrument Response Rate

At the time of the current investigation, there were 173 school superintendents in Kentucky. The researcher sent testing instruments to 172 of the 173 superintendents because one’s district was in the process of merging with another district. The number of 172 superintendents is divisible by the four job descriptions and creates a balanced study. The superintendent certified sample consisted of 352 mailings due to an expected lower response rate. Table 6 documents the response rate of participants.

Table 6

Response Rate

Variable	Superintendents	Certified
Mailings	172	352
Respondents	106	183
Response Rate	62%	52%

Note. Balanced Study

Babbie (1990) stated, “A response rate of at least 50 percent is generally considered adequate for analysis and reporting. A response rate of at least 60 percent is considered good (p. 182). Using the standards noted by Babbie (1990), the response rate obtained from the superintendent certified sample (52%) was *adequate* and the response rate obtained from the superintendent sample (62%) was *good*.”

Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

The results Muachly's Test of Sphericity revealed significance for both the job and interview variables ($p < .001$), which could potentially result in a small error in the ANOVA (Table 7). With that said, the balanced design of the study along with the high statistical significance found in the ANOVA alleviated the concern for error.

Table 7

Mauchly's Sphericity Test

Variable	<i>Mauchly's W</i>	χ^2	<i>DF</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>gg</i>	<i>ff</i>	<i>lower-bound</i>
Interview	0.70	49.71	2	<0.001	0.77	0.77	0.50
Job	0.76	38.76	2	<0.001	0.80	0.81	0.50

ANOVA Data Analysis

A 2 x 2 x 2 x (3 x S) analysis of variance design with 18 equal cells was the primary analytical technique for this study. Results of the analysis of variance for the interview variable without interactions appear in Table 8. The variables of bonus, job status, and council were statistically significant ($p < .001$). The wealth variable was barely not statistically significant ($p = 0.08$).

Table 8

Interview without Interactions

Variable	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Wealth	1.50	1	1.50	3.05	0.08
Bonus	24	1	24	48.87	<.001
Status	18.75	1	18.75	38.18	<.001
Council	9.54	2	4.77	9.71	<.001

Results of the analysis of variance for the interview variable with interactions appear in Table 9. The two-way interaction of bonus and status were statistically significant ($p = 0.01$). The two-way interaction of status and council was barely not statistically significant ($p = 0.07$).

Table 9

Interview with Interactions

Interaction	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Wealth#Status	0.66	1	0.66	0.49	0.48
Wealth#Bonus	3.34	1	3.34	2.50	0.11
Wealth#Council	2.09	2	1.04	2.15	0.11
Status#Council	2.50	2	1.25	2.58	0.07
Bonus#Council	1.45	2	0.72	1.49	0.22
Bonus#Status	7.68	1	7.68	5.81	0.01

Note. # = Interaction Symbol

Results of the analysis of variance for the job variable without interactions appear in Table 10. The variables of bonus, job status, and council were statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Table 10

Job without Interactions

Variable	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Wealth	0.16	1	0.16	0.25	0.61
Bonus	10.66	1	10.66	16.21	<.001
Status	14.08	1	14.08	21.41	<.001
Council	18.50	2	9.25	14.06	<.001

Results of the analysis of variance for the job variable with interactions appear in Table 11. The two-way interaction of wealth and status were statistically significant ($p = 0.04$) as well as wealth and council being statistically significant ($p = 0.02$).

Table 11

Job with Interactions

Interaction	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Wealth#Status	5.55	1	5.55	4.19	0.04
Wealth#Bonus	0.01	1	0.01	0.01	0.91
Wealth#Council	4.81	2	2.40	3.73	0.02
Status#Council	1.84	2	0.92	1.41	0.24
Bonus#Council	0.79	2	0.39	0.61	0.54
Bonus#Status	1.50	1	1.50	1.14	0.28

Note. # = Interaction Symbol

Three total interactions were significant ($p < 0.05$) in the interview and job variables. Superintendent ratings of these interaction variables were more significant in all three scenarios. Tables 12, 13, and 14 show the differences in how superintendents and certified participants contributed to the interaction via their rating.

Table 12

Interview Interaction Bonus#Status

Status	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Superintendent	21.04	1	21.04	14.80	<0.001
Certified	0.49	1	0.49	0.42	0.51

Note. # = Interaction Symbol

Table 13

Job Interaction Wealth#Status

Status	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Superintendent	8.16	1	8.16	5.82	0.01
Certified	0.22	1	0.22	0.18	0.67

Note. # = Interaction Symbol

Table 14

Job Interaction Wealth#Council

Status	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Superintendent	5.58	2	2.79	4.66	0.01
Certified	0.84	2	0.42	0.61	0.54

Note. # = Interaction Symbol

Millay (2003) found a three-way interaction among district wealth, bonus, and status. In the current study, that specific three-way interaction was statistically significant for the interview variable ($p = < 0.001$) and job variable ($p = 0.01$). Tables 15 and 16 detail how participants differed in terms of significance.

Table 15

Three-Way Interaction Interview Wealth#Bonus#Status

Status	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
All Participants	42.29	7	6.04	4.61	<0.001
Superintendent	29	3	9.66	6.79	<0.001
Certified	2.90	3	0.96	0.81	0.49

Note. # = Interaction Symbol

Table 16

Three-Way Interaction Job Wealth#Bonus#Status

Status	<i>Partial SS</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
All Participants	23.21	7	3.31	2.53	0.01
Superintendent	18.85	3	6.28	4.60	0.003
Certified	2.67	3	0.89	0.71	0.54

Note. # = Interaction Symbol

School Governance Preference

Superintendent participants were more likely to accept an interview for a superintendent position if the principal selection model of that school district was centralized as opposed to decentralized or a hybrid selection model (Table 17).

Table 17

Superintendent Candidate Likelihood to Accept an Interview

Model	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Decentralized	3.52	1.27
Centralized	4.05	1.20
Hybrid	3.80	1.19

Note. Likert Scale 1 *Very Unlikely* 2 *Unlikely* 3 *Neutral* 4 *Likely* 5 *Very Likely*

Superintendent participants were more likely to accept a job offer for a superintendent position if the principal selection model of that school district was centralized as opposed to decentralized or a hybrid selection model (Table 18).

Table 18

Superintendent Candidate Likelihood to Accept the Job

Model	Mean	SD
Decentralized	3.34	1.16
Centralized	3.88	1.22
Hybrid	3.65	1.15

Note. Likert Scale 1 *Very Unlikely* 2 *Unlikely* 3 *Neutral* 4 *Likely* 5 *Very Likely*

Certified participants were more likely to accept an interview for a superintendent position if the principal selection model of that school district was a hybrid model as opposed to decentralized or a centralized selection model (Table 19).

