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This study compared school administrators (principals and special education directors) in districts with residency policies and administrators in districts without residency policies on the number of community activities participated in, the location of 11 typical goods and services purchased, and job performance as rated by immediate supervisors. The literature revealed that the existence of residency policies has been justified by statements that resident administrators participate in more community activities, spend more money in the district, and have better job performance than nonresident administrators.

Four research hypotheses concerning participation in community activities, purchases, and job performance were based on the assumption that there would be no difference between administrators required to live in their school district, administrators who are not required but chose to live in their school districts, and administrators who are not required and chose to reside outside their school districts.

The subjects were 151 administrators randomly selected from school districts throughout Michigan. They were asked to list the
names and locations of the community activities in which they par-
ticipated and to also indicate the locations of 11 major goods and
services which they last purchased. The immediate supervisors of the
subjects were contacted and rated the subjects on their job perform-
ance.

The results indicated that resident administrators participated
in significantly more community activities within their school dis-
trict and significantly more community activities regardless of loca-
tion than nonresident administrators. Nonresident administrators
purchased home mortgages, groceries, gasoline for cars, car repair
services, home repair services, and medical services outside the
school district at significantly higher than expected rates. Resi-
dent administrators in districts without residency policies purchased
home appliances within the school district at a significantly higher
rate than expected. There was no significant difference between the
job performance scores as rated by immediate supervisors of resident
administrators and nonresident administrators.

Implications are that residency policies for administrators can
be justified on the grounds that resident administrations participate
in community activities and spend their salaries within the school
district, but cannot be justified on the grounds that resident admin-
istrators are rated better on job performance than nonresident admin-
istrators.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Residency requirements are city council ordinances, charter provisions, administrative rules, or school board policies which require city, county, municipality, or school district employees to reside within the boundaries of the particular governmental unit or school district. While many reasons have been voiced for requiring teachers and administrators to reside in the school district of their employment, there appear to be three main justifications for residency requirements for educational personnel found in the literature. The first reason frequently given in support of residency requirements is that educational personnel residing in the district would have more involvement in the community (Kittle & Shannon, 1944; Lee, 1982; Michaels, 1980; Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976; Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976). The second justification for residency requirements is that communities would benefit economically from the salaries of resident educators (Sandlow, 1975; Lee, 1982; Michaels, 1980; Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976; "Some Aspects," 1940; Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976). The third reason given for supporting residency requirements is that
educational personnel residing in the district would have better job performance (Bandlow, 1976; Kittle & Shannon, 1944; Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976; Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976).

Required residency for educational personnel has thus been viewed as an attempt by communities to solve some economic problems and to insure community participation. It has been assumed that educators who live in the district will spend their money in the district and, therefore, aid the local district and community economically. By requiring educators to live in the district, the community would benefit economically. It has been thought that living in the community and participating in community activities makes one a better educator. Therefore, requiring residency within the school district would solve the problem of being familiar with and understanding the community.

Required residency also has been seen as a means to improve the educational quality of the district because it has been assumed that resident educators have better job performance than nonresident educators. Since residents would be more acquainted with and involved in the community, their job performance should be superior to nonresidents. It has been assumed that requiring educators to live in the district has meant acquiring educators who would perform their jobs more effectively than those educators who live elsewhere.

Although arguments in support of residency requirements for educational personnel have been cited in court cases and by
professional educators, supportive empirical data are lacking (Lee, 1982; Michaels, 1980). Brown (1976), who reviewed Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati (1976) which upheld teacher residency, stated the rational bases accepted by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals were "no more than platitudes of the interest group asserting them. While they sound rational they may in fact be empirically false" (p. 531). In addition to lack of empirical data to support residency requirements, it appears that no study has been conducted involving the residency of educational personnel in districts where residency is mandatory. All studies which have been found related to the topic of residency requirements for educational personnel have compared resident and nonresident school employees who had freedom to choose their place of residence. Therefore, data are lacking pertaining to educational personnel required to live within the school district which employs them.

There is little or no substantiation that required residency is a solution to a district's or community's economic or educational problems and may indeed create more problems than it attempts to solve.

Some research has revealed that residency requirements may have detrimental effects on education. Martin (1974) found that teachers and administrators residing outside their districts had significantly more favorable attitudes toward students than did resident teachers and administrators.

Another negative effect may be the limitation of the number of potential applicants for a position requiring residency within a
district. When the supply of educators is high, the impact of required residency on the potential job pool is probably less pronounced. However, when the supply of educators for positions is low, any restrictions placed on hiring may greatly impact the number and perhaps quality of applicants.

A third negative effect is much more tenuous to determine. The literature suggests that residency is often unpopular and viewed as restricting one's freedom of choice. Individuals who hold these views, but out of necessity accept positions in districts requiring residency, may in many subtle ways express their displeasure and dissatisfaction to the detriment of the community and the school program.

The present study provides empirical data regarding the three main justifications frequently given in support of residency requirements for educational personnel. Analysis of the data provides information about the relationships between residency and community involvement, residency and economic benefits for the community, and residency and job performance.

In this introductory chapter, the two independent variables (type of residency and position) and four dependent variables (number of community activities within the district, total number of community activities, personal expenditures, and job performance) are defined. Also a brief literature review of each dependent variable is presented. The last sections of the chapter present the purpose of the study, the research hypotheses, and the significance of the present study.
Independent Variables

Types of Residency

One independent variable in this study is type of residency. Subjects were identified as falling into one of three residency groups depending upon their individual district's residency requirements and their personal choice of residency location. The first type of residency was mandatory residency where administrators were required to reside in the district of their employment (RRI). The second type of residency was nonmandatory residency wherein administrators chose to reside in the school district of their employment (NRI). The third type of residency was nonmandatory residency wherein administrators chose to reside outside the school district of their employment (NRO).

Types of Administrative Positions

If a sufficient number of special education directors in districts which require residency could have been found for this study, a second independent variable—administrative position—was planned to be included with elementary and secondary principals (P) comprising one group and special education directors (SD) comprising a separate group. It was believed that special education directors who differ in training and type of student served from principals might also differ on the dependent variables of this study.
Dependent Variables

Community Involvement

For the purposes of this study, community involvement was defined as all the community activities in which the subjects participated which were not job related and which benefited the community. Examples are: service clubs such as Rotary and Kiwanis, church activities, and civic or educational boards. Purely social or recreational groups or clubs which do not benefit the community such as bowling leagues, card clubs, and dance groups were not included in community activities for this study.

For purposes of data analysis, this dependent variable was divided into the total number of community activities in which subjects participated as well as the number of community activities within the district in which the subjects participated.

Support for the argument that resident educators would be more involved in the community than nonresident educators has come from court cases, research studies, and educational theory. Generally, such support is based upon involvement with teachers rather than administrators. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, in Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati (1976), stated that resident educators were expected to be more involved in school and community activities and would have a better understanding of a community's racial and social characteristics. The Federal District Court of Pennsylvania, in Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v.
Aaron (1976), stated that resident teachers would have a greater personal stake in the progress of the community. In studies conducted by Lee (1982) and Michaels (1980), community involvement was mentioned as justification for residency requirements for educators. Kittle and Shannon (1944) stated that some educational theorists have insisted that teachers identify with the communities in which they teach and have supported residency requirements. Kittle and Shannon also found that noncommuting (resident) teachers were more involved in extra curricular activities and community activities than commuting teachers.

Personal Expenditures That Benefit the Community

For the purposes of this study, personal expenditures that benefit the community were defined as the goods and services purchased by the subjects within the boundaries of their district of employment.

Several sources, including research studies and court cases, have justified residency requirements for educators on the grounds that the resident community would benefit economically. Again, much of the literature is based on work with teachers rather than administrators. The "public coffer" theory reflects the idea that salaries paid to educational personnel ought to recirculate within the public and private economy of the district that paid the salary. Local educators would spend their salaries in the community and pay local property taxes (Bandlow, 1976; Lee, 1982; Michaels, 1980; Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers,

Job Performance

For purposes of this study, job performance was defined as a rating by immediate supervisors of the subjects' work related characteristics and behaviors. The rating instrument to be used in this study contained items derived primarily from research studies concerned with the characteristics and behaviors of effective school principals.

Court cases and research studies provided some rationale to support the premise that residency requirements improved school employee job performance. Such support was primarily based on teacher rather than administrator sources. Residency requirements appeared to have aided districts in hiring teachers who were highly motivated (Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976). Residency improved the job performance of the educators and reduced the absenteeism and tardiness among school personnel (Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976). Resident principals appeared to have a greater commitment to opening the schools to community use, to dealing with behavior and discipline problems, and to improving the effectiveness of the professional teaching staff (Bandlow, 1976).
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to provide empirical data about the validity of the three assumptions which have been expressed most often in support of residency requirements: (a) Resident administrators are more involved in community activities than nonresident administrators, (b) resident administrators spend more money in the school district than nonresident administrators, and (c) resident administrators have better job performance than nonresident administrators. School principals and local special education directors in districts with residency requirements were compared to school principals and local special education directors in districts without residency requirements on the following three variables: (a) community involvement, (b) personal expenditures that benefit the community, and (c) job performance.

Research Hypotheses

Many persons have argued the pros and cons of residency requirements. However, courts have accepted testimony supporting residency requirements and have upheld this requirement despite a paucity of supportive data. Prediction about the relationships between residency requirements and the four variables identified is very difficult without adequate data. However, the following research hypotheses are posed:

1. Administrators in districts which require residency will participate in as many community activities within their school
district as administrators in districts which do not require residency but chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts which do not require residency and chose to reside outside the district.

2. Administrators in districts which require residency will participate in as many community activities regardless of the location as administrators in districts which do not require residency but chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts which do not require residency and chose to reside outside the district.

3. Administrators in districts which require residency will purchase the same goods and services within the school district as administrators in districts which do not require residency but chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts which do not require residency and chose to reside outside the district.

4. Administrators in districts which require residency will have the same job performance as administrators in districts which do not require residency and chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts which do not require residency and chose to reside outside the district.

Significance of the Study

Courts have upheld the legality of residency requirements and have stated that such requirements encourage persons to participate in community activities, spend money locally, and have better job performance. There are few data to support the position on
educational residency taken by the courts. This study could provide such data so that future court testimony about educational residency could be based on empirical evidence rather than opinion.

Salary expenditures and community involvement might be expected to be affected by where the individual lives. However, with the growth of megalopolises with nondistinct boundaries and the use of the automobile to commute to shopping and community activities, school districts may be deriving little benefit economically or socially by requiring administrators to reside in the district. Even if residency is shown to affect the salary expenditures and community involvement of administrators, are the economic and social benefits derived by the community through residency requirements worth limiting the job pool to those candidates willing to live in the community? Should school districts prioritize any economic and social benefits of residency requirements ahead of educational quality as measured by job performance?

The job performance variable is most directly related to the mission of the schools which is to educate young people. With today's emphasis on the principal's leadership role in effective schools, it is particularly important to look at job performance. If residency affects job performance, then school districts may have the right to require their administrative personnel to live within the confines of the district. If indeed, as hypothesized in this study, job performance does not differ on the living arrangement of the individual, then districts may need to rethink their policies or at least base them on empirical findings.
Residency requirements limit the job pool to persons already in the district or those willing to move into the district. If it is found that resident and nonresident administrators perform their jobs equally well, districts who are interested in hiring the best candidates could stop limiting their choices to those persons willing to abide by residency policies.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into five major sections. The first section defines residency requirements. The second section pertains to residency requirements for municipal employees and includes subsections on the history of residency requirements for municipalities, the court cases pertaining to residency for municipalities, and the reasons for residency requirements of municipal employees. The third section pertains to residency requirements for educational employees and includes subsections on the history of residency requirements for educational personnel, court cases pertaining to school districts, and the reasons for residency requirements for school district employees. The fourth section discusses arguments against residency requirements for municipal and school district employees, and the last section briefly summarizes the major points presented.

Definition of Residency Requirements

Residency requirements are city council ordinances, charter provisions, administrative rules, contract provisions, or school board policies which require city, county, municipality, or school district employees to reside within the boundaries of the particular governmental unit or school district.
There are two types of residency requirements: durational and continuing. According to Johnson (1977), a durational residency requirement is one which requires that a person be a resident of the governmental district for some period of time before employment. This type of residency requirement involves an infringement upon the fundamental constitutional right of interstate travel under the United States Constitution. The test for constitutionality is the stringent "compelling state interest" test because of the conflict with this fundamental right. The governmental body is required to show a compelling need to impose the durational residency requirement before it is allowed to infringe upon the fundamental constitutional right to interstate travel. In most cases this would be difficult to do. A durational residency requirement is therefore not preferable. (p. 21)

Levine (1985) reported that durational residency requirements of retroactive standard are barred by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

The second type of residency requirement is a continuing residency requirement. Johnson (1977) stated:

A continuing residency requirement is one which requires that a person be a resident of the governmental district while employed. It places no prerequisite of residency in the district prior to employment. Usually a grace period is provided for establishing residency in the district within a specified number of days following employment. This type of residency requirement has been found not to infringe upon the constitutional right of interstate travel. It is subject to the less stringent "rational basis" test for constitutionality. (p. 21)

The rational basis test is used in court cases when no individual or fundamental rights are being challenged. Since continuing residency requirements do not infringe upon the fundamental right to interstate travel, such requirements can be upheld in court if it can be shown that the question of whether the residency requirement has a
beneficial effect upon the public employment services rendered by the public employee is "reasonably debatable" or rational.

Residency and Municipal Employees

History of Residency Requirements for Municipal Employees

According to Goldstein (1973), residency requirements originated in seventeenth century England. The Elizabethan Poor Laws, which attempted to reduce the local welfare burden, provided that any person who was poor and had not resided within a community for 40 days could be removed. Each English community was only responsible for the care of its own indigent residents as defined by the Poor Laws. The American colonies developed similar laws pertaining to welfare programs based on English precedence.

City residency requirements for employment appeared in the late 1800s with machine politics and the spoils system (Eisinger, 1980). During that era, public employment was a reward for past service to a candidate or political party. Residency requirements may have grown out of the common practice of allowing aldermen to select policemen who resided in their respective wards. The city of Detroit, which enacted a residency policy for city policemen in 1886, is cited as an example of a jurisdiction with a residency requirement in the nineteenth century (Kresnak, 1985).

Opposition to residency requirements for public employment also arose in the late 1800s with the advent of civil service (Eisinger, 1980). Many persons supported civil service as a means to employ...
public workers who were the best candidates. Residency requirements were attacked by reform groups as being contrary to sound administrative personnel practices.

Residency requirements declined in popularity in the 1920s due to the rise of professionalism in public administration and an increased emphasis on the importance of individual rights (Eisinger, 1980). Public administration textbook writers emphasized that residency requirements were not in harmony with the merit principal.

Residency requirements were gradually eliminated from the municipal scene in the decades between 1920 and 1960 by charter revision, repeal, and public referendum (Eisinger, 1980). The exception was a brief revival during the depression era when cities tried to reserve municipal jobs for their own residents. Only Philadelphia, Buffalo, Milwaukee, and a few other big cities retained and enforced their residency requirements. Some cities maintained their laws on the books but allowed enforcement to lapse.

Eisinger (1980) indicated there was a resurgence of residency regulations in the 1970s in an attempt to combat unemployment and underemployment of central cities' minorities by eliminating white suburban workers from job competition. This resurgence was also an attempt to encourage local spending since salaries were 65%-75% of municipal budgets. Some cities were also encouraged to enact residency requirements when the Supreme Court upheld Philadelphia's residency ordinance in McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission in 1976.
Reiter (1975) surveyed the 50 largest American cities and found that 29 cities (58%) had residency requirements affecting the employment of some municipal workers. Fourteen cities (28%) demanded that all municipal employees reside within the city boundaries for the duration of their employment.

It was found that some cities in the 1970s were selective about which positions were covered by residency policies. For example, St. Louis waived residency requirements for its highly skilled professional employees due to the reduction of the qualified labor pool (Rubin, 1978).