Table 19

Certified Candidate Likelihood to Accept an Interview

Model	Mean	SD
Decentralized	3.97	1.18
Centralized	4.15	1.02
Hybrid	4.19	1.05

Note. Likert Scale 1 *Very Unlikely* 2 *Unlikely* 3 *Neutral* 4 *Likely* 5 *Very Likely*

Certified participants were more likely to accept a job offer for a superintendent position if the principal selection model of that school district was a hybrid model as opposed to decentralized or a centralized selection model (Table 20).

Table 20

Certified Candidate Likelihood to Accept the Job

Model	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Decentralized	3.45	1.14
Centralized	3.86	1.09
Hybrid	3.94	1.06

Note. Likert Scale 1 *Very Unlikely* 2 *Unlikely* 3 *Neutral* 4 *Likely* 5 *Very Likely*

A discussion of the implications for the above findings follows in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSION

One of the greatest challenges school board members experience is recruiting qualified personnel to fill superintendent vacancies (Winter, Rinehart, Keedy, & Bjork, 2007). According to Winter et al. (2007), “Such limited attraction to the superintendency among principals may result in inadequate applicant pools for superintendent vacancies in the future as the ‘baby boom’ retirements escalate (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000)” (p. 49). Because empirical research in the area of superintendent recruitment in Kentucky is scarce, this field of research must evolve to inform boards of education and policy makers on best recruitment practices of superintendents (Winter, Millay, Bjork, & Keedy, 2005). Additionally, Kentucky’s law on the school governance model for principal selection has changed multiple times over the past three decades with the most recent coming in 2011.

Specifically, Kentucky law has evolved from allowing the superintendent sole discretion in the hiring of principals, to placing principal hiring entirely in the hand of School-Based Decision-Making Councils (SBDM), to the current “hybrid” model in which the SBDM council hires principals, but the superintendent serves as a voting member of the Council. The current study described in this dissertation was a timely exploration of the perceptions of practicing administrators related to the challenges of hiring qualified superintendents, especially as it relates to the superintendent’s authority to select principals. The purpose of this research was to investigate factors that influence recruiting qualified individuals to serve as district superintendents of public schools.

The participants rated three jobs described in simulated position advertisements, one in a district with a decentralized school governance model (council selects the principal), another in a district with a centralized governance structure (superintendent selects principal), and finally where the superintendent joins the school council with a single vote (hybrid model). Superintendent job status, district wealth, and a signing bonus were additional independent variables of this study. The dependent variable was an additive composite score for applicant rating of a superintendent position. The items, scales, and scale anchors were as follows: (a) “If offered, how likely would you be to accept an interview for the superintendent position described?” (1 = *Very unlikely to accept*, 5 = *Very likely to accept*) and (b) “If offered, how likely would you be to accept a job offer for the superintendent position described?” (1 = *Very unlikely to accept*, 5 = *Very likely to accept*).

Practical Implications

First, the current study has practical implications for recruiting a more diverse pool of superintendents and superintendent applicants. At the time of this study, in Kentucky, there were 29 female, 142 male, and 3 minority superintendents with two districts not reporting (Kentucky Education Facts webpage, 2018). The gender and racial imbalances were even more pronounced in Kentucky than they are for the nation as a whole. A nationwide study revealed that 76% of superintendents are male and 94% are Caucasian (Kowalski, McCord, Petersen, Young, & Ellerson, 2010). In the current study, 81.6% of the superintendents were male and 97.8% were white. Certified participants were more diverse than superintendents with males accounting for 61% and 87.5% white.

Kentucky women and minorities are still underrepresented in the superintendent position when compared to their certified administrator counterparts. While 39% of certified participants of this study are women, only 18.4% of superintendents in this study were women. A need still exists for a more diverse pool of superintendents, and all stakeholders should be cognizant of this growth area. With respect to salaries, participants on average required a \$136,115.90 minimum salary to consider pursuing the superintendent position. Awareness of this figure may be useful to district recruiters and school boards attempting to hire individuals depending on the size of their school district.

Millay (2003) found in the original version of this near perfect replicated study that the study participants were 50.8 years of age, with 16.3 years of administrative experience, and 4.1 years of superintendent experience. Participants in the current study were 48.2 ($SD = 6.65$) years of age on average, 15.2 ($SD = 5.07$) years of administrative experience, and 2.5 ($SD = 3.63$) years of superintendent experience. This current study reveals 16 years later that superintendents and administrators alike are younger with fewer years of administrative and superintendent experience, although a *t*-test found these differences from the Millay (2003) study were not statistically significant ($p = 0.33$). If districts and policy makers can use the results of this study to make the superintendency more attractive, the pool of both aspiring and practicing superintendents may become both more diverse and more experienced.

With respect to the analysis of variance results for the interview variables, certain implications emerged. The variables of bonus, job status, and council were statistically significant ($p < .001$) individually. District wealth was not statistically significant ($p = 0.08$), but only barely so. Essentially, there is a difference in how participants rated the

likelihood of interviewing in a school district when these three variables were present in the job description. Participants were more likely to interview for a superintendent position when a bonus was present than when it was not. A two-way interaction between bonus and status was statistically significant ($p < .001$).

The first interaction research question of the study of whether the relationship between job status and other independent variables depend on whether the applicant is a superintendent or certified was confirmed. The bonus and status interaction suggests that both superintendents and certified personnel prefer jobs in school districts with bonuses, but this preference is statistically significant only in the case of sitting superintendents ($p < .001$). This difference in status confirms a second interaction research question of the study which was, “Does the relationship between signing bonus and other independent variables depend on the job status of the applicant?”

Millay (2003) did not find that a signing bonus was statistically significant at \$20,000. The increase to a \$40,000 signing bonus could contribute to the statistical significance found in this study. It is reasonable to conclude that the experienced superintendent would welcome the opportunity of the bonus because of the difficult nature of the position and the positive effects it would have on their retirement compensation, but perhaps superintendent certified participants who had never served as one were more willing to accept a job without the bonus. A qualitative follow up study might shed more light on how superintendents perceive the addition of the signing bonus.

Like the interview variable, the analysis of variance results for the job variable revealed that bonus, job status, and council were each statistically significant ($p < .001$). Participants were more likely to accept a job offer for a superintendent position when a

bonus was present than when it was not. Two separate two-way interactions existed within the job variable with one between district wealth and status ($p = 0.04$). The district wealth and status interaction suggests that superintendents and certified personnel rated districts differently based on the low or high wealth of the district they were rating, but this preference is statistically significant only in the case of superintendents ($p = 0.01$). Superintendents were more likely to accept a position in a district with high wealth than a district with low wealth. An implication of this result is that superintendents in this study may prefer to work in a district with high wealth that would have more resources and opportunities for success. Certified participants were more neutral on the district wealth variable, but slightly preferred to interview for a position in a low wealth district.

The second two-way interaction was between district wealth and council ($p = 0.02$). Participants rated job descriptions differently based on the combination of district wealth and the type of council that was presented. The interaction was only statistically significant in superintendent participants ($p = 0.01$). Superintendents rated jobs in high wealth districts with a centralized school governance model higher than the job descriptions featuring low wealth districts with either a decentralized or hybrid school governance model. The previously confirmed interaction research question of “Does the relationship between job status and other independent variables depend on if the applicant is a superintendent or superintendent certified?” has been confirmed in a second manner through the interaction of district wealth and council through the job variable.