In 1979, the Akron Civil Service Commission (cited in Eisinger, 1980) conducted a survey of 104 randomly selected cities and towns and found that two thirds of the cities surveyed had a residency requirement and 81% had enacted the regulation since 1970. Eisinger (1980) found that 57% of the cities from which he gathered data had an enforced residency requirement for some faction of city employees and that 60% of those cities with requirements had passed them in the 1970s. Some cities such as Chicago and Oklahoma City began enforcing previously enacted regulations. Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose, California, enacted residency requirements in the 1970s but had such laws removed from the record when California voters barred local residency ordinances by state constitution in 1974.

Eisinger (1980) hypothesized that economic distress in a city leads either to passage of new residency laws or resurrection of laws that have long been unenforced. Eisinger analyzed data from a sample of 74 cities divided into two groups: those cities with residency...
laws and those without. His study produced the following findings. First, cities with residency laws were more likely to have lost population in the 1960-1970 decade, had a much smaller average change in population, had higher unemployment, had less public sector growth, and actually had to reduce the number of municipal employees. Second, residency laws were far more common in Frost Belt cities governed by mayors than in Sun Belt cities run by city managers. Eisinger used the Nathan-Adams Central City Hardship Index and found that 88% of high hardship cities had residency requirements, but only 75% of medium and 41% of low hardship cities had such laws. Residency laws had been passed or maintained in virtually every large city headed by a black mayor who may have seen residency requirements as a way to use municipal authority and local resources to address black unemployment needs. Third, cities which rescinded residency laws displayed stable or high population growth and low unemployment.

The following statistics were published by the International City Management Association in 1983 and 1987, and were based upon cities which volunteered the information. Thirty-six percent of the cities reporting had a residency requirement for some of their fire fighting personnel, and 30% of the reporting cities had a residency requirement covering some of their police personnel (International City Management Association, 1983). Four percent of the responding cities required residency for some or all civilian personnel, and cities with populations over 500,000 were the most likely to have any residency requirements (International City Management Association, 1987).
New York City followed the lead of such cities as Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and Philadelphia and adopted employee residency requirements for municipal employees ("New York City Imposes," 1986). Employees hired on or after September 1, 1986, were required to be New York City residents or to move into the city within 90 days. Approximately 80,000 municipal positions were affected excluding uniformed services.

The history of residency requirements for municipal employees has shown that such requirements have ridden waves of popularity as well as survived periods of disinterest. Residency requirements have existed in most areas of the United States and have affected many policemen, firemen, and civilian workers.

Court Cases Involving Residency Requirements for Municipal Employees

A history of residency requirements would be incomplete without a discussion of the challenges to residency requirements raised in courts throughout the United States. The history of court cases concerned with residency requirements is fraught with appeals, reversals, dismissals on technicalities, and seemingly conflicting conclusions from one case to another depending on the court's view of whether interstate travel is involved requiring a "compelling" or "rational basis" test of the arguments.

Early challenges to continuous residency requirements were generally unsuccessful and were based upon perceived nonconstitutional or technical defects in the statutes or ordinances (Rhyne, Rhyne, & Elmendorp, 1977). Residency for policemen was affirmed in Alabama in
Johnson v. State (1901). In the case of Mirabuto v. Town of Emeryville (1960), the Court of Appeals in California upheld the residency requirement for policemen and firemen to assure quick response to emergencies. A city ordinance and a rule of the Chicago Police Board were upheld in the case of Manion v. Kremel (1970) where police were required to live in Chicago.

The following are two court cases where continuous residency was attacked on grounds that equal protection was denied to employees with two residences, one inside and one outside the city limits (Rhyne et al., 1977). The Supreme Court of Utah ruled in Spencer v. Crowther (1957) that renting a room in the city when his family resided outside the city did not constitute residency sufficient to preserve a police officer's job. The New Jersey Supreme Court reached a similar decision regarding domiciles outside the City in Mercadante v. City of Paterson (1971).

Kennedy v. City of Newark (1959) was one of the earliest cases where the issues concerning equal protection and residency requirements were fully litigated (Rhyne et al., 1977). The New Jersey Supreme Court upheld an ordinance requiring all the city's officers and employees to be residents of Newark during their employment. The rational basis test (minimum scrutiny) was applied. Two justifications were given in support of the constitutional validity of continuous residency: the "public coffer" theory and the "stake in the community" theory.

The public coffer theory is the idea that salaries paid to civil servants ought to recirculate within the public and private...
economy of the city that paid the salary. The original theory was based upon a sense of mutual support between city and employee rather than a need to fight local financial problems. However, in distressed cities where public salaries comprise large proportions of tight city budgets, the public coffer theory has been used as an argument to support residency requirements.

The stake in the community theory is the idea that persons who live in a community care about the community, identify with the community, and are familiar with the community. The stake in the community theory has been used as an argument to support residency requirements.

In 1959, the New Jersey Supreme Court in *Kennedy v. City of Newark* (cited in Rhyne et al., 1977) remarked:

Plaintiffs suggest that residence can be relevant only in the area in which there may be calls for emergency work. That is too narrow a view of permissible concepts of public interest. Government may well conclude that residence will supply a stake or incentive for better performance in office or employment and as well advance the economy of the locality which yields the tax revenues. (p. 50)

In 1969, another residency case involved minimum scrutiny and equal protection (Hager, 1980). The Supreme Court of Utah upheld the city's authority to require appointed officials and employees to be city residents in *Salt Lake City Fire Fighters Local 1645 v. Salt Lake City* (1969). Geographical proximity arguments satisfied the rational basis test. The court agreed that the city was entitled to residential support and taxes in exchange for providing jobs to those same employees (the public coffer theory).
In a landmark case, *Shapiro v. Thompson* (1969), the United States Supreme Court brought to the forefront a previously obscure right called the "right to travel" (Heldman, 1975). The right of citizens to travel between states is guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments and can be traced to England where citizens had an unwritten right of freedom of movement. In *Shapiro v. Thompson* (1969), the Court struck down a 1-year durational residency period required for state welfare eligibility in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. The Court stated that since the right to travel is a fundamental right, it can only be restricted by a "compelling" governmental interest or strict scrutiny. Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia failed to meet the burden of demonstrating a compelling interest which was more important than an individual's right to travel.

According to Goldstein (1973), the impact of *Shapiro v. Thompson* (1969) was widespread. The case implied that any law unfairly discriminating against one's right to live where he chooses can be invalidated unless a compelling state interest was shown. However, the Supreme Court itself pointed out the limitations to *Shapiro v. Thompson*. The case applied to the right to interstate travel, not intrastate travel; involved the exercise of a right to obtain the necessities of life, not the privilege of employment; and pertained to durational residency, not continuous residency. The *Shapiro v. Thompson* case had far reaching effects, and Lamer (1975) stated that lower courts were circumventing all of the limitations of the *Shapiro v. Thompson* case and were invalidating residency requirements.
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affecting only intrastate travel.

According to Hager (1980), the most noteworthy case of police and firemen challenging residency requirements was Detroit Police Officers Association v. City of Detroit (1972). The Michigan Supreme Court supported the residency requirement which denied waivers to policemen and reversed the rulings of the Wayne County Circuit Judge and Michigan Court of Appeals which had found that Detroit policemen were denied the equal protection afforded to other employees. The Michigan Supreme Court applied the minimum scrutiny test and found that Detroit demonstrated a legitimate interest in police/community relations sufficient to justify infringement on the policeman's constitutional right to travel. Also, the court acknowledged that a special relationship existed between the police and the community they patrol, a policeman's presence assured residents that a trained person was available immediately in emergencies, and recruitment of black officers was a positive goal.

The Detroit Police Officers Association v. City of Detroit, (1972) case was to have a profound impact on future litigation of residency requirements when the Michigan Supreme Court dismissed the case "for want of substantial federal question" (Goldstein, 1973). The court did not recognize the argument that the right to live where a citizen chooses was a fundamental personal liberty requiring the compelling state interest test. Many lower courts interpreted the Michigan Supreme Court dismissal to mean that continuous residency requirements did not raise an equal protection claim (Rubin, 1978).
According to Hager (1980), only two courts have found that continual residency requirements infringe upon a fundamental constitutional right and require the strict scrutiny test of compelling municipal interests. Donnelly v. City of Manchester (1971) was the first case, and Krzewinski v. Kugler (1972) was the second case. Surprisingly, even though the two courts applied the same strict scrutiny and compelling interest standards, both courts reached different conclusions about residency requirements.

In Donnelly v. City of Manchester (1971), the Supreme Court of New Hampshire invalidated a city ordinance requiring all classified city employees to become Manchester residents within 12 months of employment. The court weighed public benefit from the residency requirement against the serious restriction on the fundamental right to travel. The municipal interests which were presented were economic ones, such as the public coffer theory; and those interests were not accepted by the court as compelling.

In Krzewinski v. Kugler (1973), a federal district court applied the strict scrutiny test to residency requirements and found that the city's compelling interest in promoting the employees' identity with the community justified the restriction on individuals' right to travel. The court upheld the residency requirement for police and firemen despite the finding that intrastate travel qualified as a fundamental right. Disregarding the familiar municipal arguments of "public coffer" and "public employment is a privilege not a right," the court presented a new, compelling, and legitimate interest behind residency requirements, the theory of the modern pattern of urban
disruption and dissipation (Hager, 1980). This theory suggests that the public servant could develop an unconscious disdain for the city and its residents if permitted to live outside the city limits. The New Jersey court found the municipal employer's compelling interest in avoiding disengagement between personal life and working hours more important than any encroachment on an individual's right to commute and upheld the residency requirement.

In *Ector v. City of Torrance* (1973), the plaintiff, a librarian, argued that the court should apply the compelling state interest test to strike down a residency requirement that denied his constitutional rights to equal protection, travel, and public employment. California's Second District Court of Appeals could find no compelling governmental interest to infringe upon the freedom to travel and did strike down the residency requirement. However, the California Supreme Court reversed the court of appeals by applying the rational basis test. According to Rhyne et al. (1977), the court accepted every municipal interest argument that the city offered which included: (a) promotion of ethnic balance, (b) reduction of high unemployment rates of inner-city minorities, (c) improvement of relations between such groups and city employees, (d) enhancement of job performance by greater personal knowledge of city conditions and by a feeling of a personal stake in the city's progress, (e) reduction in employee tardiness and absenteeism, (f) available emergency personnel, and (g) the city's economic benefit from local expenditure of employees' salaries.
Finally a residency case came before the United States Supreme Court, and it was hoped that the Court's decision would eliminate the confusion about the constitutionality of continuous residency requirements. The Supreme Court was urged, when hearing arguments in McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission (1976), to declare as fundamental the right to commute and the right to live and work where one chose. However, the Court used McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission (1976) to reaffirm the inapplicability of both Shapiro v. Thompson (1969) and the compelling interest test for continuous residency requirements, and the Court also upheld the constitutionality of such requirements under minimum scrutiny standards (Rhyne et al., 1977).

In McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission (1976), a veteran fireman moved his family out of Philadelphia and defended his actions on the grounds that he believed the city was unsafe. He claimed that the residency requirement abridged his fundamental right to travel. In ruling against McCarthy, the Supreme Court found no support for McCarthy's claim that the right to live elsewhere while employed by the city of Philadelphia was a right protected by the U.S. Constitution.

The Supreme Court's refusal to apply the compelling interest rationale of Shapiro v. Thompson (1969) reaffirmed the view that continuous residency requirements must be tested under the rational basis with minimal scrutiny. The justification for the use of the rational basis test was that such residency requirements did not infringe on any fundamental rights (Rhyne et al., 1977). The decision
in *McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission* (1976) was said to galvanize other cities to either enact similar residency requirements or to enforce antiquated statutes (Rubin, 1978).

Although *McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission* (1976) clarified the legality of residency requirements, some controversy and confusion still occurred. The New Jersey Supreme Court refused to hear a challenge to a state statute that exempted police and firemen from residency requirements (Orr, 1985). The New Jersey Senate narrowly approved a bill allowing municipalities to require future policemen and firemen to reside where they were employed (Zarate, 1985). The Rhode Island Supreme Court upheld the firing of a former East Providence city treasurer who did not move into the city within the grace period the residency policy allowed ("Residency Rules Increase," 1976). The New York State Court of Appeals struck down a New York City residency law in 1980; however, the New York City Council, in 1986, passed another law requiring new hires in some city agencies to live within the city limits ("New N.Y.C. Residency Law," 1986). A federal appeals court ruled that three Cicero, Illinois, ordinances which prevent nonresidents from applying for municipal jobs effectively excluded blacks from municipal employment and ordered a federal district court to reconsider a preliminary injunction against enforcement of the ordinances ("Three Cicero, Illinois, Residency Laws," 1986). The California Court of Appeals ruled that an ordinance requiring San Leandro Fire Department personnel to live within 40 road miles of the fire station is not so unreasonable as to make it constitutionally defective ("Residency
Ordinance for Fire Fighters," 1986). The Connecticut Supreme Court upheld a residency ordinance which required Bridgeport city employees to live in the city despite the fact that the ordinance had not been enforced for 40 years ("City Workers May Be Required," 1985). The Michigan State Court of Appeals affirmed a lower court's decision reinstating a Saginaw fire fighter who was discharged in 1981 for allegedly violating a city ordinance requiring city employees to maintain a permanent residence within the city limits ("Arbitrator's Decision Will Stand," 1984).

Despite the confusion and complexity surrounding the study of court cases involving continuous residency requirements, such requirements, if well written and backed by strong municipal rationale, have consistently been upheld in courts using the minimal scrutiny test. Since McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission (1976), municipal employees have primarily concentrated their formal challenges to residency requirements through union efforts at the bargaining table.

Reasons for Residency of Municipal Employees

Many reasons for the existence of residency requirements for municipal employees have been expressed by various authorities. Rubin (1978) lists seven reasons that city governments have cited for favoring residency rules:

They insure that employees take pride in their work.

Living in the city, they have a greater stake in its quality of life.
They provide jobs for the city's own residents.

They help achieve racial and ethnic balance in the work force.

They protect the public coffer, since people tend to spend money where they live.

They enlarge the emergency manpower pool.

They foster employee identity with the community.

(p. 257)

Two other justifications for residency requirements have also been cited. Hager (1980) said that residency requirements could help prevent the further decline in the character, health, and safety of cities. Eisinger (1980) found that one residency requirement was enacted to save energy used by commuters. Each of these nine reasons for favoring residency rules will be discussed in this section.

Pride in Work and Job Performance

Rubin (1978) indicated that one reason favoring residency requirements was that employees who live in the city will take pride in their work and have a greater stake in the quality of the city's life. This rationale appears to be based on two factors: (a) pride in work and (b) job performance. Each part will be discussed separately.

The pride in work reason implies that the quality of job performance will be enhanced in employees who reside in the municipality. The New Jersey Supreme Court remarked in Kennedy v. City of Newark (cited in Rhyne et al, 1977) that "Government may well conclude that residence will supply a stake or incentive for better
performance in office or employment" (p. 60). The city of Torrance argued that residency requirements furthered governmental interests by the enhancement of job performance by greater personal knowledge of city conditions (Rhyne et al, 1977). The California Supreme Court, in Ector v. City of Torrance (1973), accepted the city's argument that residency requirements improve the quality of job performance.

Although not mentioned by Rubin (1978), another way that residency requirements may improve job performance is through diminution of absenteeism and tardiness. Employees who live in the city limits have shorter distances to travel to work leading to lower absenteeism and tardiness. This argument favoring residency requirements has been accepted in Ector v. City of Torrance (1973).

Residency requirements have encouraged workers to have a greater stake in the quality of the city's life. It is thought that employees residing in the city that employs them care more about the city than employees residing outside the city. According to Lamer (1975), this reason for residency has been accepted as a legitimate municipal interest in the three court cases of Detroit Police Officers Association v. City of Detroit, (1972), Ector v. City of Torrance, (1973), and Kennedy v. City of Newark, (1959),

Jobs for City's Residents

Rubin (1978) indicated that city governments favor residency requirements because such requirements provide jobs for the city's own residents. At times of high local unemployment, such as the
depression and the 1970s, residency laws were enacted or revived to reserve municipal jobs for a city's own workers or to open more jobs for unemployed minorities (Eisinger, 1980). In *McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission* (1976) and *Ector v. City of Torrance* (1973), high unemployment rates for inner-city minority groups were cited as reasons for residency requirements. In Oakland, California, according to Thompson (cited in Eisinger), personnel administrators who were under pressure to open more city jobs to minorities, pushed successfully for the enactment of a residency law. Residency requirements have eliminated many white suburban workers from the competition for municipal civil service jobs.

**Improve the Racial and Ethnic Balance**

Rubin (1978) stated that city governments favor residency rules because rules help achieve racial and ethnic balance in the work force. As previously mentioned, minorities benefit from residency requirements because many are already residents of the cities. The Michigan Supreme Court recognized that recruitment of black police officers was a positive goal and legitimate governmental interest (*Detroit Police Officers Association v. City of Detroit*, 1972). Achieving racial and ethnic balance in the work force has been accepted as a governmental interest furthered by residency requirements in *Ector v. City of Torrance* (1973).
Promote Confidence in Local Government

According to Rubin (1978), city governments favored residency rules because confidence in local government was promoted. Residency was a way to show citizens that those who work for the city also feel the city is a good place to live (Hayford, 1978).

Protect the Public Coffer

Rubin (1978) stated that city governments favor residency requirements because such rules protect the public coffers. This reason is the most frequently expressed and most persistent rationale for residency laws according to Eisinger (1980). Residency requirements have been upheld in court cases when the public coffers argument was used (Abrahams v. Civil Service Commission of New Jersey, City of Newark, 1974; Ector v. City of Torrance, 1973; Eisinger, 1980; Kennedy v. City of Newark, 1959; Salt Lake City Fire Fighters Local 1645 v. Salt Lake City, 1969). The presumed economic benefits to New York City by the spending of resident workers was a prominent argument in the mayor's efforts to obtain a residency law ("New N.Y.C. Residency Law," 1986).

Enlarge the Emergency Manpower Pool

A reason for residency requirements is that they enlarge the emergency manpower pool (Rubin, 1978). The "proximity" argument has frequently been cited to justify residency requirements for municipal police officers and fire fighters. The Utah Supreme Court accepted
the need to have fire fighters live in the city in *Salt Lake City Fire Fighters Local 1645 v. Salt Lake City* (1969). Zarate (1985) cited Senator Lynch of New Jersey as stating that it is "unrealistic to call back workers who live 30 miles away" (p. E14). Police officers also need to live in close proximity of the urban municipality. According to Orr (1985), police officers are paid to be on call 24 hours a day, and when officers reside outside the city the city loses several hours of their time each day. The Michigan Supreme Court (*Detroit Police Officers Association v. City of Detroit*, 1972) acknowledged that a policeman's presence in the city, whether on or off duty, assures residents that a specially trained person is available immediately if law enforcement is necessary.

**Identify With the Community**

Another reason for residency requirements for municipal employees cited by Rubin (1978) was that the resident employees identified with the community. By virtue of living in the community where they work, it is assumed that employees would become familiar with the community, identify with the community, develop concern for the community, and be sensitive and responsive to the community. In *Krzewinski v. Kugler* (1972), the court concluded that residency requirements promoted community identity among police and firemen, resulted in chance associations and encounters which might lead to invaluable sources of information, increased community rapport, and decreased misunderstanding and violence. This rationale of identifying with the community has been used in such court cases as *Detroit*
Police Officers Association v. City of Detroit (1972), Ector v. City of Torrance (1973), and Kennedy v. City of Newark (1975), as well as in such city ordinances as Cincinnati (Eisinger, 1980).

Harney (1985), writing about required residency in New York City, indicated that resident employees would be affected by the same pressures and problems as other citizens and would more readily identify with life in New York City.

**Prevent Further Decline of Cities**

Hager (1980) indicated that a reason for supporting residency requirements is to prevent the further decline in the character, health, and safety of inner cities. In Krzewinski v. Kugler (cited in Hager) the court accepted the "modern pattern of urban disruption and dissipation prevalent today" (p. 198) as a valid city interest for the justification of residency requirements. The court recognized that there was deeply rooted disrespect for an absentee police force which ruled by day and resided elsewhere at night. Residency requirements would prevent total disengagement between personal life and working hours (Hager, 1980). Residency requirements bring new families, loyalties, and financial resources into the cities. Many cities have problems such as increased welfare burdens, residential blight, unemployment, declining city tax base, poor quality schools, inadequate housing, the threat of insolvency, and high crime rates. Residency requirements can halt or reverse the flight from the central cities.
According to Hager (1980), courts must uphold residency requirements in order to save the health of American cities. Residency requirements are consistent with urban redevelopment attempts to stop urban decay which is a compelling governmental interest that could stand up in court against even the fundamental right of intrastate travel. It satisfies the equal protection tests and incorporates all of the earlier contentions: city familiarity, proximity, mutual financial support, psychological disengagement per Krzewinski, and the reduction of residents' unemployment.

Conserve Energy

Eisinger (1980) explained a reason for residency requirements which was voiced by the city of Portland, Oregon. A residency ordinance was imposed to reduce the energy used by city employees in their journey to work.

All of these reasons for residency requirements have been expressed by municipal authorities, attorneys, judges, and concerned citizens. Court cases concerning residency requirements have been won or lost based upon such testimony.

Residency and Educational Employees

Residency requirements for school employees have been affected by the same influences and the same trends as described by Eisinger (1980) for municipal workers. Throughout this century, residency requirements have fluctuated in their prevalence.
This section on residency requirements for school employees includes information about the history of residency requirements for school employees, court cases involving residency requirements for educational personnel, and reasons cited in support of residency requirements for educational personnel.

History of Residency Requirements for Educational Employees

One of the jobs of school boards is to set standards for the hiring of school personnel. One of those standards may be a residency requirement. According to Engelhardt (1931),

The school board has discretionary power and may establish reasonable rules and regulations governing eligibility to hold a position in the school district over which it has jurisdiction. In many situations this power has been the means of maintaining very high professional standards for all the positions in the school system. On the other hand, rare cases may be cited in which school boards insist that teachers control their social life as set forth in the contract. Some of these restrictive requirements are as follows . . . to reside within the school district. (p. 178)

Logan (1927) found that many superintendents preferred outsiders because they were afraid of local teachers. The superintendents recommended that no more than one-quarter of local talent be hired.

In Boston in 1930, an attempt to exclude nonresident teachers created national interest. Legislation to require all of the city's teachers to reside in the district was vetoed by the governor. The motivating factors for this action were economic interests and a desire to gain a more strict control of the teaching staff ("Boston's Solution," 1930). St. Louis had a similar occurrence in 1929 (Jewell, 1954).
Studies have been conducted to determine the extent to which local teachers have been preferred over nonresident teachers. Jewell (1954) reported that a national study conducted by the Research Division of the National Education Association in 1932 found that 80% of the school districts in cities with populations over 100,000 preferred local residents, while 44% of the school districts in cities with population between 2,500-5,000 preferred local residents. Jewell also reported that a similar study in 1942, which compared results to 1932, found that school districts in cities of 100,000 preferred local residents in the same percentages; three categories of school districts in cities with populations between 2,500 and 30,000 decreased in their preference for local teachers from 1 to 7%; and school districts in cities with populations of 30,000 to 100,000 increased in their preference for local teachers by 2%.

Cooke, Cardwell, and Dark (1946) confirmed the findings of the 1942 study by the National Education Association (cited in Jewell, 1954). They found that since 1940, there was less preference given to local candidates for teaching positions. Hiring conditions were affected by economic conditions, a teacher shortage, and a change in professional attitudes.

Umstattd and Hanson (1937) surveyed approximately three-fourths of Minnesota's superintendents and reported that 54% of the superintendents preferred to have no local teachers on their staffs. However, Umstattd and Hanson also found that the percentage of teachers actually employed by districts greatly exceeded the desired levels of the superintendents.
The city of Madison, Wisconsin, had a residency requirement for teachers in the 1940s (Stockinger, 1982). However, the requirement was not enforced when the baby boom era caused a teacher shortage.

Atkinson (1948) found that only 8% of 157 selected cities throughout the United States required teachers to have local residence for appointment to a teaching position. Forty-six percent of those which required residency had populations over 100,000.

In 1954, Jewell conducted his own comprehensive study regarding teacher residency. One part of the study was similar to the earlier ones by the Research Division of the National Education Association (cited in Jewell) concerning preference by districts for hiring local teachers. His survey included responses from 549 cities throughout the United States. He found that there was a complete reversal from the 1930s and 1940s on the part of districts regarding their preference to hiring local teachers. He discovered that the number of districts with populations in excess of 100,000 which preferred local teachers had decreased from 80% to 36%; the number of districts with populations of 30,000 to 100,000 which preferred local teachers had decreased from 79% to 28%; and even the smallest cities of 2,500–5,000 which preferred to hire local teachers decreased from 42% to 11%.

Jewell (1954) studied administrative hiring practices for teachers and found that fewer than 1% of the responding cities restricted employment to local teachers; 1.2% of the cities restricted employment to nonlocal teachers; 17–20% of the cities, particularly larger ones, preferred local residents if their qualifications are equal to
nonlocals; and 73-77% of the districts reported no preferences involving residence in the process of hiring teachers. Of the cities which Jewell surveyed, 12% changed their hiring practices during the 1940s; and a shortage of teachers and a scarcity of housing facilities were the two most prevalent reasons given for the changes in hiring practices.

The administrative practices which affected the residence of teachers after being hired was also studied by Jewell (1954). He found that approximately 20% of all the cities surveyed expected nonresident teachers to find a residence in the district after being hired. The expectation of residency was not reported in one city with a population over 100,000, but the expectation was reported in the smallest cities (2,500-5,000) with the highest percentage, 27%.

The Middle Atlantic states made the fewest demands for teacher residency. Approximately 10% of the cities surveyed requested that teachers move within the district after being hired. The largest group of school districts (44%) had no concern about whether a teacher moved into the district.

Jewell (1954) also surveyed practices concerning residency and its influence upon teachers' salaries, promotions, and assignment to extra duties. Only 3 districts out of 549 reported that there was any relationship between teacher residency and salary which was contrary to earlier reports of higher pay for nonresident teachers. Residency was not a factor in promotions in 97% of the districts surveyed. Only 5 districts reported any relationship between residency and extracurricular duties. However, administrators reported
that local teachers assumed more than their share of extra duties.

The existence of residency policies for teachers was examined by Jewell (1954). He tabulated the responses of the 549 cities and found that 24% of the cities had some kind of residency policy, and 31% of the smallest cities and 10% of the largest cities had policies.

Jewell (1954) also studied "teacherages" which were residences for teachers which were owned or controlled by the school district and developed as an inducement to persuade teachers to venture into certain sections of the country where schools were needed. Jewell found that 8% of the school districts operated teacherages and that the largest number were found in the smallest cities.

The permanence of teacher residency was also studied by Jewell (1954). He received 510 responses from cities regarding the number of teachers who were permanent residents of the districts in which they taught. Jewell found that two-thirds of the teachers were permanent residents. Cities with populations of more than 100,000 had the greatest percentage of permanent residents. Approximately 17% of the teachers had temporary residences within the teaching district, and approximately 15% of the teachers had permanent residences outside the teaching district. In general, Jewell found that the larger the city, the smaller the number of temporary residents. The Middle Atlantic states had the highest percentage of commuters. More than twice as many women as men made their homes only temporary residences.
Michaels (1980) investigated the prevailing practices of continuous residency requirements for public school employees. He reported that residency requirements were forbidden by law in the following states in the following years: Indiana (1952), South Carolina (1953), Minnesota (1971), Rhode Island (1976), California (1977), Oklahoma (1977), Connecticut (1978), Massachusetts (1978), and Utah (1979). Three other states also had laws affecting the residency of teachers in some manner. In Hawaii (1976), all employees in the service of the state, county, or municipal government had to be state residents at time of application or demonstrate their intent to make Hawaii their permanent home. A 1977 Illinois law concerning teacher residency stated that residency was required at the time of hiring in order to be considered in determining the compensation of a teacher or whether to retain a teacher. New Mexico (1978) required all state employees except teachers and professional employees of state educational institutions and certified employees of the public schools to be state residents.

As part of his study, Michaels (1980) surveyed the five largest school districts in each of the 48 continental states plus the state of Hawaii (which is a single school district) and the District of Columbia. He found that continuous residency requirements were not prevalent in the 197 responding school districts since only 8% of the responding districts had residency requirements in effect. Districts with more than 100,000 students or less than 10,000 students were the most likely to have residency requirements.
Michaels (1980) found that 82% of the 23 districts in the study who had enacted residency regulation did so in the 1970s. Residency was an issue in the 1970s in 24% of the responding school districts, and the issue was the most prevalent in the Northeast region of the country.

Analysis of Michaels's (1980) data which were collected on the residency policies which were in effect across the nation revealed that residency requirements were being enforced in 87% of districts. Those districts with residency requirements did not require employees who were already hired to move into the district in 87% of the cases. Most districts allowed 1 month to 1 year to move into the resident district; although, 43% had no specified time period to move in.

Michaels (1980) found that the residency policies in 62% of the districts covered only part of the school employees. Half of the districts required the superintendent and line administrators to live in the district, and only one district required teachers to be residents.

Rewards and repercussions for school employees in districts with residency policies were also studied by Michaels (1980). He found that school districts with residency requirements did not generally offer any extra benefits or considerations to employees for residing within the school district. However, it was common for school districts to require employees to remain residents as a condition of employment, and violation of the requirement was a basis for termination.
Michaels (1980) found two trends in his study. First, state legislatures were increasingly enacting legislation prohibiting continuous residency for public school employees. Second, more large school districts were passing residency requirements.

In the 1970s and 1980s, there were teacher residency requirements in several large cities in the United States including Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Boston, Buffalo, and Syracuse. According to the New York Times (cited in Michaels, 1980) the New York City Board of Education was considering a policy. Chicago's residency policy for new teachers became effective September 1, 1980 (Ogletree, Starkman, & Dora, 1982). In Philadelphia, new teachers hired after August 23, 1983, had to become city residents within 1 year of their employment ("Philadelphia Adopts Residency Rule," 1983).

In 1979, Outwin (cited in Lee, 1982) surveyed selected high school principals in Michigan regarding administrative residency requirements. Outwin found that 68% of the respondents lived in the school district which they served, and that residency was only a required condition of employment for 20% of those surveyed.

Lee (1982) surveyed 222 selected members of the lay public in rural Michigan cities regarding administrative residency requirements. Lee found that 8% of respondents stated residency requirements were established in their district. Yet in every sample district either implied or mandatory residency requirements existed.

There has been a pattern to first enact residency requirements for city employees and then to follow with residency requirements for teachers. Such was the case in Boston and Denver.

Both Boston and Denver repealed their teacher residency requirements in the 1980s. Following intensive lobbying by teachers' unions, Massachusetts Governor Dukakis signed a law in 1986 which banned local residency requirements for newly hired public school teachers ("New Law Prohibits Residency Rules," 1986). The new law struck down ordinances in Boston, Springfield, Fall River, and other jurisdictions in Massachusetts. Denver's residency guideline for new teachers was repealed by the Denver Board of Education in 1985, because it was an invasion of personal freedom and limited the district's ability to recruit top talent during a predicted teacher shortage (Bingham, 1985).

In 1987, House Bill No. 4183 was introduced into the Michigan legislature to amend the school code to prohibit local and intermediate school districts from adopting "a rule or policy preventing or discouraging the promotion of an employee on the basis of that employee's residence" (pp. 4-5). As of May 1989, the bill was still being studied in the Committee on Education.