Millay (2003) found a three-way interaction among district wealth, bonus, and status. Therefore, an interaction research question of this study was to discover if that same interaction was statistically significant with a new sample of participants. In the

current study, that particular three-way interaction was statistically significant for the interview variable (whether the candidate would consider accepting an interview, $p < 0.001$) and job variable (whether the candidate would consider accepting the job itself, if offered, $p = 0.01$). The three-way interaction was proven to be statistically significant only in the superintendent participants for the interview variable ($p < 0.001$) and job variable ($p = 0.003$). The three-way interaction difference for the certified participants on the interview variable ($p = 0.49$) and job variable ($p = 0.54$) contrasted the statistical findings of their superintendent counterparts. This interaction question of “Does a relationship between district wealth, bonus, and status exist?” was proven to be statistically significant, just as Millay (2003) found over a decade ago.

The fourth and final interaction research question asked was if the relationship between school governance model and job status was contingent on if the applicant is a superintendent or superintendent certified. Council and status were significant independently for likelihood to interview and accept a job. The interaction between the council and status were not significant for the likelihood to accept an interview, but just barely so ($p = 0.07$), and not significant for the likelihood to accept the job ($p = 0.24$). There was not a definitive relationship between these two variables. With that said, superintendents and certified participants differed on their preferences on school governance models. All of the interactions above were only statistically significant for the superintendents.

The school council variable indicates that superintendents prefer positions in districts with centralized hiring and school governance. On a 5-point Likert scale with 1 = *Very unlikely to accept* and 5 = *Very likely to accept*, superintendents were likely to

accept an interview ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.2$) and a superintendent job ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.22$). Superintendents were more likely to accept an interview and job in these centralized districts than the alternatives of a hybrid district where they had a single vote on a committee and the decentralized model where they did not possess a vote. The hybrid selection model, which is the current law for principal selection in effect for Kentucky, was the second choice of superintendents for both interview acceptance ($M = 3.8$, $SD = 1.19$) and job acceptance ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.15$). The decentralized model finished a distant third to interview ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.27$) and accept a superintendent position ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 1.16$).

Certified participants slightly preferred the hybrid model of school governance and principal selection with interviewing for the position ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.05$) and accept the job ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.06$). The centralized school governance and principal selection was a close second to interview for the position ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 1.02$) and accept the job ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 1.09$). Decentralized was the third least likely choice interview ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.18$) and accept a superintendent position ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.14$).

Millay (2003) also found that superintendents and certified personnel preferred centralized school governance over decentralized school governance. This is the second superintendent recruitment study conducted in Kentucky that shows the decentralized school governance principal selection process is not preferred. Policymakers and other stakeholders now have current and past data indicating that a principal hiring model without superintendent input is not welcomed by those in the role or certified to be in the future. Superintendents also selected the centralized model over the recent hybrid model

in which superintendents serve as voting members of the school council that actually selects the principal. This finding implies that Kentucky superintendents prefer to have sole autonomy over principal hiring as opposed to the collaborative hybrid model where they have one of six votes on the principal decision. With a good return rate of 62% from superintendents for this study, there is reason to conclude that Kentucky superintendents would prefer to return to a centralized school governance for selecting the principal instead of the current model of the hybrid.

It is more difficult to draw conclusions from the fact that aspiring superintendents were slightly more likely to choose the current hybrid model, in part because of the narrow margin of difference. It could be inferred that the experience of superintendents working with councils during the principal selection process has influenced their preferences to be the sole decision maker or to work with councils in a different manner such as a consultative approach. Another conclusion could be that many certified participants are current principals and district administrators and have no other reference point for hiring than working in collaboration with school councils. Most of the certified participants were hired by a council and they may be more comfortable with that process than the older superintendents from a previous era of school governance and those who participated in Millay's (2003) study.

School districts in states without school councils may have a competitive advantage versus Kentucky school districts when it comes to hiring qualified superintendents. If this is true, superintendent recruitment in Kentucky may become especially difficult at a time when superintendent hiring is problematic everywhere due to the increasing demands of the position. The question for state policy makers is as

follows: Is having a hybrid selection school governance model and principal selection process worth the possible negative impact councils may be having on superintendent recruitment? If school councils are having a positive impact on schools, then the answer may be “Yes.” If evidence emerges that school councils have no positive impact, then the recommendation relative to this study’s findings would be for policy makers to revisit the issue of the current hybrid school governance versus centralized school governance for the selection of principal. It may be that centralized school governance is the better model, at least relative to the impact of governance on hiring superintendents.

Future research should continue to examine factors that have a significant impact on superintendent recruitment. In this study, three of the interaction research questions were confirmed to be true. Four overall interactions were proven to be highly statistically significant for the likelihood to interview and accept a superintendent position with one of those being a three-way interaction. The three variables of bonus, status, and council were all proven to be highly statistically significant on their own. In addition, the centralized school governance model for principal selection was once again 16 years later proven to be the preferred choice of superintendent candidates for vacant positions.

Table 21 below quite simply summarizes the results of how the four independent variables were rated by the participants.

Table 21

<i>Differences in How Certified & Superintendents Rated Variables</i>		
Variable	Certified	Superintendent
Council	Prefers Hybrid Model	Prefers Centralized Model
Wealth	Neutral, Prefers Low Wealth Districts	Prefers High Wealth Districts
Bonus	No, Neutral	Yes, Prefers Bonus

Note. Likert Scale 1 *Very Unlikely* 2 *Unlikely* 3 *Neutral* 4 *Likely* 5 *Very Likely*

Implications for Future Research

There were multiple significant findings in this study that justify and position future research. An implication for future research is a prospective cross-state comparison using the school council variable (yes, no, and hybrid), or perhaps a national study using the school council variable, which may provide valuable insight to both the national educational community and state-level educational policy-makers concerning the impact of school councils on K-12 educational administration recruitment. This study could be replicated in states that do not have Kentucky's history of councils and law changes in terms to their school governance model. Would superintendent candidates in others states be receptive to a collaborative shared decision making process for the position of principal or would they confirm what Kentucky Superintendents felt prior to the hybrid model when it was a decentralized process (Millay, 2003) and, more recently, what they indicated in a post hybrid model selection era with their desire to have autonomy in a centralized hiring process?