Court Cases Involving Educational Employees

Court cases pertaining to residency requirements for school district personnel have primarily involved teachers. As with court cases for municipal employees, continuous residency requirements for educational employees have generally been upheld in court.
One of the earliest court cases concerned whether a school board could determine the location of a teacher's residence. The Supreme Court of New Hampshire in *Horne v. School District of Chester* (1910) ruled that school boards could not determine a teacher's boarding place and make residence at such a place a condition of the employment contract.

In California, the court in *Stuart v. Board of Education of City and County of San Francisco* (1911) stated that a school board could require teachers and other employees to live in the city and county during employment. Requiring residency was a reasonable exercise of the power of school board.

An appeals court in California in *Lansing v. Board of Education of City and County of San Francisco* (1935) struck down a provision of the charter of San Francisco which required all employees of the city to reside there including teachers. The court said school districts were separate entities from the city and county of San Francisco and under the direct control of the board of education. Board members were officers of a political subdivision of the state which was separate from the municipality within which it was located.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in *Jones v. Kulpmont Borough School District* (1939) ruled against unscrupulous school boards. The court did not support the dismissal of a teacher who resided outside the district since the school board had no general policy regarding residency. The court did maintain that a policy requiring a teacher to reside in the district was reasonable.
Michaels (1980) stated that there were few challenges to residency requirements in the 1940–1960s; however, one case was heard by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. In 1944, the Appeal of Sinton case (cited in Michaels, 1980) upheld a school board residency requirement and found that the appellant's negligence in complying with the residency requirement was persistent, willful, and unlawful.

The Michigan Supreme Court refused to review the appeals court ruling in Park v. Lansing School District and Board of Education of Lansing School District (1975). The appeals court ruled in favor of the board's residency policy which mandated that administrative personnel hired after July 1, 1962, live within the school district.

As previously mentioned, the New Hampshire Supreme Court, in Donnelly v. City of Manchester (1971), invalidated a residency ordinance based on the constitutional issue of a fundamental right to travel. It was a teacher who succeeded in having the residency ordinance for all city employees thrown out.

The Wyoming Supreme Court, in O'Melia v. Sweetwater County School District No. 1 (1972) ruled that a school district could require teachers to reside in the district at least 5 days a week. Such a requirement did not deprive teachers of right to live where they choose.

A federal district court, in Hansen v. Unified School District No. 500, Wyandotte County, Kansas (1973), upheld two teachers' claims that a residency requirement violated their civil rights under the equal protection clause of the constitution. The court stated that the classification of residents versus nonresidents was essentially
arbitrary and did not rest upon any reasonable basis since the school
district failed to show that residents were any more effective teach­
ers than nonresidents.

McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission (1976), which
was previously discussed as the landmark case for municipal residency
requirements, was just as important for school employee residency
requirements. According to Michaels (1980), the McCarthy v. Phila-
delphia Civil Service Commission case provided the opportunity for
school districts to adopt continuous residency regulations without
the fear of having them rendered unconstitutional by the courts.
Eighteen percent of the school districts in Michaels's study who
enacted residency requirements reported that the McCarthy v. Phila-
delphia Civil Service Commission court case was influential. All
post-McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission cases except
one have upheld the right of school districts to impose continuous
residency requirements.

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, in Wardwell v. Board of Edu-
cation of City School District of City of Cincinnati (1976), upheld a
90-day grace period to establish residency. The court found that the
right to intrastate travel is not protected by the Constitution and
that there was rational basis for the school board's residency re-
quirement. A school teacher brought action against a Cincinnati
School Board rule requiring all teachers to reside in the district
within 90 days of employment.

The Federal District Court of Pennsylvania, in Pittsburgh Fed-
eration of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers,
APL-CIO v. Aaron (1976), upheld the resolution adopted by the school board to impose residency on future school district employees. The court used the rational basis test and declared that continuous residency requirement did not violate an individual's right to interstate or intrastate travel.

The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in Utah, in Mogle v. Sevier County School District (1976), affirmed the right of the school district to enforce its continuous residency requirement which affected a guidance counselor. The court relied on the rational basis test to uphold the constitutionality of the regulation.

The case of Angwin v. City of Manchester (1978) affirmed Donnelly v. City of Manchester (1971). The court held that a residency ordinance for teachers was offensive to the New Hampshire constitution and was unconstitutional.

Generally, continuous residency requirements that are in a district's best interests have been upheld since the McCarthy v. Philadelphia Civil Service Commission (1976) case eliminated the right to travel issue. However, school employees have utilized their unions and collective bargaining to address concerns about residency requirements. Johnson (1977) stated that the Michigan Public Employment Relations Act imposes upon boards of education the duty to bargain in good faith about the wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment including residency requirements.
Reasons for Residency Requirements for Educational Employees

Reasons for residency requirements for educational employees are similar to reasons for residency requirements for municipal employees. Michaels (1980) surveyed 197 school districts throughout the United States to find out the reasons school boards enacted residency requirements. He found the following seven reasons:

A personal stake in the progress of the community will be fostered in each employee.

The community will enjoy the economic benefits which will accrue from local expenditures of employees' salaries.

There will be improved relations between minority groups and school district employees.

An ethnic balance in the community will be promoted.

There will be a reduction of unemployment in the community.

There will be an enhancement of the quality of employee performance through greater personal knowledge of the environment of the school district.

There will be a reduction of absenteeism and tardiness with regard to public school employees. (p. 46)

Each of these seven reasons for residency requirements for school employees will be discussed in this section.

Personal Stake in the Community

Michaels (1980) reported that school boards believed that "the most important reason for imposing a residency requirement was the belief that a personal stake in the progress of the community would be fostered in each employee" (p. 44). In his study, 81% of the 16 districts where a continuous residency requirement regulation was in
effect chose personal stake in the community as a rationale for having a residency requirement.

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals (Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976) upheld teacher residency requirements based upon several rational bases. One reason was that teachers living in the district would be involved in school and community activities and be more likely to be committed to the district and its schools.

Outwin's study (cited in Lee, 1982) found that high school principals believed living in a district would affect their community involvement. A majority of the high school principals in his study thought resident administrators would be more involved in school and community activities and that the principals' presence in the district would lend a perception of support for the community.

Community members believe that residency increases administrators' community involvement. Lee (1982) found that lay respondents thought resident high school principals were more accessible to parents and students, resident administrators were more easily involved in school and community activities, and residency illustrated administrative support for school and community.

Clark and Williams (1979) argued for the required residency of school superintendents because of the social benefits to community. Resident superintendents would be available to provide leadership in civic responsibilities and setting community goals.
**Enhancement of Job Performance**

According to Michaels (1980), the second most frequently cited reason for the enactment of residency requirements by school boards was the conviction that the quality of employee job performance would be enhanced through greater personal knowledge of the environment of the school district. Courts in such cases as *Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron* (1976) and *Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati* (1976) have accepted rationale that residency requirements aid in hiring teachers who are highly motivated or have better job performance.

Bandlow (1976) built a case for residency requirements enhancing job performance for administrators through a study with resident and nonresident administrators. He stated that resident principals appeared to place a greater emphasis on administrative behaviors related to improving school-community relations. His study showed significant differences between the role perception of the resident principal and the nonresident principal on such items as having a greater commitment to opening the schools to community use, dealing with behavior and discipline problems, and improving the effectiveness of the professional teaching staff. "If one accepts the assumption that the way one perceives his job strongly influences the way one performs his job, then the implications for school policy-makers are clear. The residence of the professional staff can no longer be ignored" (p. 28).
Further support for residency requirements improving job performance is given by a study by McKlveen (1953). He found that hometown teachers were more inclined to participate in extracurricular activities, were less transient, and were more experienced.

**Economic Benefits to Community**

According to Michaels (1980), the third most frequently cited reason that school boards enacted residency requirements was community enjoyment of the economic benefits which would accrue from local expenditures of employees' salaries. This reason is the public coffer theory which was previously explained. Resident teachers and administrators would be more likely to spend their income in the community where they reside.

In addition to the public coffer theory, the community could also benefit economically from increased tax revenues. Residency requirements were thought to encourage teachers to vote for school taxes and help with the passage of tax levies (Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 1400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976; Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976). Bandlow (1976) stated that teachers and administrators with above average incomes could benefit the community economically by paying property taxes. A majority of the lay community in Lee's (1982) study believed that a valid reason for residency requirements was that administrators should be taxpayers in the community.
Reduction of Absenteeism and Tardiness

The fourth most frequently cited reason that school boards gave for residency policies was a reduction in absenteeism and tardiness (Michaels, 1980). In his study, 31% of the school districts with residency requirements stated that they enacted residency requirements for that reason. Reduction of absenteeism and tardiness was accepted as a reason for residency requirements in Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron (1976).

Promote Ethnic Balance

Michaels (1980) found that school boards enacted residency policies because they believed that an ethnic balance in the community would be promoted. Twenty-five percent of the districts in his study listed this reason for choosing residency requirements. A residence requirement would also encourage integration in society and in the schools (Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976).

Reduction in Unemployment

School boards enacted residency policies because they believed such policies would reduce the unemployment in the community (Michaels, 1980). Twenty-five percent of the districts in Michaels's study stated that a residency policy would have that effect. Reducing the unemployment rates of inner-city citizens was accepted.
rationale by district court in *Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron* (1976).

**Improved Relations Between Minorities and School District Employees**

Michaels (1980) found that 25% of the school boards which enacted residency requirements believed that such requirements improved the relations between minority groups and school district employees. This reason was also supported by *Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati* (1976). The court stated that resident teachers were more likely to gain sympathy and understanding for the racial, social, economic, and urban problems of the children they teach.

In the 1920-1930s different reasons for preferring educators to live within the district existed. In the 1920s, some local teachers were paid less than nonresident teachers so school boards were in favor of the economic savings of hiring residents (Jewell, 1954).

Cooke (1939) suggested eight influences which have had an effect on the determining the preference of school boards for local teachers.

1. The local teacher knows better how to deal with the peculiarities of persons and conditions in the community.

2. The local teacher has the advantage of more healthful and convenient living conditions while at home.

3. The local teacher knows best the influential folks in town and can "steer" their interest to the benefit of the school.

4. The local teacher usually has a longer tenure.
5. The local teacher spends week-ends and vacations in the community and may be of service to the community.

6. The local teacher can better secure the support of local groups in behalf of the school.

7. The local teacher can be of assistance in expediting the social adjustment of non-resident teachers.

8. The local teacher who is a superior teacher and might be attracted elsewhere is inclined to stay at home. (pp. 101-102)

Reasons Against Residency Requirements

The history of residency requirements has shown that the existence of such requirements depends on the economic state of the municipality, the professional philosophy of the employees, and the supply of workers available. The court cases have shown that persons in varying occupations have vehemently opposed having their freedom of travel or choice in housing location limited by their employer.

Reasons for requiring residency for municipal and school employees have been presented. Support for such reasons has been provided based upon accepted rationale in court cases, professional opinions, and research studies.

However, a discussion of residency requirements would not be complete without an investigation into the reasons that residency requirements are challenged and opposed. The next sections will discuss the reasons against residency requirements for municipal employees and school district employees.
Reasons Against Residency Requirements for Municipal Employees

Continuous residency requirements if properly written will withstand challenges in court. However, the fact that such requirements are legal, does not change the negative opinions about residency requirements that employees have. There seems to be four main arguments against residency for municipal employees. First, even though the requirements are legal in the eyes of the court, employees and legal commentators still view residency requirements as violating employees' fundamental right to travel and live where they choose. Second, most of the reasons frequently stated in support of residency requirements can be refuted or be solved by less controversial solutions than required residency. Third, there are possible side effects which may occur as a result of residency policies. Fourth, there is a lack of evidence and research to substantiate whether the requirements really produce the effects which proponents believe. Four main reasons against residency requirements for municipal workers will be discussed in this section.

Violation of Fundamental Rights

City employees and legal commentators insist that residency requirements are unconstitutional. However, the highest courts in the land have consistently upheld continuous residency requirements.

City employees forced to reside within the municipal boundaries as a condition of their employment have attacked residency requirements on several grounds. Public employees allege that their right
to travel and right to live where they choose is violated and they are being denied equal protection under the laws. The aggrieved workers argue that state and federal constitutions guarantee that the right to travel is a fundamental right and that all citizens are guaranteed equal protection. Consequently, residency requirements which discriminate against nonresidents deny equal protection and encroach upon the fundamental right to travel freely.

Hager (1980) explained that in court cases where a fundamental right is not being threatened, the courts apply the traditional minimum scrutiny test which allows statutory discrimination if the facts reasonably may be conceived to justify it. In the case of equal protection a violation will be found only if the classification is based on grounds wholly irrelevant to accomplishing the municipality's objective.

Most municipalities can show rational relationships between residency requirements and the cities' needs. So residency cases based on violation of equal protection are difficult to win.

In cases where a fundamental right such as the right to travel is alleged to be violated, the municipality must meet a more stringent test and show compelling reasons for discriminating against nonresidents. The right to travel between states is a fundamental right. However, according to Hager (1980), the courts have not reached consensus on whether the right to intrastate travel and the right to commute are fundamental.

Lamer (1975) stated:
In a proper case, the Court should recognize that an individual's right to travel to another state would be meaningless if, once he arrived, his constitutional protection were to be confined within the boundaries of the county or political subdivision in which he found himself originally. No valid distinction between interstate and intrastate travel can be made. (p. 461)

Until intrastate travel is determined to be a fundamental right, the cities need show only rational relationships to support residency requirements.

Needless to say, the average public employee does not understand the legal technicalities of how a residency requirement which restricts his travel and residence choice can be legal. Hager (1980) commented about residency requirements as viewed by legal commentators who understand judicial technicalities:

Legal commentators unanimously support the invalidation of residency requirements, contending that such ordinances penalize an individual's exercise of his right to travel. Examining the employment relationship in isolation, commentators argue that municipalities do not have the authority to impose conditions on employment which courts would not tolerate in the private sector. Further, no municipal interest justifies interference with a nonresident's constitutional right to live and work where he chooses. (p. 217)

Refuting Reasons for Residency Requirements

Many of the reasons cited in support of residency can be argued or refuted. Many of the problems reported to be solved by residency requirements can be solved by less drastic measures than residency requirements. The following subsection will discuss such arguments and solutions.
Pride in work and job performance. Residency requirements are supposed to insure that employees take pride in their work and provide an incentive for efficient job performance. Yet, opponents argue that there is no proven connection between the quality of work performance and location of residence (Rubin, 1978). Reiter (1975) stated that courts generally have failed to critically examine the empirical support for the validity of the relationship between having a stake in the community and job performance. The Police Benevolent Association President stated "making a police officer live in New York City will not improve the quality of work performance" (Kramer, 1985, p. A5).

Reiter (1975) stated that many nonresidents formerly lived in the city and continued to have ties to the city via family, neighbors, and friends. Such former residents would have some incentive for efficient job performance through those contacts. Residency requirements are actually counter productive to hiring the best qualified candidates. Residency policies restrict cities' abilities to compete for qualified candidates (Weiss & Kramer, 1985). The job pool of potential applicants would be reduced by a residency restriction.

Stake in the community. Proponents of residency requirements state that residents have a greater stake in the city's quality of life and are better able to identify with the community. Courts have upheld residency requirements based upon this argument. However, Reiter (1975) stated that courts have failed to scrutinize empirical
support for such a position. "Indeed, it is difficult to imagine what kind of evidence a municipality could offer to attest to the psychological identification of resident and nonresident employees" (p. 1699).

The Supreme Court in Dunn v. Blumstein, (1972) said that residence does not guarantee knowledge about or interest in a community. Lamer (1975) stated that an individual employee's knowledge about and interest in community problems probably stems from the type of neighborhood in which the individual resides, and that neighborhood will be determined by income, social status, and educational background.

According to Goldstein (1973), as America has become urbanized, community boundaries have blurred. In a large city one could live outside the city yet more readily identify with the problems of the area where one works than one who lives in another area within the same city.

Lamer (1975) suggested two alternatives to residency requirements which would be more effective at acquainting employees with the problems of the community. On-the-job training programs or citizen-government community relation boards were examples.

Promote racial and ethnic balance. Proponents of residency requirements believe that such requirements help achieve racial and ethnic balance in the work force. Lamer (1975) stated that residency requirements penalize both blacks and whites who want to exercise their fundamental right to relocate and are less effective at solving
the problems of ethnic balance and inner-city minority unemployment. Affirmative action programs and measures to combat racial discrimination problems directly have been more effective than residency requirements (Goldstein, 1973; Lamer, 1975).

**Protect the public coffer.** Proponents of residency requirements have professed that such requirements protect the public coffer since people tend to spend money where they live. Both Lamer (1975) and Reiter (1975) argued that if city employees performed work that justified the cost of their salaries, then the city lost none of its resources by employing nonresidents.

Reiter (1975) stated that the public coffer theory must be subjected to factual investigation to ascertain if there is a substantial relationship to residency. It is not assured that city dwellers buy more goods and services in the city than suburbanites.

Goldstein (1973) suggested that the assessment of a city income tax proportioned between resident and nonresidents is a reasonable and nondiscriminatory alternative to residency requirements. The tax would assess nonresidents for city services which benefit them and make it impossible for the city employees to escape all taxes by living outside the city.

**Enlarge the emergency manpower pool.** Proponents of residency requirements believe that such requirements assure that emergency service providers will be available in emergencies. Reiter (1975) stated that the premise is based on two assumptions: (a) that employees living outside the city are farther removed geographically
from their place of employment than city residents and (b) employees are less able to report promptly for emergencies because of heavy traffic, weather, or civil disorders. Since many cities have irregular borders, it is conceivable that a nonresident could be closer to work than a resident. Some nonresidents may be further away from work in terms of air miles yet be closer in terms of road distance or time. Factual investigation is necessary to determine if residency requirements are substantially related to the emergency manpower objective (Reiter, 1975).

Both Kroopnick (1975) and Rhyne et al. (1977) suggested two alternatives to residency requirements when proximity to work is an issue. A requirement that an emergency employee live within a certain distance from his employment location or be able to respond within a given time interval is more rational and fair than setting the boundaries of the city limits.

Some alternatives to residency requirements have previously been mentioned (Goldstein, 1973; Kroopnick, 1975; Lamer, 1975; Reiter, 1975). Goldstein (1973) summarized the problems of cities as well as alternatives to residency requirements when he said:

Redevelopment programs to improve living conditions in the inner cities, modernized transportation facilities, improved shopping area, aesthetic recreation facilities—all these will serve to attract employees, and other commuters generally, to return to live within the city. Thus, the megalopolis of tomorrow cannot demand reverse migration; it must bribe it. (p. 530)
Side Effects of Residency Requirements

Residency requirements are extremely unpopular. In a survey of police officers in Detroit, 95% of the officers wanted to have the 72 year old residency requirement lifted, and two-thirds of the officers said that they would move out of Detroit within 5 years of the change in requirement (Howard, 1985). When sentiment against a requirement is great, there are likely to be side effects of the requirement that devalue or detract from the intended purpose of the requirement.

Kinkopf (1985) found that 15% of the police officers in Detroit had dual residences so that it appeared that they lived in the city when they actually lived outside the city. He also found that the police department had added personnel to the residency unit which investigated possible violations of the residency requirements in order to enforce the requirement.

Residency requirements are supposed to give workers a stake in the community. Senator Dorsey from New Jersey (cited in Zarate, 1985) remarked that residency requirements "create walls that keep people in urban areas against their will" (p. E14).

Lack of Empirical Support for Residency Requirements

Rubin (1978) and Reiter (1975) have already been cited as stating that support of residency requirements is not substantiated by empirical data. Eisinger (1980) stated that "residency laws are not only weak policy responses to the massive economic decay of American cities but also unproven devices in their economic effects" (p. 94).
Reasons Against Residency Requirements for Educational Employees

This subsection discusses the reasons frequently cited against residency requirements by educational personnel. First, reasons against residency requirements from 1939 will be given to add perspective to the discussion. Then the three main reasons against residency requirements today will be elaborated. Those reasons are: lack of popularity, refuting arguments for residency requirements, and lack of supportive evidence.

Previous Reasons Against Residency Requirements

Some years ago, Cooke (1939) listed eight reasons why it was an undesirable policy to hire local teachers. They were:

1. Often the local teacher does not receive the respect that would be given him away from home.

2. Local teachers were satisfied with lower salaries because they live at home. This adds to the difficulty of attracting good teachers from other districts.

3. A non-local teacher must earn promotions on the basis of merit and cannot depend on politics.

4. An incompetent local teacher is difficult to remove or transfer.

5. Frequently local teachers have home duties which prevent them from doing their best with their teaching responsibilities.

6. School boards cannot entertain unbiased opinions in matters which pertain to local teachers.

7. Occasionally inefficient local teachers are promoted to administrative positions because of politics.

8. Too many local teachers may cause the school district to become provincial. (p. 101)
Lack of Popularity of Residency Requirements

Residency requirements for educational employees are very unpopular as evidenced by court cases and collective bargaining agreements. Persons who are opposed to residency requirements for educational personnel are school board members, the lay public, and administrators and teachers.

Michaels (1980) found that school boards have not adopted continuous residency requirement regulations for three main reasons. First, the school board did not favor them. Second, the school board wished to avoid litigation. Third, there was a lack of support from the community and administration.

The members of the lay public are also opposed to residency requirements for educational personnel. One of the reasons some district school boards were unsuccessful in their attempts to enact residency requirements was community opinion that a residency policy was unacceptable (Michaels, 1980).

Administrators are opposed to residency requirements. In 1977, the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals passed MASSP Resolution #7 "Residency Requirements" (cited in Lee, 1982) which recommended that boards of education rescind residency requirements for administrators for four reasons. First, a residency requirement discriminates against capable and qualified persons. Second, adequate housing is not always available in the district. Third, there is no supportive evidence that residency and administrative effectiveness are related. Fourth, effective administrators are committed
to the district they serve regardless of the location of their residence.

Garvelink (1978) stated reasons why he as a school superintendent is opposed to residency requirements. A resident superintendent becomes less objective as an evaluator. There is more pressure on a superintendent's wife and children when they live in the district. There is less freedom to express one's self on other issues in the community when one lives in the district.

Two studies with high school principals in Michigan found that principals were opposed to residency requirements. Burde (cited in Lee, 1982) found that 64% of principals in his study opposed residency requirements. Outwin (cited in Lee, 1982) found that 55% of the principals in his study believed that a residency requirement was an infringement of their rights.

Residency requirements have not been popular with employees, and Michaels (1980) found that 37% of districts with residency requirements had been challenged by their employees through grievances, arbitration, and litigation. Eighteen percent of the districts with residency policies had considered revoking them because the policies were unnecessary, the district wanted to avoid litigation, the community insisted the policy be removed, or housing was unavailable.

School employees and teachers unions oppose residency requirements. Ogletree et al., (1982) surveyed 188 employees of the Chicago school system and found that 54% of the employees surveyed were opposed to required city residency. Forty-six percent said they would not move into the city if required to do so. The Chicago
teacher union opposed the residency policy as a violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution.

Lack of low to moderately priced housing in some areas has been cited as a reason against residency requirements for school personnel. The personnel required to live in the district may not be able to afford a place to live (Garvelink, 1978; Michaels, 1980).

Refuting Reasons for Residency Requirements

Improved job performance. Although proponents of residency requirements believe that requirements improve job performance of educational personnel, there is a lack of evidence that shows a relationship between job performance and residency requirements. In Hanson v. Unified School District No. 500, Wyandotte County, Kansas, (1973) a residency requirement was struck down when the school district could not show that residents of the county were more effective teachers than nonresidents.

According to Lynch (1980), the Pittsburgh School Board was requested to demonstrate empirically to the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board that a residency requirement was related to its basic policy and mission so that the board did not have to negotiate with its employees prior to adopting a residency requirement. Despite ample time, the school district failed to show a relationship between residency requirements and its policy and mission and was ordered to bargain with its employees about the residency requirement.
One research study may indicate that residency requirements harm job performance of educational personnel. Martin (1974) found that teachers and administrators residing outside their districts had significantly more favorable attitudes toward students than did teachers and administrators residing in their school district.

Residency requirements limit the possible pool of qualified educational personnel. Critics of residency requirements for educators voiced their pleasure when residency requirements in Massachusetts (Briere, 1986) and Denver (Bingham, 1985) were eliminated and job competition would improve.

Research has not shown that there is a relationship between residency and competency (Michaels, 1980). Glassman (cited in Michaels) stated that where one lives is a basic right that has no impact on the quality of teaching.

**Emergency manpower availability.** Spiegel (cited in Lee, 1982) stated that the emergency manpower availability argument for residency requirements could be challenged when applied to educational personnel. Teachers do not need to be called upon in times of civil disorder or disaster.

**Public coffer.** According to Michaels (1980), it was impossible to determine the amount of money that school district employees pump into the local economy. So it is difficult to support or refute the relevance of the public coffer theory to educational personnel.

Spiegel (cited in Lee, 1982) stated: "If employees are presumed to perform work that justifies the cost of their salaries then the
city loses none of its resources by employing non-residents" (p. 9).

In Michigan, where state funding was becoming more important than local property tax, the argument for residency requirements which was based on educators' spending their property tax dollars in the district was less credible (Garvelink, 1978).

**Identity with community.** As for the argument about residents having a greater stake in the city and providing an incentive for better job performance, Spiegel (cited in Lee, 1982) stated that the size of the municipality can be self-defeating in that larger cities tend to isolate the populous into ethnic and economic subdivisions which do not necessarily enhance a worker's identity to the municipality.

**Lack of Supportive Research**

Michaels (1980) stated that residency requirements are not research based. Lee (1982) commented about the lack of research regarding residency requirements for school administrators.

**Summary**

It would seem then that continuous residency requirements which have been upheld in court, but are controversial, unpopular, and unsupported by empirical data, should be studied. The purpose of this study is to provide empirical data about the validity of the three assumptions which have been expressed most often in support of residency requirements for administrators in public education:
resident administrators are more involved in community activities than nonresident administrators, resident administrators spend more money in the district than nonresident administrators, and resident administrators have better job performance than nonresident administrators.

The following research hypotheses are posed:

1. Administrators in districts with residency policies will participate in as many community activities within the school district as administrators in districts without residency policies who live inside or outside their school district.

2. Administrators in districts with residency policies will participate in as many community activities as administrators in districts without residency policies who live inside or outside their school district.

3. Administrators in districts with residency policies will purchase as many goods and services within the school district as administrators in districts without residency policies who live inside or outside their school district.

4. Administrators in districts with residency policies will have the same job performance as administrators in districts without residency policies who live inside or outside their school district.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study was to provide a comparison between three groups of administrators (resident administrators in districts with residency policies, resident administrators in districts without residency policies, and nonresident administrators in districts without residency policies) on their participation in community activities, the location of their personal expenditures, and their job performance. This chapter will present information about district and subject selection, the subjects, instrumentation, procedures, independent and dependent variables, hypotheses, analysis and statistical treatment of data, significance level, and study limitations.

District and Subject Selection

District Selection

The Superintendent Questionnaire (described in the Instrumentation section of this chapter) was sent to all 546 superintendents throughout the state of Michigan in order to determine which districts in the state had a residency policy for administrators. (See Appendix A for cover letter and Appendix B for questionnaire.) It was determined from the 459 questionnaires (84%) which were returned that 250 districts (54%) had no residency policy for any school
district employees, 100 districts (22%) had residency policies for superintendents and assistant superintendents, 95 districts (21%) had residency policies for administrators including principals or special education directors, and 3 districts had residency policies for noncertified staff. Nine questionnaires were spoiled and unusable, and two were returned with refusals to participate. All of the 95 districts with residency policies for principals and special education directors were selected for this study, and 95 districts from the 250 without a residency policy for any personnel were randomly selected.

Subject Selection

Subjects from districts with residency policies and subjects from districts without residency policies were selected according to the following procedures (see Figure 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>95 districts with residency policies</th>
<th>95 districts without residency policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool of 374 administrators</td>
<td>Pool of 629 administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random selection</td>
<td>147 subjects</td>
<td>174 subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granting permission</td>
<td>RRI 71 Yes 12 No  NRI 48 Yes 14 No</td>
<td>RRO 12 Yes 8 No  NRO 41 Yes 9 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor evaluation</td>
<td>RRI 66</td>
<td>NRI 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Subject Selection.
Subjects were randomly selected from the existing pool of potential subjects from the 95 districts with residency policies for principals and special education directors and the 95 selected districts without residency policies for any personnel. According to the Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide (Michigan Education Directory, 1988) and the Directory of Special Education Administrators in Michigan (Statewide Communication and Dissemination System, 1988), a pool of 374 administrators consisting of 364 principals and 10 special education directors existed for the 95 districts with residency policies. It was believed that the smaller districts would be overrepresented in the sample if an equal number of subjects were chosen from each of the 95 districts. Therefore, two principals were randomly selected from districts with four or more principals, and one principal was selected from districts with less than four principals. From the pool, 137 principals were randomly selected and all 10 special education directors were selected as subjects.

Subjects in districts without residency policies were selected in a similar manner. A pool of 629 administrators consisting of 592 principals and 37 special education directors existed for the 95 selected districts without residency policies (Michigan Education Directory, 1988; Statewide Communication and Dissemination System, 1988). To help assure that subjects in smaller districts would not be over represented in the sample, 3 principals were randomly selected from districts with 19 or more principals, 2 principals were randomly selected from districts with 6 or more principals, and 1 principal was randomly selected from the other districts. A total of
174 administrators were selected including 137 principals and 37 special education directors.

Letters and questionnaires concerning the location of personal expenditures and community activities were sent to the 147 selected administrators in districts with residency policies and the 174 selected administrators in districts without residency policies. (See Appendix C for cover letter and Appendices D and E for questionnaires.) After the questionnaires from the selected administrators were returned, further delineation of the two residency groups were made.

Of the 147 administrators in districts with residency policies, 101 returned their questionnaires for a return rate of 69%. In perusing the information from the districts with residency policies, it was found that two groups of administrators existed. One group consisted of 83 administrators who lived in the district where residency was required (RRI). The other group of 18 administrators did not live in the district which required residency (RRO). These were persons who had lived outside the district when the policy took effect or were affected by special circumstances.

Of the 101 questionnaires which were returned, 83 administrators (82%) in districts with residency policies gave permission for their supervisor to evaluate their job performance. There were 71 administrators (RRI) living in the district who gave permission and 12 administrators (RRO) living outside the district who gave permission. Since the 12 administrators (RRO) living outside the district were a very small group, this group was deleted from the study.
Of the 174 administrators in districts without residency policies, 112 returned their questionnaires for a rate of 64%. Based upon their responses, the administrators were divided into two groups: administrators who chose to live within the district (NRI) and those who chose to live outside the district (NRO). Eighty-nine administrators gave permission for their supervisor to evaluate their job performance.

Supervisors of the administrators who gave permission were contacted to evaluate the job performance of the subjects (see Appendices F and G). Supervisors returned job performance questionnaires for 66 administrators in districts with residency policies, which was a 93% rate of return; and supervisors returned job performance questionnaires for 85 administrators in districts without residency policies, which was a return rate of 99%. There were 151 administrators with results for all four dependent variables. The final sample was comprised of 151 administrators in three groups: RRI = 66, NRI = 46, and NRO = 39.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 151 elementary and secondary school principals and special education directors in school districts throughout Michigan. The final sample consisted of 66 administrators in districts with residency policies, 46 administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to live in the district, and 39 administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to live outside the district.
Of the 151 subjects, 109 (72%) held master's degrees. The subjects had an average of 12.5 years of administrative experience and 7.3 years of experience in the current administrative position. The average age of the subjects was 45.4 years, and 127 (86%) of the subjects were male.