A second direction for future research could be a qualitative study that examines the unique history of Kentucky school governance from the perspective of Kentucky superintendents that have led school districts across different eras where the principal was selected using different school governance models. A current Kentucky superintendent with at least 9 years of experience would be well versed in the differences between the decentralized and hybrid models. These same experienced superintendents would also have opinions on the benefits or disadvantages of the centralized model which would be helpful to bridge the results derived from the Millay (2003) and the current study. Retired superintendents would also be prime candidates for this type of qualitative study for the

same reasons. Current and retired superintendents may even offer an alternative that has yet to be considered that combines the hybrid and centralized models in a consultative approach where the superintendent has the decision authority but consults with the school council during the process. Their experienced accounts would inform policymakers on the context of the three models (centralized, decentralized, and hybrid) that Kentucky has implemented since 1990. This would be a reflective opportunity for a researcher to embark on to expand the foundation of previous Kentucky Superintendent recruitment studies and overall understanding of superintendent recruitment in Kentucky.

This same qualitative method could be applied to the certified participants to understand more thoroughly why they have differed from the superintendents in some areas of the applicant rating in two different recruitment studies. Rynes (1991) stated, “No recruitment issue has generated more attention than realistic job previews” (p. 423). Wanous (1980), the leading researcher in this area of recruitment research, defined a realistic job preview (RJP) as a recruitment practice designed to present applicants with both the positive and negative information about the job, as opposed to a traditional job preview (TJP) which accentuates only the positive aspects. It could be possible that certified personnel who are superintendent certified (Assistant Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, etc.) are not getting a realistic preview of what the superintendency entails. In contrast, perhaps the certified personnel are getting adequate exposure through their district professional learning communities, administrator meetings, and college coursework, but they have a differing perspective from the current superintendents that should be researched. This could potentially be an experience issue where you do not know the job until you have experienced it. A qualitative study could

provide more details on their account and examine the realistic job preview more comprehensively.

Retention was also found to be a concern in this study with tenure and turnover emerging as a theme throughout the study. Superintendents and certified participants were younger and less experienced in their teaching, administrative, and superintendent careers than when compared to the original version of this study (Millay, 2003). A third implication for future research could center around why superintendents are leaving the position of superintendent and what can local boards of education do to ensure this experience is a mutually benefiting for the best interest of all students. Additional variables that could contribute to superintendent turnover such as the evolvement of managing and embracing social media, pay, assessment pressure, and the overall mental health of superintendents as they cope with the stress of the position could all be further studied to assist in retention efforts for local boards of education.

A fourth implication from the study relates to the underrepresentation of female and minority superintendents in Kentucky. In this ever-increasing era of equal access and accountability, ethnic diversity is an area that could be studied further. Examining school governance from the perspective of females or African-Americans would inform stakeholders on their preferences for decision making which could potentially increase their likelihood to interview for superintendent positions across the state. The better informed that Kentucky stakeholders are on underrepresented populations, the greater success Kentucky will have closing that gap.

A fifth and final implication would be to further study the impact a signing bonus can have on an applicant accepting a superintendent position. A quantitative or

qualitative approach that would focus on the details of which aspects influence the applicant to accept or decline (district wealth, politics, board relations, etc.) the signing bonus would help local boards of education use their autonomy to attract quality candidates.

If this study is replicated again in the future, or if a similar research design is utilized with other participants, the researcher might consider adjustments. The testing instrument could be distributed via email or a Google Survey. The use of an electronic instrument or as a follow up to an initial mailing would shorten the data collection period and save on fiscal resources. A future research could consider operationalizing a fourth school governance model that has not been implemented in Kentucky. This fourth model would be a centralized consultative that would read similar to the centralized model testing instrument used in this study with the adjustment of “Prior to selecting the principal in a centralized school governance model, the superintendent will consult with the school council for their input on the leadership needs of their individual building.” Voluntary feedback on multiple testing instruments from participants indicated they wanted to make the sole decision for the principal position, but that they would prefer to consult with the council to understand their needs and demonstrate they’re a collaborative leader.

Currently, Kentucky principals consult with their own councils to hire teachers. This practice, which many consider a success, could be used by the sitting superintendent to hire the principal. Superintendents may be open to a centralized consultative model that would be a compromise between the current hybrid model and centralized model implemented outside of Kentucky. This potential common ground would not only be

collaborative in nature, but could make superintendent vacancies in Kentucky more attractive.

Conclusion

Superintendent recruitment has proven to be a challenging endeavor for local boards of education in Kentucky as turnover rates have increased during the past decade (F. Carter, Personal Communication, November 16, 2018). Millay (2003) found that superintendents in Kentucky were dissatisfied with school councils, and then the law changed to shared decision making model coined in this study as a hybrid. The current study revealed that superintendents do not prefer the new hybrid model of school governance as opposed to having the sole decision making authority that other states experience in a centralized model.

There are fewer certified superintendent candidates than 16 years ago, superintendents are younger than they were during the original version of this study, and superintendent turnover is at an all-time high in Kentucky. A conclusion of this study is that Kentucky Superintendents are once again informing policymakers that they wish to experience the same hiring decision autonomy that superintendents across the country enjoy. If superintendent autonomy over principal hiring makes the job more attractive, that could have an impact on recruiting more candidates, and a more diverse pool of candidates, as well as assisting with superintendent retention.

References

- Alderfer, C. P., & McCord, C. G. (1970). Personal and situational factors in the recruitment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 54*, 377-385.
- Allen, D., Bryant, P., & Vardaman, J. (2010). Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 24*, 48-64.
- Allen, D. G., Mahto, R. V., & Otondo, R. F. (2007). Web-based recruitment: Effects of information, organizational brand, and attitudes toward a web site on applicant attraction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1696–1708.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Barber, A. E., & Roehling, M. V. (1993). Job postings and the decision to interview: A verbal protocol analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 845-856.
- Barber, A. E., Wesson, M. J., Roberson, Q. M., & Taylor, M. S. (1999). A tale of two job markets: Organizational size and its effects on hiring practices and job search behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 841-867.
- Baur, J., Buckley, R., Bagdasarov M., Z., & S. Dharmasiri, A. (2014). A historical approach to realistic job previews. *Journal of Management History, 20*, 200-223.
- Becker W. J., Connolly T., & Slaughter, J. E. (2010). The effect of job offer timing on offer acceptance, performance, and turnover. *Personnel Psychology, 63*, 223–241.
- Blau, G. (1994). Testing a two-dimensional measure of job search behavior. *Social Science Research, 1*, 1-24.
- Boudreau, J. W., & Rynes, S. L. (1985). Role of recruitment in staffing utility analysis.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 354-366.

Braddy, P., Meade, A., Michael, J., & Fleenor, J. (2009). Internet recruiting: Effects of website content features on viewers' perceptions of organizational culture.

International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 17, 19-34.

Breaugh, J. A. (1981). Relationships between recruiting sources and employee performance, absenteeism, and work attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 142-147.

Breaugh, J. A. (1983). Realistic job previews: A critical appraisal and future research directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 612-619.

Breaugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and practice*. Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing.

Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18, 103–118.

Breaugh, J. A. (2009). *Recruiting and attracting talent: a guide to understanding and managing the recruitment process*. SHRM Foundation's Effective Practice Guidelines Series. Alexandria, VA: Human Resource Management Review.

Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 389-416.