Instrumentation

Three questionnaires were developed for this study. The first questionnaire, Superintendent Questionnaire, was sent to superintendents to determine which school districts had policies requiring principals and special education directors to reside in the school district. (See Appendix B.) The second questionnaire, Community Involvement and Salary Expenditures (Appendix D for RRI and Appendix E for NRI and NRO), and the third questionnaire, Job Performance (Appendix G), were developed to acquire data on the four dependent variables: number of community activities within the school district, total number of community activities, location of personal expenditures, and job performance.

Superintendent Questionnaire

The Superintendent Questionnaire was sent to superintendents to ascertain which of Michigan's 548 districts had policies requiring principals and special education directors to reside in the school district. The names and addresses of the superintendents were obtained from the *Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide* (Michigan Education Directory, 1988). The questionnaire consisted of
three items which asked about the existence of a residency policy, the type of personnel covered by the policy, and the names of any newly hired administrators. (See Appendix B.) The names of newly hired administrators were requested since the directory had not yet been updated for the 1988-89 school year.

**Community Involvement and Salary Expenditures**

The Community Involvement and Salary Expenditures questionnaire was sent to principals and special education directors. There were two forms of the questionnaire: one form for administrators in districts with residency policies and another form for administrators in districts without residency policies. Both forms consisted of the same five parts with only Part I having different items.

Part I for administrators in districts with residency policies consisted of four questions about residency policies and whether the administrators lived in the school district. Part I for administrators in districts without residency policies consisted of three items about residency policies and whether the administrators lived in the school district.

Part II contained five items to solicit background information on the administrators. The items included educational degrees, years of administrative experience, age, and sex.

Part III contained 11 typical expenditure items from tables published by the United States Bureau of the Census (1986). The subjects were asked to indicate which goods or services were purchased inside the boundaries of the school district and which goods and
services were purchased outside the boundaries of the school district.

In Part IV, subjects were asked to list the community activities in which they participate and indicate whether the location of the activity was inside or outside the school district. This section allowed the researcher to compare the number and location of community activities engaged in by administrators in districts with residency policies and administrators in districts without policies.

Part V contained a consent form. Each subject was asked to sign the consent form and list the name and position of his or her immediate supervisor who would rate the subject's job performance.

**Job Performance Questionnaire**

The Job Performance questionnaire consisted of 30 items pertaining to effective job performance of administrators. The items were on a 5-point Likert scale which included these ratings: almost never, seldom, sometimes, often, nearly always, and does not apply. The first 28 items were taken from research studies concerning characteristics and behaviors of effective principals (McCurdy, 1983), and the last 2 items were taken from a court case concerning required educational residency (Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976).

**Procedures**

The first questionnaire, Community Involvement and Salary Expenditures, was coded and sent to the selected administrators in
districts with residency policies and the administrators in districts without residency policies. Subjects also received a copy of the Job Performance questionnaire, a separate copy of which was to be sent to their supervisor for completion. The subjects who completed the questionnaire and supplied the name and address of their immediate supervisor were placed into three groups: administrators who were required to reside in the district of their employment, administrators who were not required but chose to reside in the district of their employment, and administrators who were not required and chose not to reside in the school district of their employment.

The Job Performance questionnaire was sent to the immediate supervisor named by each of the administrators. Immediate supervisors rated the job performance of their administrator. Supervisors who did not respond 10 days after the deadline were sent another questionnaire.

To ensure confidentiality of responses from the superintendents, principals, special education directors, and immediate supervisors, the following procedures were utilized:

1. Each superintendent was assigned a code number with which the superintendents' questionnaires were coded. (The superintendents' coded responses were separated into districts with residency policies for principals and special education directors and districts without residency policies for principals and special education directors.)

2. Each principal and special education director selected in the residency policy group and nonpolicy group was assigned a code
number. The code numbers were placed on the questionnaire about community involvement and expenditures when it was sent to the administrator. The same code numbers were also placed on the job performance questionnaire when it was sent to the immediate supervisor. In cases where supervisors were asked to rate more than one subject, names were temporarily attached to the job performance questionnaire so that immediate supervisors could tell which administrator they were rating. Upon completion of the job performance questionnaire, the temporarily placed names were removed and only the code numbers remained.

3. Lists of superintendents' names, principal's names, and code numbers were kept by the investigator in a locked file to be destroyed after completion of the study.

This research study was reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University (see Appendix I).

Independent and Dependent Variables

Prior to data collection, two independent variables, type of residency and administrative position, were planned. There were three types of residency—administrators in districts with required residency who lived in the district, administrators in districts without required residency who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without required residency who chose to reside outside the district—and two types of administrative position—principals and special education directors. Data analysis
revealed that the number of special education directors (N= 20) in the final sample was insufficient to use administrative position as an independent variable in this study. What became apparent though was that the size or population of a school district might impact type of residency. Consequently, size of school district was subjected to post hoc analysis.

Each of the school districts in the study was assigned to one of four groups according to size. The four groups based upon size for this study were devised from information about Michigan school districts found in Bulletin 1014 (Michigan Department of Education, 1987). The Bulletin ranked K-12 school districts in the state by the number of state aid members (the number of students in attendance on the count day). For purposes of this study, the K-12 Michigan school districts were then assigned to one of four groups based on size. Group 1 was comprised of the largest school districts with size rankings from 1 to 131. Group 2 was comprised of the next largest school districts with size rankings from 132 to 262. Group 3 was comprised of the next largest school districts with size rankings from 263 to 394. Group 4 was comprised of the smallest school districts with size rankings from 395 to 525. Each district included in this study was then assigned to one of the four size groups by matching the state aid membership ranking in the bulletin with the appropriate group.
Hypotheses

The hypotheses were formulated from the problem statement and research questions. The research questions and the research and statistical hypotheses follow:

**Research Question 1:** Is there a significant difference in the number of community activities participated in within the school district between administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the district?

**Research Hypothesis 1:** Administrators who live in districts with residency policies will participate in the same number of community activities as administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside within the district and administrators in districts without policies who chose to reside outside the school district.

**Statistical Hypothesis 1:** There will be no significant difference in the number of community activities participated in within the school district between administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the school district.

**Research Question 2:** Is there a significant difference between the total number of community activities participated in between
administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside within the district, and administrators in districts without policies who chose to reside outside the district?

**Research Hypothesis 2:** Administrators in districts with residency policies will participate in the same total number of activities as administrators in districts without policies who chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the district.

**Statistical Hypothesis 2:** There will be no significant difference in the total number of community activities participated in between administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without policies who chose to reside outside the district.

**Research Question 3:** Is there a significant difference in the location of goods and services purchased by administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose not to reside in the district?

**Research Hypothesis 3:** Administrators who live in districts with residency policies will purchase goods and services in the same location as administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the school.
district.

**Statistical Hypothesis 3:** There will be no statistical difference in the location of goods and services purchased within the school district by administrators with required residency, administrators who chose to reside within the school district, and administrators who chose not to reside in the school district.

**Research Question 4:** Is there a significant difference in job performance between administrators required to live in the district, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without policies who chose not to reside in the district?

**Research Hypothesis 4:** Administrators who are required to reside in the district will have the same job performance rating as administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the school district.

**Statistical Hypothesis 4:** There will be no significant difference in job performance scores between administrators who are required to reside in the district, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the district.
Data Analysis Procedures for the Dependent Variables

Community Involvement

Community involvement was analyzed in two steps. First, the number of community activities in which subjects participated within their school district was analyzed, and then the total number of community activities in which subjects participated regardless of location was analyzed. A one-way analysis of variance was utilized in both analyses. The analysis of variance was selected because of the following assumptions: There was adequate sample size, the data were interval, and the distribution was assumed to be normal.

The Scheffe test (a multiple comparison technique) was utilized as a follow-up to the one-way analysis of variance when a significant $F$ value was found. Gay (1987) stated that "the Scheffe test is appropriate for making any and all possible comparisons involving a set of means... and sample sizes do not have to be equal" (p. 393). The procedure shows which of the residency groups was significantly different from each other on the dependent variable.

Location of Personal Expenditures

The effect of residency on the dependent variable, location of personal expenditures, was analyzed using chi square. Chi square was utilized since the data were nominal in nature. Each of the 11 items (home mortgage, new car, groceries, dinner out, gas for car, admission to sports or entertainment, car repair, home repair, clothing,
home appliance, and doctor visit) was analyzed separately using chi square.

**Job Performance**

The effect of residency on the fourth dependent variable, job performance, was analyzed by a one-way analysis of variance. It was assumed that there was a sufficient sample size, the data were interval in nature, and the distribution was normal so analysis of variance was utilized.

**Data Analysis for the Independent Variable, District Size**

The relationship of type of residency and size of district was analyzed by the chi-square procedure. Chi square was utilized since the data were nominal in nature.

**Background Data**

The background data for subjects in each of the three residency groups were compiled on the highest educational degree obtained by each subject, the total number of years of administrative experience, the years of administrative experience in the present administrative position, age, and sex of subjects in the three independent residency groups. A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if there was any statistical difference between the three independent residency groups on total years of administrative experience, years of administrative experience in the present experience, and age of the subjects. Chi square was used to determine if there was any
statistical difference between the three independent residency groups on highest educational degree obtained and sex of the subjects.

Descriptive data were also gathered from administrators in districts with residency policies and administrators in districts without policies regarding their attitudes toward residency requirements. Data from administrators in districts with residency policies were collected and analyzed to determine what percentage of administrators had prior knowledge of the residency policy, what percentage of administrators agreed with the policy, and what percentage of administrators would live in the district if not required to do so. Data from administrators in districts without residency policies were collected and analyzed to determine what percentage of administrators would be in favor of such a policy and what percentage of administrators would live in the district if required to do so.

Significance Level

The .05 level of significance was selected to test all null hypotheses. This level was chosen for two reasons. First, it is considered an acceptable level in behavioral research (Tuckman, 1972). Second, the .05 level provides a balance between the likelihood of making a Type I and a Type II error. A more stringent level of significance would increase the probability of a Type II error of rejecting a true research hypotheses. A less stringent level of significance would increase the probability of a Type I error of accepting a false research hypotheses.
Limitations

Sample Bias

Even though the rate of return for the Superintendent Questionnaire was 86%, subsequent subject responses had the built-in bias of only including information on those districts which originally participated. In addition, each successive attrition of subjects due to lack of return of questionnaires further reduced the sample size and increased the bias.

Permission of Subjects to Rate Job Performance

The sample was limited to those subjects willing to give permission for their immediate supervisor to rate their job performance. Those subjects who gave permission might have assumed that their job performance would be rated satisfactorily.

State of Michigan

This study was conducted with subjects in districts throughout the state of Michigan. Any generalizations of the findings are limited to Michigan.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to provide empirical data about the validity of the three assumptions which have been expressed most often in the literature and court records in support of residency requirements for administrators: resident administrators are more involved in community activities than nonresident administrators, resident administrators spend more money in the school district than nonresident administrators, and resident administrators have better job performance than nonresident administrators. This chapter presents data about the background of the subjects, their impressions of residency requirements, and the results of the chi-square and ANOVA tests on the four independent variables and the decisions regarding each hypothesis.

Results of the Study

Background of the Subjects

Background data were collected from the subjects regarding their college degrees, years of experience as administrators, years in present administrative positions, age, and sex.
Highest College Degrees Earned

All 151 subjects reported their highest degree earned (see Table 1). There was only 1 subject in the study whose highest degree was a bachelor's degree. The most prevalent highest degree earned for all types of residency groups was the master's degree. A significant value for chi square ($\chi^2 = 19.95$) was found. Therefore, there was a significant difference between the residency groups on highest college degrees earned.

Table 1

Chi Square for Highest College Degrees of Subjects by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>RRI ($n = 66$)</th>
<th>NRI ($n = 46$)</th>
<th>NRO ($n = 39$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq. %</td>
<td>Freq. %</td>
<td>Freq. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1a 1.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>52 78.8</td>
<td>37 80.4</td>
<td>20 51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>11 16.7</td>
<td>5 10.9</td>
<td>8 20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2 3.0</td>
<td>4 8.7</td>
<td>11 28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. RRI = Subjects with required residency who live in the district. NRI = Subjects without required residency who live in the district. NRO = Subjects without required residency who live outside the district.

Note. $\chi^2 = 19.9457$, $p < .05$.

aThis subject was moved to the master's cell for chi-square data analysis.
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The highest residuals were found in cells for the nonresident administrators (NRO). The nonresident administrators were found to have more doctoral degrees than expected and fewer master's degrees than expected.

**Years of Experience**

The total number of years of administrative experience was reported by 149 of the subjects (99%) (see Table 2). The mean years of administrative experience between residency groups varied less than 2 years with NRI at 13.36 years and NRO at 11.56 years. No significant difference was found between the residency groups in total years of administrative experience (see Table 3).

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRI</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRO</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of administrative experience in the current position were reported by 149 of the subjects (99%) (see Table 4). Although the mean years of experience varied by more than 2 years from the NRI group to the NRO group, a significant F value (F = 1.60) was not found (see Table 5). Therefore, there was no significant difference.
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Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Years of Administrative Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td>.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>60.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Years in Current Administrative Position by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRI</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRO</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Years in Current Administrative Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.63</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>40.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.
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in years of experience in the current position between residency groups.

**Age of Subjects**

The age of the subjects was reported by 148 administrators (98%) (see Table 6). The mean ages of the residency groups varied by 2.4 years with the NRO group having the highest mean age and the RRI group having the lowest mean age. No significant difference in age between residency groups was found (see Table 7).

**Table 6**

Means and Standard Deviations for Age of Subjects by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRI</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRI</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRO</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.84</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7**

Analysis of Variance for Age of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>1.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.
**Sex of Subjects**

The sex of 148 of the subjects was reported (98%) (see Table 8.) Over 75% of each residency group was composed of male administrators. A significant value for chi square was not found. Therefore, no significant difference in proportion of males to females in the three residency groups was found.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>RRI</th>
<th>NRI</th>
<th>NRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( \chi^2 = 4.08, df = 2, p > .05. \)

**Summary of Background of the Subjects**

No significant differences were found between the three residency groups on age, sex, years of administrative experience in current position, or total years of administrative experience. However, a significant difference was found between residency groups on highest college degree earned; the administrators in districts without residency policies who lived outside the district (NRO) had more doctoral degrees than expected and fewer master's degrees than expected.
Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

The first research hypothesis stated: Administrators who live in districts with residency policies will participate in the same number of community activities within the school district as administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside within the district and administrators in districts without policies who chose to reside outside the school district. The corresponding null hypothesis was: There will be no significant difference in the number of community activities participated in within the school district between administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the school district.

Table 9 shows the mean and standard deviations of the community activities within the school districts by residency group.

Table 9
Means and Standard Deviations of Community Activities Within the School District by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 66)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 46)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The null was tested by a one-way analysis of variance (see Table 10). A significant $F$ value ($F = 14.55$) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between the residency groups in the number of community activities the groups participated in within the school district.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$ ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.1040</td>
<td>14.5473*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.6881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$p < .05$.

The Scheffé test was utilized to determine which residency groups were significantly different from the other. It was found that administrators in districts with residency policies (RRI) and administrators living in districts without residency policies (NRI) were significantly different from administrators living outside districts in districts without residency policies (NRO) in the number of community activities in which they participated within the school district. Therefore, the two groups of administrators residing in the school district were significantly different from the group of administrators living outside the district in the number of activities in which they participated within the school district.
Hypothesis 2

This hypothesis concerned the total number of community activities in which the subjects participated regardless of the location of the activities. The research hypothesis stated: Administrators in districts with residency policies will participate in the same total number of activities as administrators in districts without policies who chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the district. The corresponding null hypothesis was: There will be no significant difference in the total number of community activities participated in between administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in district without residency policies who chose to live in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to live outside the district.

Table 11 shows the means and standard deviations of the total community activities by residency groups.

Table 11
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Community Activities by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 66)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 46)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The null hypothesis was tested by a one-way analysis of variance (see Table 12). A significant $F$ value ($F = 5.22$) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between residency groups in the total number of community activities in which the subjects participated.

Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Total Community Activities by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>5.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

The Scheffé test was utilized to determine which residency groups were significantly different from the other. It was found that administrators in districts with residency policies (RRI) and administrators living in districts without residency policies (NRI) were significantly different from administrators living outside districts without residency policies (NRO) in the total number of community activities in which they participated. The resident administrators were significantly different from nonresident administrators on the total number of community activities in which they participated.
Hypothesis 3

This hypothesis concerned whether the location of goods and services purchased by the residency groups was inside or outside the school district. The research hypothesis stated: Administrators in districts with residency policies will purchase the same percentage of goods and services in the school district as administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the district. The corresponding null hypothesis was: There will be no significant difference in the percentage of goods and services purchased in the school district between administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the district.

The null hypothesis for each of the 11 goods and service items was tested by a chi-square procedure by residency group.

Home mortgage. A significant value for chi square ($\chi^2 = 36.43$) was found when data on the location of home mortgages by residency groups were analyzed (see Table 13). Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between residency groups on the location of the purchase of their home mortgages.

The largest residuals were found in the cells for the NRO group. Thus, the significant value for chi square was primarily due to the nonresident administrators acquiring their home mortgages outside the
Table 13
Chi Square for Home Mortgages by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 57)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 41)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home mortgages in district</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home mortgages out district</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 36.43$, $p < .05$.

school district in higher than expected proportions and acquiring their home mortgages inside the school district in lower than expected proportions.

**New car.** The location of new car purchases was not found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 14). Therefore, the null was retained. There was not a significant difference between the location of a new car purchase between residency groups.

**Grocery shopping.** The location of grocery purchases was found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 15). A significant value for chi square ($\chi^2 = 34.75$) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference in the location of grocery purchases between residency groups.
Table 14
Chi Square for New Car Purchases by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 61)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 45)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New cars purchased in district</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cars purchases outside district</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 3.23, p > .05.$

Table 15
Chi Square for Grocery Purchases by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 65)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 45)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food purchases in district</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food purchases outside district</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 34.75, p < .05.$
The largest residuals were found in the cells for the NRO group. Thus, the significant value for chi square was primarily due to the nonresident administrators purchasing groceries in lower than expected rates inside the school district and purchasing groceries in higher than expected rates outside the school district.

Dinner out. The location of restaurants for dining out was not found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 16). The majority of subjects in all residency groups dined out in locations outside the school district. Therefore, the null was retained. There was not a significant difference between residency groups in the location of restaurants for dining out.

Table 16
Chi Square for Dinner Out by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 58)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 35)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dinner in district</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner out of district</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 3.01$, $p > .05$.

Gasoline for the car. The location of gasoline purchases was found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 17). A significant
value for chi square ($\chi^2 = 21.91$) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between the residency groups in the location of the purchase of gasoline for their car.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 63)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 45)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas purchased in</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas purchased out</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 21.91$, $p < .05$.

The highest residuals were found in the cells of the NRO group. The nonresidents purchased gasoline for their cars outside the school district at a higher than expected rate and purchased gasoline inside the school district at a lower than expected rate.

Entertainment and sports admissions. The location of entertainment and sports admissions was not found to be significantly different for residency groups when the hypothesis was tested by chi square (see Table 18). Therefore, the null was retained. There was no significant difference between the residency groups on the location of their entertainment and sports admissions.
Table 18
Chi Square for Entertainment and Sports
Admissions by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 56)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 37)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment in district</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment outside district</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 4.01, p > .05.$

Car repair. The location of car repair service was found to differ significantly between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 19). A significant value of chi square ($\chi^2 = 19.98$) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between residency groups in the location of car repair service.

Table 19
Chi Square for Car Repair by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 63)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 45)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car repair in district</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car repair outside district</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 19.98, p < .05.$
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The highest residuals were found in the cells of the NRO group. The nonresident administrators purchased car repair service inside the school district at a lower than expected rate and purchased car repair service outside the school district at a higher than expected rate.

Home repair. The location of home repair services was found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 20). A significant value for chi square ($\chi^2 = 62.54$) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between the residency groups in the location of home repair services which were purchased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 58)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 41)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home repair in district</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home repair outside district</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 62.54$, $p < .05$.

The highest residuals were found in the cells of the NRO group. The nonresident administrators purchased home repair services inside the school district in lower than expected rates and purchased home
repair services outside the school district in higher than expected rates.

Clothing purchases. The location of clothing purchases was not found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 21). Therefore, the null was retained. There was no significant difference between the residency groups on the location of clothing purchases.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 62)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 44)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchased in district</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchased outside district</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( \chi^2 = 5.24, p > .05 \).

Home appliances. The location of home appliance purchases was found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 22). A significant value of chi square \( (\chi^2 = 18.68) \) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between the residency groups in the location of home appliance purchases.

The highest residuals were found in the cells of the NRI group. The resident administrators who chose to live in the districts
Table 22

Chi Square for Home Appliance Purchases by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 61)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 46)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appliance purchase in district</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance purchase outside district</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $x^2 = 18.68$, $p < .05$.

Purchased home appliances within the district at a higher than expected rate and purchased home appliances outside the district in a lower than expected rate. The second highest residuals were found in the cells of the NRO group. The nonresident administrators purchased home appliances outside the district at a higher than expected rate and purchased home appliances inside the district at a higher than expected rate.

**Doctors' office.** The location of the doctors' office typically visited was found to be significantly different between residency groups when chi square was used to test the hypothesis (see Table 23). A significant chi square value ($x^2 = 25.97$) was found. Therefore, the null was rejected. There was a significant difference between residency groups in the location of the doctors' office typically visited.
Table 23

Chi Square for Doctors' Office by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 61)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 44)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors' office inside district</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors' office outside district</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\chi^2 = 25.97, p < .05.$

The highest residuals were found in the cells of the NRO group. The nonresident administrators visited doctors located outside the district at a higher than expected rate and visited doctors inside the district at a lower than expected rate.

**Hypothesis 4**

This hypothesis concerned the subjects' job performance. The research hypothesis stated: Administrators who are required to reside in the district will have the same job performance rating as administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the school district. The corresponding null hypothesis was: There will be no significant difference in job performance scores between administrators who are required to reside in the district, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside in the district, and
administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to reside outside the district.

Table 24 shows the means and standard deviations for the job performance scores by residency groups.

Table 24

Means and Standard Deviations for Job Performance Scores by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 66)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 46)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis was tested by a one-way analysis of variance (see Table 25). The F value (F = 2.02) was not significant. Therefore, the null was retained. There was no significant difference between the residency groups on job performance ratings by their supervisors.

Data Analysis on Size of District

Upon perusal of the data from the Superintendent Questionnaire, it was believed that a post hoc analysis regarding size of district should be carried out. A chi square procedure was used with the three residency groups and the four groups based on size of district as described in Chapter III. A significant value of chi square
Table 25

Analysis of Variance of Job Performance by Residency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05.

(χ² = 34.44) was found (see Table 26). Therefore, there was a significant difference between residency groups and the size of district having residency requirements.

Table 26

Chi Square for Residency Groups and Size of District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>RRI (n = 66)</th>
<th>NRI (n = 46)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (largest)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (smallest)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. χ² = 34.44, p < .05.

The highest residuals were found in the cells for Group 1, the largest school districts. The administrators required to live in the
school district (RRI) were found at a lower than expected rate, and the resident and nonresident administrators in districts without policies (NRI and NRO) were found at a higher than expected rate in the largest school districts.

Additional Findings

Perceptions of Subjects Concerning Residency Requirements

Responses From Subjects in Districts With Residency Policies

There were 66 subjects in districts with residency policies who were asked the following questions and their responses have been included below.

1. Your superintendent indicated that administrators are required to live in the district. Were you previously aware of such a policy or contract provision? Yes 61 (92%) No 5 (8%)

2. Do you agree with the policy or contract provision? Yes 48 (73%) No 17 (26%) No answer 1 (1%)

3. Would you live in the district if you were not required? Yes 48 (73%) No 8 (12%) No answer 10 (15%)

Responses From Subjects in Districts Without Residency Policies

There were 46 subjects living inside districts without residency policies and 39 subjects living outside districts without residency policies who were asked the following questions and their responses are indicated.
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1. If your district required you to live in the district would you be in favor of such a policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Group</th>
<th>NRI (n = 46)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32 (70%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 (30%)</td>
<td>36 (92%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi square procedure was utilized to do a post hoc analysis of the data from this question. A significant value of chi square ($X^2 = 33.37$) was found. There was a significant difference between the two residency groups on whether they favored a residency policy. The residuals indicated that the administrators who chose to live in the district favored residency policies at a higher rate than expected and that the administrators who chose not to live in the district favored residency policies at a lower than expected rate.

2. Would you live in the district if you were required to do so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Group</th>
<th>NRI (n = 46)</th>
<th>NRO (n = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8 (17%)</td>
<td>23 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>14 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>37 (80%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, a chi-square procedure was used to do a post hoc analysis. There was no significant difference between the two residency groups.
groups without residency policies on whether they would live in the district if required to do so when chi square was used to analyze the responses \( \chi^2 = 2.35 \).

**Location of Residency Requirements for Principals and Special Education Directors**

Appendix H shows a map of the Michigan school districts that had residency requirements for principals and special education directors. Residency requirements for principals and special education directors were found in 95 of 546 school districts in Michigan (17%) representing 47 of the 83 counties (57%).
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The present study was designed to compare school administrators in three residency groups (administrators in districts with residency policies, administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to live in the district, and administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to live outside the district) on four dependent measures (participation in community activities within the school district, participation in community activities regardless of location, location of salary expenditures, and job performance). Initially, type of administrative position (principal or special education director) was included as a second independent variable. However, due to limited numbers of special education directors in the sample, administrative position was not retained as an independent variable. It became apparent after the first questionnaires from superintendents were received that residency might be affected by or be related to the population of school districts. Subsequently, each of the school districts in the sample was placed into one of four size classifications according to the student population of each district from large to small, and a post hoc analysis was conducted. From a population of elementary and secondary principals and special education directors throughout the state of Michigan, 151
administrators were randomly selected to participate in this study. There were 66 administrators in districts with residency policies, 46 administrators in districts without residency policies who chose to live in the district, and 39 in districts without residency policies who chose to live outside the district. Data on community activities and location of salary expenditures were supplied by the subjects from a questionnaire. Data on job performance were obtained from a 30-item questionnaire completed by the immediate supervisors of the subjects. Comparisons between the three residency groups were made through the use of one-way analysis of variance and chi-square procedures depending upon the type of data. This chapter provides conclusions regarding the results and relationship of these results to previous studies, implications of the findings within the educational community, and recommendations for future research.

Discussion

Hypotheses 1 and 2

The historical position that resident administrators would be involved in more community activities than nonresident administrators was supported by this study. There were significant differences between the resident and nonresident groups on the number of community activities in which administrators participated within the district (Hypothesis 1) and the total number of community activities regardless of location (Hypothesis 2). If school districts and school boards believe it is important for administrators to be involved in
community activities, then requiring them to live in the district can be justified by the results of this study.

The results related to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 extend the findings from previous court cases and research which had examined the issue with the teacher population but had not included administrators. Two court decisions (Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976; Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976) stated that teachers residing in the district would be more involved in the community than nonresidents. The results of the current study concurred with those of Kittle and Shannon (1944), who found that commuting (nonresident) teachers participated in fewer community functions than did resident teachers. Thus, resident administrators, like resident teachers, participated in more community activities than their nonresident counterparts.

Hypothesis 3

The position that resident administrators would spend their salaries within the school district was partially supported by the results of this study. Significant differences between residency groups were found on 7 of the 11 personal expenditure items which were studied. Significant differences were found on the location of the following purchases of goods or services: home mortgage financing, groceries, car gasoline, car repair, home repair, home appliances, and doctor visits. Significant differences between residency groups were not found on such purchases as new car, dining out,
entertainment and sports admission, and clothing. Probably the most expensive purchases for the subjects were their home mortgages, and those mortgages were obtained within the districts where the subjects lived. Probably the second most expensive purchase was a new car, and new car purchases were not related to where the administrator lived. Further analysis of the other nine items in relation to their monetary value was not possible since the value of those purchases was not known. Since the location of the majority of the 11 items as well as the location of the most expensive item was related to where the subject lived, the position that resident administrators would spend their salaries within the school district was supported. School districts that want their administrators to spend their salary within their school district may be justified in requiring residency.

The empirical data from this study showed that resident administrators make many of their purchases within the school district in which they reside and supported previous court decisions and research studies dealing with residency and economic factors. This study was in agreement with the findings of two court cases (Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron, 1976; Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati, 1976) that communities would benefit economically from the salaries of resident teachers. The salary expenditure data from this study concurred with statements made by Bandlow (1975), Lee (1982), and Michaels (1980) that resident administrators spend their salaries within the school district where they live.
Hypothesis 4

The position that resident administrators have better job performance than nonresident administrators was not supported by this study. There was no significant difference between the residency groups on job performance ratings by their immediate supervisors.

The empirical data from this study did not support the decisions of two court cases and the findings of one previous research study. In Wardwell v. Board of Education of City School District of City of Cincinnati (1976), the Sixth Circuit Court accepted testimony that residency requirements aided the district to hire teachers who were highly motivated. Although this study did not compare the motivation of resident and nonresident administrators, some of the items on the job performance instrument such as "is conscientious," "has good attendance," and "manages time well" may be related to motivation. There was no difference between resident and nonresident administrators on their job performance.

The data from this study did not support the decision in Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers Local 400, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO v. Aaron (1976). The United States District Court of Pennsylvania upheld a residency requirement based upon a school board's resolution suggesting that required residency would enhance the quality of employee performance and decrease absenteeism and tardiness. This study found that resident administrators did not have better job performance than nonresident administrators, and the job performance instrument included the two items, "has good..."
Bandlow (1975) found significant differences between resident and nonresident principals on their perception of staff development and time actually spent on community education activities and discipline. He concluded that those differences meant resident principals had better job performance and that public school employees should be required to live in the district. Although his study provided empirical data about residency of administrators, the data were based upon principals reporting the amount of time they spent per week or the amount of time they thought they should spend on certain job activities.

The present study differed from Bandlow's (1975) in the measurement of job performance and the type of residency studied. While Bandlow relied on self-reported data, the present study asked the subjects' supervisors to rate their job performance. One should note, however, that reports were gained only from those administrators who gave permission for their supervisor to report on their job performance. The current study examined three types of residency including administrators who were required to live in the district; whereas, Bandlow only studied principals in districts without residency policies.

**Size of District**

A significant difference was found between residency groups on the size of school district in which residency policies were found. In this study, residency policies were found to exist at a lower rate
than would normally have been expected in the largest school districts. These data would seem to be in conflict with the historical argument that residency requirements were enacted to counteract white flight, and white flight would be likely to happen in the largest school districts. It may be that residency requirements are a result of a combination of more powerful local school boards and a larger supply of educators in the smaller school districts than is possible in the larger school districts. Whatever the reason, residency requirements for administrators are less likely to be found in the largest 25% of the school districts.

Background of Subjects

It was assumed that the three residency groups were similar due to being randomly selected. That assumption was supported by the findings that there was no difference between the residency groups on age, sex, and years of administrative experience. However, there was a significant difference between the groups on the types of degrees (bachelor's, master's, specialist, doctorate) held. Other background factors such as age, years of administrative experience, and sex were not significantly different between groups.

It is purely speculation as to why the nonresident administrators had a higher than expected rate of doctoral degrees. It may be that the nonresidents, particularly those with doctoral degrees, prefer to be flexible and keep their job options open by not being employed in a district requiring residency. The highly educated nonresidents may plan to change jobs to climb the career ladder and
find that living outside the school district allows access to other
districts. That idea would support the position that residency re­
quirements limit the job pool. It may be that those nonresidents
believe that there are professional benefits such as better feelings
about students to be obtained by living outside the district of their
employment. This position would support the findings by Martin
(1974) that nonresident administrators had better attitudes toward
students than resident administrators. The nonresidents may have
chosen to reside outside the school district in order to be closer to
universities to pursue their advanced degrees.