Breaugh, J. A., & Mann, R. B. (1984). Recruiting source effects: A test of two alternative explanations. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 57, 261-267.

Brown, T. F., Swenson, S. H., & Hertz, K. V. (2007). Identifying the relative strength of Glasser's five basic needs in school superintendents. *Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 3, 5-46.

Byrne D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.

- Caers, R., & Castelyns, V. (2010). LinkedIn and facebook in Belgium: The influences and biases of social network sites in recruitment and selection procedures. *Social Science Computer Review*, 29, 437–448.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: McNally.
- Caples, J. (1974). *Tested advertising methods* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Chapman, D. S., Uggerslev, K. L., Carroll, S. A., Piasentin, K. A., & Jones, D. A. (2005). Applicant attraction to organizations and job choice: A meta-analytic review of the correlates of recruiting outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 928–944.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-484.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavior sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Choi, J. (2014). Can offering a signing bonus motivate effort? Experimental evidence of the moderating effects of labor market competition. *The Accounting Review*, 89, 545-570.
- Dineen, B. R., & Soltis, S. M. (2011). Recruitment: A review of research and emerging directions. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbooks in Psychology. APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol 2. Selecting and developing members for the organization* (pp. 43-66). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Drucker, P. F. (1974). *Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York: Harper

& Row.

Earnest, D., Allen, D., & Landis, R. (2011). Mechanisms linking realistic job previews with turnover: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 64*, 865-897.

Educational Professional Standards Board (2018) *Kentucky education certification inquiry*. Retrieved from <https://wd.kyepsb.net/EPSTB.WebApps/KECI/>

Ehrhart, K. H., & Ziegert, J. C. (2005). Why are individuals attracted to organizations? *Journal of Resource Management, 31*, 901–919.

Ellis, R. A., & Taylor, M. S. (1983). Role of self-esteem within the job search process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 632-640.

Ellis, C., Skidmore, S. T., & Combs, J. P. (2017). The hiring process matters: The role of person-job and person-organization fit in teacher satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*, 448-474.

Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1980). Verbal reports as data. *Psychological Review, 87*, 215-251.

Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1984). *Protocol analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th edition).

Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Food and Nutrition Service, United States Department of Agriculture (2001). Child nutrition programs—Income eligibility guidelines. *Federal Register, 66*, (No. 55). Washington, D.C.: Author.

Gibson, C. (2016). Increasing superintendent longevity in Kansas. Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 10242074)

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000) *The study of the American school*

- superintendency, 2000: A look at the superintendent of education in the new Millennium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Glenn, J., Hickey, W., & Sherman, R. (2009). Consultant perceptions of skills that school boards value in superintendent applicants. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 4(4), 1-20. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1071430.pdf>
- Glickstein, G., & Ramer, D. C. Z. (1988, February). The alternative employment marketplace. *Personnel Administrator*, 100-104.
- Goodman, R. H., & Zimmerman, W. G. (2000). *Thinking differently: Recommendations for 21st century school board/superintendent leadership, governance, and teamwork for high student achievement*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Guion, R. M. (1976). Recruiting, selection, and job placement. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 777-828). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1980). Operationalizing the concept of business-level strategy in research. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 567-575.
- Heneman, H. G., Heneman, R. L., & Judge, T. A. (1997). *Staffing organizations* (2nd ed.). Middleton, WI: Mendota House.
- Heneman, H. G., Schwab, D. P., Fossum, J. A., & Dyer, L. D. (1983). *Personnel/human resource management*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Higgins, C. S., Hawthorne, E. M., Cape, J. A., & Bell, L. (1994). The successful community college instructor: A profile for recruitment. *Community College*

Review, 21, 27-36.

Indjejikian, R., Matijka, M., Merchant, K., & Van der Stede, W. (2014). Earnings targets and annual bonus incentives. *The Accounting Review, 89*, 1227-1268.

Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 141-151.

Kalmer, E. (2009). Decade of difference (1995-2005): An examination of the superintendent search consultants' process on Long Island. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*, 115-144.

Kamrath, B., & LaFee, S. (2014) In career terms, bigger doesn't mean better. *School Administrator, 71*, 36.

Kentucky Regulation Statues (2017). *School based-decision making*. KRS 160.345

Kentucky Department of Education. (2018). *Kentucky education facts*. Retrieved from <https://education.ky.gov/Pages/default.aspx>

Kirk, R. E., (1995). *Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Kowalski, T. J., McCord, R. S., Petersen, G. J., Young, I. P., & Ellerson, N. M. (2010). *The American school superintendent 2010 decennial study*. Lanham, MD: American Association of School Administrators in partnership with Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Kristoff, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualization, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49.

Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees'

- perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 454-470.
- Liden, R. C., & Parsons, C. K. (1986). A field study of job applicant perceptions, alternative opportunities, and demographic characteristics. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 109-122.
- Maurer, S. D., Howe, V., & Lee, T. W. (1992). Organizational recruiting as marketing management: An interdisciplinary study of engineering graduates. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 807-833.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership: Follow them and people will follow you*. Nashville, Tenn: Thomas Nelson.
- McNay, K. (2016) Experienced Kentucky female superintendents' perceptions of political leadership. Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 10103991)
- Millay, J (2003) *Superintendent recruitment: Effects of superintendent job status, school councils, district wealth, and signing bonus on applicant rating of the job* (Doctoral dissertation). Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY.
- Morley, M. (2007). Person-organization fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 109-117.
- Moser, K. (2005). Recruitment sources and post-hire outcomes: The mediating role of unmet expectations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 13, 188-197.
- Newton, R. M. (2006). Does recruitment message content normalize the superintendency as male? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42, 551-577.

- Ng, E. S. W., & Burke, R.J. (2005). Person-organization fit and the war for talent: Does diversity management make a difference. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*, 1195-210.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ogilvy, D. (1983). *Ogilvy on advertising*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Orloff, S. (2012) Skill sets and attributes of school district superintendent candidates. Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3542301)
- Payne R. K. (2001). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Highlands, TX: Aha! Process, Inc.
- Pouliakas, K. (2010). Pay enough, don't pay too much or don't pay at all? The impact of bonus intensity on job satisfaction. *Kyklos, 63*, 597-626.
- Pounder, D. G., & Merrill, R. J. (2001). Job desirability of the high school principalship: A job choice theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*, 27-57.
- Rebore, R. W. (1995). *Personnel administration in education: A management approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Reilly, R. R., Brown, B., Blood, M. R., & Malatesta, C. Z. (1981). The effects of realistic previews: A study and discussion of the literature. *Personnel Psychology, 34*, 823-834.
- Ronfeldt, M., Reininger, M., & Kwok, A. (2013). Recruitment or preparation? Investigating the effects of teacher characteristics and student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*, 319-337.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton

University Press.

- Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for New research directions. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 399-444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *15*, 286-310.
- Rynes, S. L., & Boudreau, J. W. (1986). College recruiting in large organizations: Practice, evaluation, and research implications. *Personnel Psychology*, *39*, 729-757.
- Rynes, S. L., Bretz, R. D., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 487-521.
- Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1990). Interviewer assessments of applicant “fit”: An exploratory investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 487-521.
- Rynes, S. L., Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1980). Individual reactions to organizational recruiting: A review. *Personnel Psychology*, *33*, 529-542.
- Rynes, S. L., & Lawler, J. L. (1983). A policy-capturing investigation of the role of expectancies in decisions to pursue job alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 620-631.
- Rynes, S. L., & Miller, H. E. (1983). Recruiter and job influences on candidates for employment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 147-154.
- Sarac, M., Meydan, B., & Efil, I. (2017). Does the relationship between person–organization fit and work attitudes differ for blue-collar and white-collar employees? *Management Research Review*, *40*, 1081-1099.

- Schwab, D. P. (1982). Recruiting and organizational participation. In K. M. Rowland and G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Personnel Management* (pp. 103-128). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schwab, D. P., Rynes, S. L., & Aldag, R. J. (1987). Theories and research on job search and choice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 5, 129-166.
- Selden, S., & J Orenstein, J. (2011). Government e-recruiting web sites: The influence of e-recruitment content and usability on recruiting and hiring outcomes in US state governments. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 19, 31-40.
- Silva, N., Hutcheson, J., & Wahl, G. (2010). Organizational strategy and employee outcomes: A person–organization fit perspective. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144, 145-161.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., Pearlman, K., & Stoffey, R. W. (1993). Applicant reactions to selection procedures. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 49-76.
- Soelberg, P. O. (1967). Unprogrammed decision making. *Industrial Management Review*, 8, 19-29.
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87, 355-374.
- Stansfield, R. H. (1982). *Advertising manager's handbook* (3rd ed.). Chicago: Dartnell.
- Strong, E. K., Jr. (1923). *The psychology of selling and advertising*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Superville, D. R. (2016) Few women run the nation's school districts. Why? *Education Week*, 36, 14-19.
- Sutton, R. I., & Louis, M. R. (1987). How selecting and socializing newcomers influences insiders. *Human Resource Management*, 26, 347-361.
- Tallerico, M. (2000). Gaining access to the superintendency: Headhunting, gender, and color. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36, 18-43.
- Taylor, M. S., & Bergmann, T. J. (1987). Organizational recruitment activities and applicants' reactions at different stage of the recruitment process. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 261-285.
- Tufts, S. H., Jacobson, W. S., & Stevens, M. S. (2014). Status update: Social media and local government human resource practices. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 35, 1-15.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2000). *Occupational outlook handbook*, (2000/01 ed., Bulletin 2520). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2018). *Food and nutrition service*. Retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/05/08/2018-09679/child-nutrition-programs-income-eligibility-guidelines>
- Van Wesep, E. (2010). Pay before performance: The signing bonus as an incentive device. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 23, 3812-3848.
- Varkkey, B., Korde, R., & Wadhvaniya, S. (2017). Changes in the executive bonus payment patterns in India between 2008 - 2016: Some evidences. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 49, 63-86.
- Walker H. J., Field, H. S., Giles, W. F., Armenakis, A. A., & Bernerth J. B. (2009).

- Displaying employee testimonials on recruitment websites: Effects of communication media, employee race, and job seeker race on organizational attraction and information credibility. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1354–1364
- Wanous, J. P. (1973). Effects of a realistic job preview on job acceptance, job attitudes, and job survival. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 58*, 327-332.
- Wanous, J. P. (1977). Organizational entry: Newcomers moving from outside to inside. *Psychological Bulletin, 84*, 601-618.
- Wanous, J. P. (1980). *Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, and socialization of newcomers*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Winter, P. A. (1996). Community college faculty recruitment practices: The effects of applicant sex, instructional programs, and job attributes. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22*, 187-201.
- Winter, P. A., & Dunaway, D. M. (1997). Reactions of teachers, as applicants, to principal recruitment practices in a reform environment: The effects of job attributes, job information source, and school level. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 30*, 144-153.
- Winter, P. A., Keedy, J. L., & Newton, R. M. (2000). Teachers serving on school council decision-making councils: Predictors of teacher attraction to the job. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*, 248-263.
- Winter, P. A., & Kjørlein, C. L. (2000). Community college faculty recruitment: Effects

- of job mobility, recruiter similarity difference, and applicant gender. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24, 547-566.
- Winter, P. A., & Kjørlein, C. L. (2001). Business faculty recruitment: The effects of full-time versus part-time status. *Community College Review*, 29, 18-32.
- Winter, P. A., Millay, J. D., Bjork, L. G., & Keedy, J. L. (2005). Superintendent Recruitment: Effects of school councils, job status, signing bonus, and district wealth. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15, 433-455.
- Winter, P. A., & Muñoz, M. A. (2001). Community college business faculty recruitment: Association between personal characteristics and applicants' rating of the job. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 639-651.
- Winter, P. A., Rinehart, J. S., Keedy, J. L., & Bjork, L. G. (2007). Superintendent recruitment: A statewide assessment of principal attraction to the job. *Planning and Changing*, 38, 35-39.
- Wolf, M. V., Sims, J., & Yang, H. (2014). Social media utilization in human resource management. *In Web Based Communities and Social Media 2014 Conference (WBC 2014); 8th Multi Conference on Computer Science and Information Systems*. Lisbon, Portugal
- Young, I. P., & Heneman, H. G. III (1986). Predictors of interviewee reactions to the selection interview. *Journal of Research Development in Education*, 19, 1-9.
- Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Place, W. A. (1989). Theories for teacher selection: Objective, subjective, and critical content. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5, 329-336.
- Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Heneman, H. G., III. (1993). Effects of job attribute

categories, applicant job experience, and recruiter sex on applicant job attractiveness ratings. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7, 55-66.

Zhang, L., & Gowan, M. (2012). Corporate social responsibility, Applicants' individual traits, and organizational attraction: A person–organization fit perspective. *Journal of business and psychology*, 27, 345-362.

Appendix A: IRB Acceptance Letter



Date: May 7th, 2019
TO: Mark Martin, Doctoral
FROM: Western Kentucky University (WKU) IRB

PROJECT TITLE: [1376059-1] Superintendent Recruitment: Effects of Superintendent Job Status, School Councils (Principal Selection Models), District Wealth, and Signing Bonus on Applicant Rating of the Job

REFERENCE #: IRB 19-422
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE: May 7, 2019
EXPIRATION DATE: December 1, 2019
REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Western Kentucky University (WKU) IRB has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This submission has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the project and insurance of participant understanding followed by an *implied* consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require each participant receive a copy of the consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this office prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. Please use the appropriate reporting forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to this office.