Perceptions of Subjects Concerning Residency Requirements

Lack of popularity of residency requirements was cited in
Garvelink (1978), Lee (1982), Michaels (1980), and Ogletree et al.
(1982). That position was only partially supported by the findings
in this study. The majority of the administrators (73%) in districts
with residency policies and the majority of the administrators (70%)
living inside districts without residency policies agreed with the
residency policies and, therefore, would not support the position
that residency requirements are unpopular. However, only 8% of the
nonresident administrators were in favor of residency policies which
would lend support to the lack of popularity of residency require­
ments. The strength of the nonresident administrators' response,
however, must be tempered by the finding that 59% stated that they
would move into the district if required. It appears that those
administrators who are required to live in the district and those who
chose to live in the districts favor residency policies. Those administrators who chose to live outside the districts do so deliberately and are opposed to residency policies.

Implications

Many residency policies were enacted years ago in times of economic recession and as a response to white flight from cities. Districts were encouraged to enact and maintain such policies when court cases upheld the legality of such policies. It has been implied from court testimony, educational literature, and research studies that resident administrators are more involved in community activities than nonresident administrators, resident administrators spend more money in the district than nonresidents, and resident administrators have better job performance than nonresident administrators. In most cases, the implications were not based upon empirical data. The present study has supplied some empirical data on which to base some decisions about enacting or continuing to follow a residency policy.

This study did not support the assertion that resident administrators have better job performance than nonresident administrators based upon supervisor evaluations and, therefore, did not substantiate residency policies based upon that justification. Since the job performance of administrators such as school principals has been shown to be related to school effectiveness, any relationship between job performance and residency requirements which could be substantiated would be important data to be utilized for the improvement of
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school quality. In the case of this study where a significant difference in job performance was not found in relation to residency, residency requirements were not shown to impact on school effectiveness via the job performance of school administrators.

While finding no difference in job performance between resident and nonresident administrators, the present study did find that community involvement and community expenditures were higher for resident administrators than for nonresident administrators. On the basis of these findings, one might raise the question that if there is no difference in job performance and seemingly positive differences in community involvement and community expenditures for resident administrators, that perhaps school districts should require residency for their administrators. Several points need to be made regarding this viewpoint. First, it is not known if a relationship between involvement in community activities and effective job performance exists, so that the educational significance of resident administrators being more involved in community activities is unknown. Likewise, the relationship of community expenditures by resident administrators to job performance is unknown; indeed, the degree of financial impact and actual dollar amounts which are generated by resident versus nonresident administrators for the resident school districts are also unknown. Lastly, the potential side effects of residency requirements, especially in relationship to a limited applicant pool, weaken this argument.

School districts that care about quality education and the effectiveness of their schools will seek the most qualified
candidates for their administrative positions. Residency requirements have the potential for limiting the job pool of possible candidates. There are many reasons the best candidate for any particular administrative position may be unwilling or unable to reside in the district. Reasons which have been voiced against residency have previously been discussed in the literature section. Any of those reasons may prevent qualified applicants from applying for a position in a district with a residency policy and, unfortunately, the district would be unable to determine the impact of such a policy. With today's concern for quality education in the public schools, residency requirements which do not improve the job performance of administrators, and may even lead to a decrease in the effectiveness of schools by limiting the job pool, have no place in education. The educational benefits gained from community involvement and in community spending due to residency requirements cannot be compared to the ultimate goal of quality education through the selection of effective school leaders regardless of the location of their residence.

The business of schools is educating children, and there are many who would say that schools have failed in their attempts. Many children are not learning, are dropping out, or are on drugs. Education must change to meet the complex and comprehensive needs of a diverse population.

Research has shown that an important component of effective schools is the school principal (McCurdy, 1983). How a principal or other administrator performs his or her job responsibilities affects children's education. School principals influence others "through
the attitude they breed and the motivation they impart in creating a climate of achievement" (p. 9). There are many factors concerning a principal's job performance which have been researched and found to contribute to his or her effectiveness (McCurdy, 1982). Examples of effectiveness are: leadership in setting goals, selecting and evaluating staff, organizing instruction, communicating high standards, and possessing a high degree of interpersonal skill. However, as shown in this study, where an administrator lives does not affect his or her job performance and, therefore, does not affect his or her effectiveness. Residency is irrelevant to providing a quality education for children through effective job performance of school administrators. While residency does seem to affect involvement in community activities and salary expenditures, unless and until it can be shown that these factors have a direct relationship to education, residency requirements would seem irrelevant to school effectiveness and should be eliminated.

Recommendations

Recommendations are made to the following groups: school boards, educators, and researchers.

1. School boards in districts with existing residency policies need to review those policies in light of this study. Board members need to seriously discuss what they hope to accomplish as well as what they believe is accomplished with their policy. Boards may want to solicit information from their present administrative staff about the positive and negative effects of required residency. Pertinent
structured questions regarding residency requirements may be asked of candidates during the interview process in order to build a database about residency as viewed by potential candidates. School boards need to know that for certain segments of the educational population residency requirements are unpopular and limit the pool of potential applicants.

School boards in districts without residency policies should weigh the pros and cons of residency requirements very carefully prior to enacting a policy. Boards should base their decision on empirical data related to the educational field.

2. Educators who wish to oppose residency requirements may cite this study in their discussions with school boards, union representatives, or attorneys. Empirical data now exist to show that resident administrators do not have higher job performance as measured by supervisors' ratings than nonresidents.

3. Further research on this topic is suggested. This study was conducted throughout the state of Michigan. Similar research could be conducted in other states.

4. Because a significant difference was found between residency groups regarding community involvement, the effect of this involvement on administrative job performance should be studied. Then a determination regarding the impact of administrators' community involvement upon educational effectiveness can be made.
Appendix A

Cover Letter to Superintendents
Dear:

I am currently working on a research study which examines residency policies for administrators throughout the state of Michigan. My study has been endorsed by the Michigan Association of School Administrators and the Michigan Association of Administrators for Special Education. (See the letters attached.)

The research study consists of three questionnaires. The first questionnaire asks school district superintendents to supply information about the existence of residency policies in their districts.

After the superintendents' questionnaires have been returned, the second questionnaire solicits data from randomly selected principals and special education directors concerning their participation in community activities; the locations of their major salary expenditures; personal information regarding educational experience, education, age, and sex; and the name of their immediate supervisor.

The third questionnaire solicits data regarding the job performance of each of the selected principals and special education directors from their immediate supervisor.

All of the questionnaires are coded, and the master list of names will be destroyed following data collection to assure anonymity. Only group data will be included in the written results to assure confidentiality.

Your participation in this research is particularly important and greatly appreciated because the other stages of the study are dependent upon this first questionnaire. Please return the enclosed questionnaire in the envelope provided by October 18, 1988.

Sincerely,

Sue Nelson
Coordinator of Planning, Monitoring, and Data Collection
Appendix B

Superintendent Questionnaire
SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please supply the following information about your district.

1. Does your school district have a policy requiring any personnel to reside in the school district?
   
   _____ YES (go to item 2) _____ NO (go to item 3)

2. Check each type of personnel who is required to live within your district.
   
   _____ superintendent
   _____ assistant superintendent
   _____ principal(s)
   _____ teachers
   _____ others Please identify ____________________________

   

3. The Michigan Education Directory may not have up to date information about your administrators. If any of your school principals are new or have different assignments from last year would you please attach a current list of principals' names and building assignments?

   

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY. PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND PRINCIPAL LIST IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED BY OCTOBER 28, 1988.
Appendix C

Cover Letter to Participants
January 4, 1989

Dear:

I am currently working on a research study which examines residency policies for principals and special education directors. Superintendents throughout the state of Michigan were requested to indicate if their district required or did not require residency for a variety of district personnel. You and 146 other administrators were randomly selected from those personnel working in districts where the superintendent indicated there was a residency policy. Administrators in districts with policies will be compared to administrators in districts without policies on such items as community involvement, location of salary expenditures, and job performance.

Required residency is an emotional topic about which there is little concrete data. This survey will take less than five minutes of your time and will help in a formalized manner to determine if a residency policy has any effect on the performance of administrators. Three administrative groups have endorsed this study and encourage your participation. See statements attached.

Enclosed are two questionnaires. I would ask you to complete Questionnaire #1 "Community Involvement and Salary Expenditures." Questionnaire #2, "Job Performance" is a copy of the questionnaire which will be sent to your immediate supervisor if you give me permission to do so. Questionnaire #2 is included so that you may be fully aware of its contents. If you agree to have your supervisor provide this information about your job performance, please sign Part V of Questionnaire #1 and supply your supervisor's name and position. Questionnaire #2 will be sent to your supervisor after your permission is received.

All questionnaires used in this study are coded. No names will be connected to any of the responses, and anonymity is assured. The list of names associated with the codes will be destroyed as soon as enough questionnaires to make the study valid are returned. None of the individual responses will ever be shared; only group data will be reported in the results.

Please complete Questionnaire #1 and return it in the enclosed envelope by January 30, 1989. You may keep Questionnaire #2. Your participation in this research is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sue Nelson
Coordinator of Planning, Monitoring, and Data Collection
Appendix D

Questionnaire #1. Community Involvement and Salary Expenditures
QUESTIONNAIRE #1: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND SALARY EXPENDITURES

Part I.

1. If your district required you to live in the district would you be in favor of such a policy?  
   _ YES _ NO

2. Do you reside within the boundaries of the school district which employs you?  
   _ YES (Go to Part II) _ NO

3. Would you live in the district if you were required to do so?  
   _ YES _ NO Please briefly explain ________________________________

Part II.

1. My highest college degree is _ bachelors _ masters _ doctorate
2. I have ___ years of experience as an administrator.
3. I have ___ years in my present administrative position.
4. I am ___ years old.
5. I am ___ male ___ female.

Part III.

Please put a check in the column below which indicates the correct location for each item or service you purchase.  
Check "Within School District" if you typically purchase the item or service within the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed.  Check "Outside School District" if you typically purchase the item or service outside the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed.  Check "Does Not Apply" if you are unable to determine the location or you do not purchase or use a particular item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM OR SERVICE</th>
<th>WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>OUTSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>DOES NOT APPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Home mortgage</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Last new car</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Major grocery shopping</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dinner out</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gasoline for car</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Admission for sports, entertainment</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Car repair</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home repair</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Major clothing</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Home appliance</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Doctor visit</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Over)
**Part IV.**

Please list all of the non-job related community service activities in which you participate. The activities you list should benefit others in the community, and examples are Kiwanis, church, coaching Little League, Board Member for non-profit group, fund raising for group other than school, volunteer fireman, Big Brother/Sister, etc. Purely social or recreational activities such as bowling leagues, card clubs, or dance groups should not be listed.

Put a check under "Within School District" if the location of the activity or the sponsoring agency is within the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed. Put a check under "Outside School District" if the location of the activity or the sponsoring agency is outside the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>OUTSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V.**

I have read the questionnaire concerning my job performance which was included with this questionnaire and give permission for my immediate supervisor listed below to complete the questionnaire.

Signed ________________________________

Name of immediate supervisor ________________________________

Position of immediate supervisor ________________________________

Thank you very much for your participation.

Please return the survey by January 30, 1989 in the enclosed envelope.
Appendix E

Questionnaire #1. Community Involvement and Salary Expenditures
Part I.

1. Your superintendent indicated that administrators are required to live in the district. Were you previously aware of such a policy or contract provision? ____ YES ____ NO

2. Do you agree with the policy or contract provision? ____ YES ____ NO

3. Do you reside within the boundaries of the school district which employs you? ____ YES ____ NO Please briefly explain why you are not living in the school district. [Blank space]

4. Would you live in the district if you were not required? ____ YES ____ NO Please briefly explain. [Blank space]

Part II.

1. My highest college degree is _ bachelors _ masters _ doctorate
2. I have ___ years of experience as an administrator.
3. I have ___ years in my present administrative position.
4. I am ___ years old.
5. I am ___ male ___ female.

Part III.

Please put a check in the column below which indicates the correct location for each item or service you purchase. Check "Within School District" if you typically purchase the item or service within the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed. Check "Outside School District" if you typically purchase the item or service outside the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed. Check "Does Not Apply" if you are unable to determine the location or you do not purchase or use a particular item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM OR SERVICE</th>
<th>WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>OUTSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>DOES NOT APPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Home mortgage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Major grocery shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dinner out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gasoline for car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Admission for sports, entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Car repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Major article of clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Home appliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Doctor visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
Part IV

Please list all of the non-job related community service activities in which you participate. The activities you list should benefit others in the community, and examples are Kiwanis, church, coaching Little League, Board Member for non-profit group, fund raising for group other than school, volunteer fireman, Big Brother/Sister, etc. Purely social or recreational activities such as bowling leagues, card clubs, or dance groups should not be listed.

Put a check under "Within School District" if the location of the activity or the sponsoring agency is within the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed. Put a check under "Outside School District" if the location of the activity or the sponsoring agency is outside the boundaries of the school district in which you are employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>OUTSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part V

I have read the questionnaire concerning my job performance which was included with this questionnaire and give permission for my immediate supervisor listed below to complete the questionnaire.

Signed __________________________________________

Name of immediate supervisor ________________________

Position of immediate supervisor ____________________

Thank you very much for your participation.
Please return the survey by January 30, 1989 in the enclosed envelope.
Appendix F

Cover Letter to Supervisors
March 17, 1989

Dear:

Enclosed is a questionnaire concerning the job performance of an administrator whom you supervise. This questionnaire is the last of three parts of a research study which began in October, 1988, with questionnaires sent to 546 superintendents throughout Michigan gathering data to compare administrators in districts with residency requirements and administrators in districts without residency requirements.

You have been contacted to be part of the research because supplied your name and gave permission for you to complete this questionnaire about his or her job performance.

Required residency is an emotional topic about which there is little concrete data. This questionnaire will take less than five minutes of your time and will help in a formalized manner to determine if a residency policy has any effect on the performance of administrators. Three administrative groups have endorsed this study and encourage your participation. See statements attached.

The questionnaire has been coded so that no name will be connected with the responses which you make. The list of names associated with the codes will be destroyed as soon as enough questionnaires to make the study valid are returned. None of the individual responses will ever be shared; only group data will be reported in the research results.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided by Friday, April 7, 1989. Thank you very much for your participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Sue Nelson
Coordinator of Planning, Monitoring, and Data Collection
Appendix G

Job Performance Questionnaire
## JOB PERFORMANCE

Please put one (1) mark per item in the column which best describes the principal or special education director whom you supervise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ALMOST DOES</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>SELDOM</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>APPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Provides leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>First priority is student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Identifies goals for school or department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Understands instructional program (curriculum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Spends time in classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hand picks own staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cares less about relations with staff and more about students' academic progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Has high expectations for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Has high expectations for staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Organizes appropriate staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Implements change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Promotes continuity and stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Works closely with teachers on instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Offers rewards, resources, and personal interaction with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Coordinates and advises rather than makes demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Manages time well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Makes sound decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Allocates resources wisely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Directs staff appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Evaluates personnel fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Considers alternative views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Uses a high degree of interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Is motivated to public service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Commits off-duty time to public service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Is conscientious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Is relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Tolerates ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Takes risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Has good attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Is punctual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

School Districts With Residency Requirements in Michigan
Appendix I

Letter of Approval From Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, Western Michigan University
TO:       Susan G. Nelson
FROM:    Ellen Page-Robin, Chair
RE:      Research Protocol
DATE:    April 6, 1988

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Comparative Study of Elementary and Secondary Principals and Local Special Education Directors in Districts with and without Residency Policies" has been approved at no more than minimal risk by the HSIRB after expedited review.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 387-2647.
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