This project has been determined to be a MINIMAL RISK project. Based on the risks, this project requires continuing review by this committee on an annual basis. Please use the appropriate forms for this procedure. Your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date of December 1, 2019.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after the completion of the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Robin Pyles at (270) 745-3360 or irb@wku.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

Appendix B: Implied Consent

IMPLIED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Project Title: Superintendent Recruitment: Effects of Superintendent Job Status, School Councils (Principal Selection Models), District Wealth and Signing Bonus on Applicant Rating of the Job.

Investigator: Mark Martin (Meade County Public Schools & Western Kentucky University Doctoral Candidate) mark.martin@meade.kyschools.us

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your agreement to participate in this project.

You must be 18 years old or older to participate in this research study.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have. You should keep a copy of this form for your records.

- 1. Nature and Purpose of the Project:** The research purpose is to evaluate superintendent jobs described in simulated job vacancies.
- 2. Explanation of Procedures:** Participants will be asked for 4-6 minutes of their time to complete the attached testing instruments. The research protocols consist of a packet containing: a subject informed consent letter, a general information form, a job evaluation instrument containing three superintendent job descriptions, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope for the participant to mail back the instruments. If needed, a second mailing will include another subject informed consent letter stressing the importance of the research and their participation, and an additional set of the instrument were sent to all non-respondents two weeks after the first reminder.
- 3. Discomfort and Risks:** Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may decline to answer questions that make you feel uncomfortable. You are free to discontinue participation at anytime.
- 4. Benefits:** Your participation will assist in developing new knowledge for boards of education and policy makers about recruiting qualified individuals to serve in the capacity of superintendent.
- 5. Confidentiality:** Every effort will be made to assure absolute confidentiality to the extent permitted by law. Should data from the study be published, your identity or the identity of your institution will not be revealed in any way. Records will be viewed, stored, and maintained in private, secure files only accessible by the P.I. for three years following the study, after which time they will be destroyed.
- 6. Refusal/Withdrawal:** Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.
You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

Your continued cooperation with the following research implies your consent.

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM
INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN
REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY

THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Robin Pyles, Human
Protections
Administrator
TELEPHONE: (270)
745-3360

WKU IRB# 19-422
Approved: 5/07/2019
End Date: 12/01/2019
EXPEDITED

Appendix C: Testing Instruments

GENERAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Please enter the correct information or check the one space for each item below that applies to you best. Please remember this study is anonymous and confidential.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:

Age: ____ Gender: Male ____ Female ____

Ethnicity: White American ____ Native American ____
 African American ____ Hispanic American ____
 Asian American ____ Other (specify) ____

Marital Status: Single ____ Married ____

Number of Dependent Children: ____

Approximate enrollment of the district where you work: ____

EDUCATION:

Highest Degree Earned: PhD/EdD ____ MS/MA ____ BS/BA ____

CURRENT JOB HELD:

Superintendent ____ Elementary Principal ____

High School Principal	___	Middle School Principal	___
Asst Superintendent	___	Director of Pupil Pers.	___
Instructional Supervisor	___	Director of Special Ed.	___
Teacher	___	Counselor	___
		Other (please specify)	_____

EXPERIENCE:

Total Years of Teaching Experience prior to becoming an administrator: _____

Total Years of Administrative Experience: _____

If Currently a Superintendent, List Number of Years: _____

YOUR OPINION ON SALARY:

If you were pursuing a vacant superintendent job, what is the minimum annual salary that would be acceptable? \$_____

SUPERINTENDENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: A simulated advertisement for three superintendent positions in hypothetical school districts appears below. Information about the district, job qualifications, and application procedures appear first, followed by three rating items ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Please read the background information and the job descriptions and evaluate both jobs by circling the number on each rating item that best captures your opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS: Minimum requirements for both positions are: Masters degree in the field of education, three successful years of teaching experience, three successful years of administrative experience, statement of eligibility for superintendent certification for this state and successful teaching experience. In both of the positions listed below, the superintendent reports to the local Board of Education and must demonstrate visionary leadership, strong administrative skills, a thorough understanding of P-12 curriculum, the ability to build strong connections to the community, and the ability to manage a large budget.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: Applications will undergo review by the respective board designated superintendent search committee. The final hiring decision will be made by each district’s Board of Education. Please send a letter of application, five references, resumè, and official transcripts to the following address: Wilson Superintendent Search Committee or Jones Superintendent Search Committee, C/O Education Week, P. O. Box 123, Washington D.C. 29999.

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. **The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract

will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept							Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5			

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept							Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5			

DISTRICT C: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal with the district superintendent having a single vote as a committee member when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very Un likely to Accept						Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4			5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very Un likely to Accept						Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4			5

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers

SUPERINTENDENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: A simulated advertisement for two superintendent positions in hypothetical school districts appears below. Information about the district, job qualifications, and application procedures appear first, followed by three rating items ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Please read the background information and the job descriptions and evaluate both jobs by circling the number on each rating item that best captures your opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS: Minimum requirements for both positions are: Masters degree in the field of education, three successful years of teaching experience, three successful years of administrative experience, statement of eligibility for superintendent certification for this state and successful teaching experience. In both of the positions listed below, the superintendent reports to the local Board of Education and must demonstrate visionary leadership, strong administrative skills, a thorough understanding of P-12 curriculum, the ability to build strong connections to the community, and the ability to manage a large budget.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: Applications will undergo review by the respective board designated superintendent search committee. The final hiring decision will be made by each district’s Board of Education. Please send a letter of application, five references, resumé, and official transcripts to the following address: Wilson Superintendent Search Committee or Jones Superintendent Search Committee, C/O Education Week, P. O. Box 123, Washington D.C. 29999.

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very				Very
<u>Un</u> likely to				Likely to
Accept				Accept
1	2	3	4	5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very
Unlikely to
Accept

Very
Likely to
Accept

1

2

3

4

5

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch. The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists. A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to accept an interview for the superintendent position described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to accept a job offer for the superintendent position described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT C: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch. The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal with the district superintendent having a single vote as a committee member when a vacancy exists. A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept								Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5				

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept								Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5				

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers

SUPERINTENDENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: A simulated advertisement for two superintendent positions in hypothetical school districts appears below. Information about the district, job qualifications, and application procedures appear first, followed by three rating items ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Please read the background information and the job descriptions and evaluate both jobs by circling the number on each rating item that best captures your opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS: Minimum requirements for both positions are: Masters degree in the field of education, three successful years of teaching experience, three successful years of administrative experience, statement of eligibility for superintendent certification for this state and successful teaching experience. In both of the positions listed below, the superintendent reports to the local Board of Education and must demonstrate visionary leadership, strong administrative skills, a thorough understanding of P-12 curriculum, the ability to build strong connections to the community, and the ability to manage a large budget.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: Applications will undergo review by the respective board designated superintendent search committee. The final hiring decision will be made by each district's Board of Education. Please send a letter of application, five references, resumé, and official transcripts to the following address: Wilson Superintendent Search Committee or Jones Superintendent Search Committee, C/O Education Week, P. O. Box 123, Washington D.C. 29999.

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very

Very

Unlikely to

Likely to

Accept

Accept

1

2

3

4

5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. **The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT C: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal with the district superintendent having a single vote as a committee member when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept		1	2	3	4	5	Very Likely to Accept
--	--	---	---	---	---	---	-----------------------------

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept		1	2	3	4	5	Very Likely to Accept
--	--	---	---	---	---	---	-----------------------------

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers

SUPERINTENDENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: A simulated advertisement for two superintendent positions in hypothetical school districts appears below. Information about the district, job qualifications, and application procedures appear first, followed by three rating items ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Please read the background information and the job descriptions and evaluate both jobs by circling the number on each rating item that best captures your opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS: Minimum requirements for both positions are: Masters degree in the field of education, three successful years of teaching experience, three successful years of administrative experience, statement of eligibility for superintendent certification for this state and successful teaching experience. In both of the positions listed below, the superintendent reports to the local Board of Education and must demonstrate visionary leadership, strong administrative skills, a thorough understanding of P-12 curriculum, the ability to build strong connections to the community, and the ability to manage a large budget.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: Applications will undergo review by the respective board designated superintendent search committee. The final hiring decision will be made by each district’s Board of Education. Please send a letter of application, five references, resumè, and official transcripts to the following address: Wilson Superintendent Search Committee or Jones Superintendent Search Committee, C/O Education Week, P. O. Box 123, Washington D.C. 29999.

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very				Very
<u>Un</u> likely to				Likely to
Accept				Accept
1	2	3	4	5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very
Unlikely to
Accept

Very
Likely to
Accept

1

2

3

4

5

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. **The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Unlikely to</u> Accept		3		5
1	2		4	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Unlikely to</u> Accept		3		5
1	2		4	

DISTRICT C: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal with the district superintendent having a single vote as a committee member when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept								Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5				

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept								Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5				

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers

SUPERINTENDENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: A simulated advertisement for two superintendent positions in hypothetical school districts appears below. Information about the district, job qualifications, and application procedures appear first, followed by three rating items ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Please read the background information and the job descriptions and evaluate both jobs by circling the number on each rating item that best captures your opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS: Minimum requirements for both positions are: Masters degree in the field of education, three successful years of teaching experience, three successful years of administrative experience, statement of eligibility for superintendent certification for this state and successful teaching experience. In both of the positions listed below, the superintendent reports to the local Board of Education and must demonstrate visionary leadership, strong administrative skills, a thorough understanding of P-12 curriculum, the ability to build strong connections to the community, and the ability to manage a large budget.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: Applications will undergo review by the respective board designated superintendent search committee. The final hiring decision will be made by each district's Board of Education. Please send a letter of application, five references, resumé, and official transcripts to the following address: Wilson Superintendent Search Committee or Jones Superintendent Search Committee, C/O Education Week, P. O. Box 123, Washington D.C. 29999.

DISTRICT C: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal with the district superintendent having a single vote as a committee member when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very						Very
<u>Un</u> likely to						Likely to
Accept						Accept

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. **The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers

SUPERINTENDENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: A simulated advertisement for two superintendent positions in hypothetical school districts appears below. Information about the district, job qualifications, and application procedures appear first, followed by three rating items ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Please read the background information and the job descriptions and evaluate both jobs by circling the number on each rating item that best captures your opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS: Minimum requirements for both positions are: Masters degree in the field of education, three successful years of teaching experience, three successful years of administrative experience, statement of eligibility for superintendent certification for this state and successful teaching experience. In both of the positions listed below, the superintendent reports to the local Board of Education and must demonstrate visionary leadership, strong administrative skills, a thorough understanding of P-12 curriculum, the ability to build strong connections to the community, and the ability to manage a large budget.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: Applications will undergo review by the respective board designated superintendent search committee. The final hiring decision will be made by each district's Board of Education. Please send a letter of application, five references, resumé, and official transcripts to the following address: Wilson Superintendent Search Committee or Jones Superintendent Search Committee, C/O Education Week, P. O. Box 123, Washington D.C. 29999.

DISTRICT C: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal with the district superintendent having a single vote as a committee member when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Un</u> likely to Accept	Very Likely to Accept			
1	2	3	4	5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. **The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The

Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Seventeen percent (17%) of the students**

in the district receive free or reduced lunch. The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high

schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance

structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept

1 2 3 4 5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept

1 2 3 4 5

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. **The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered. **The successful candidate for this position will receive a forty thousand dollar (\$40,000) signing bonus at the end of the first month on the job.**

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Un</u> likely to					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers

SUPERINTENDENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: A simulated advertisement for two superintendent positions in hypothetical school districts appears below. Information about the district, job qualifications, and application procedures appear first, followed by three rating items ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Please read the background information and the job descriptions and evaluate both jobs by circling the number on each rating item that best captures your opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS: Minimum requirements for both positions are: Masters degree in the field of education, three successful years of teaching experience, three successful years of administrative experience, statement of eligibility for superintendent certification for this state and successful teaching experience. In both of the positions listed below, the superintendent reports to the local Board of Education and must demonstrate visionary leadership, strong administrative skills, a thorough understanding of P-12 curriculum, the ability to build strong connections to the community, and the ability to manage a large budget.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES: Applications will undergo review by the respective board designated superintendent search committee. The final hiring decision will be made by each district's Board of Education. Please send a letter of application, five references, resumé, and official transcripts to the following address: Wilson Superintendent Search Committee or Jones Superintendent Search Committee, C/O Education Week, P. O. Box 123, Washington D.C. 29999.

DISTRICT C: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal with the district superintendent having a single vote as a committee member when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very

Very

Unlikely to

Likely to

Accept

Accept

1

2

3

4

5

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT B: The Jones School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The Jones School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the students in the district receive free or reduced lunch.** The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **centralized** at the district central office. **The district central office, under leadership of the superintendent, governs schools and sets most school policies. The superintendent selects the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very					Very
<u>Unlikely to</u>					Likely to
Accept					Accept
1	2	3	4	5	

DISTRICT A: The Wilson School District invites applications for the position of Superintendent of Schools. The

Wilson School District has an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the**

students in the district receive free or reduced lunch. The district has the following facilities: A central office, two high schools, one vocational school, two middle schools, ten elementary schools, and an alternative education facility. All schools are funded based on state standards and each has a parent-teacher organization. The school governance structure for the district is **decentralized** from the district central office to the school level. **Local site-based decision-making (SBDM) councils govern schools, set most school policies, and select the school principal when a vacancy exists.** A competitive salary based on experience, comprehensive benefits package, and a minimal four-year contract will be offered.

1. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept an interview for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Unlikely to</u> Accept								Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5				

2. If offered, how likely would you be to **accept a job offer for the superintendent position** described?

Very <u>Unlikely to</u> Accept								Very Likely to Accept
1	2	3	4	5				

The Wilson School District and Jones School District
are Equal Access/Equal Opportunity Employers