



Western Michigan University  
ScholarWorks at WMU

---

Dissertations

Graduate College

---

12-2002

## Factors Affecting Superintendent Longevity in Michigan

Sally Hipp  
*Western Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Educational Leadership Commons, and the Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Hipp, Sally, "Factors Affecting Superintendent Longevity in Michigan" (2002). *Dissertations*. 1281.  
<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1281>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



**FACTORS AFFECTING SUPERINTENDENT LONGEVITY IN MICHIGAN**

**by**

**Sally Hipp**

**A Dissertation  
Submitted to the  
Faculty of The Graduate College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the  
Degree of Doctor of Education  
Department of Teaching, Learning and Leadership**

**Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
December 2002**

## **FACTORS AFFECTING SUPERINTENDENT LONGEVITY IN MICHIGAN**

**Sally Hipp, Ed.D.**

**Western Michigan University, 2002**

Theory and research surrounding the issue of longevity of superintendents seemed contradictory in the literature. On the one hand, the average length of time a superintendent serves in his/her position has not changed noticeably over the last few decades. Yet many researchers were reporting a crises in this field because the applicant pool seemed to be shrinking and longevity of superintendents in large urban districts was reported to be lower than the average longevity rate of 5-6 years. In addition the perception of many of the superintendents in the field was that the turnover rate of superintendents was on the increase.

This research looked at superintendents in Michigan to determine if there were potential risk and protective factors for longevity. A 41 question survey was sent to all the superintendents in Michigan (n=524) with a return rate of 64.5%. This survey included variables that were described in the literature as having a potential to influence longevity of superintendents. Longevity was defined by two criterion variables: (1) stayers, and (2) leavers. The stayers were those superintendents who had been in their current position longer than six years. The leavers were those superintendents who had been in their current position six years or less. The predictor variables were formed from the questions on the survey, and were clustered into three groups:

**(1) Superintendent Factors, (2) School District Factors, and (3) School Board Factors.**

**Six research questions were addressed through stepwise logistic analysis.**

**The results indicated nine variables that were significant at the .10 confidence level.**

**The Superintendent Factors that were protective for longevity included:**

- The length of time the superintendent lived within 25 miles of his/her position,**
- The length of time the superintendent spent in a previous position,**
- Leaving the past position for family considerations,**
- The outcome of the last evaluation,**
- The existence of additional retirement benefits in the salary package,**
- The age of the superintendent.**

**The Superintendent Factor that was a risk for longevity was the micromanagement of the board as that inhibits the superintendent's effectiveness.**

**The School District Factor that was protective for longevity was moving from a suburban district to a suburban district.**

**There were no School District Factors that were a risk for longevity. Nor were there any School Board Factors that were protective for longevity.**

**The School Board Factor that was a risk for longevity was the quality of the relationship between the superintendent and the school board.**

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.**

**ProQuest Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

UMI Number: 3077378

Copyright 2002 by  
Hipp, Sally

All rights reserved.

UMI<sup>®</sup>

---

UMI Microform 3077378

Copyright 2003 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.  
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

---

ProQuest Information and Learning Company  
300 North Zeeb Road  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

**Copyright by  
Sally Hipp  
2002**



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**My gratitude and deepest appreciation to the many people who assisted and supported me throughout my doctoral program and the dissertation.**

**To my committee chairperson, Dr. Joe Kretoivics, for the countless hours he spent with me and the support he gave me as he guided me through this most challenging aspect of my doctoral program.**

**To Dr. Brooks Applegate for his assistance in navigating through the statistical analyses of this work. His knowledge of research design and statistics helped to made this work possible.**

**To my other committee members, Dr. Charles Warfield and Dr. Suzanne Hedstrom, for their suggestions that strengthened this work.**

**To my husband, Don Hipp, who drove with me from Grand Rapids to Kalamazoo when I had classes and when I met with my committee. Thanks for hanging in there with me through the long years of this doctoral program, through my ups and downs, through changing deadlines, and through times when I was not available.**

**To Grace Manguba, who spent long hours with me in the statistics lab and on the telephone. Thank you Grace for always being willing to assist me and run those statistics just one more time.**

**To Ann Flint, who helped me construct my tables and spent many long hours with me in her home and on email so that this work could be complete.**

### **Acknowledgments--continued**

To Dr. Walter DeBoer for going over my survey with me and suggesting ways it could be improved.

To my daughters Anne, Alison and Francesca, for understanding when their mom was not available to them.

To the gang at Eastern Elementary, who met with me almost every Friday, encouraging me to continue when I felt confused and overwhelmed.

To more than 300 Michigan superintendents who took time to fill out my survey and mail it back to me.

My heartfelt thanks to all of you. I could not have done it without you.

**Sally Hipp**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xii
CHAPTER	
I. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY .....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	3
Superintendent Factors .....	6
School Board Factors.....	6
School District Factors .....	7
Purpose of the Study .....	8
Research Questions.....	8
Assumptions.....	8
Limitations .....	9
Definitions .....	9
Outline of the Study.....	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	11
Introduction.....	11
Superintendent Longevity .....	12

## Table of Contents—continued

### CHAPTER

<b>Factors Affecting Superintendent Longevity .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Superintendent Factors .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Retirement .....	14
Salary .....	16
Academic Preparation.....	18
Total Years in District .....	19
Perceived Stress .....	20
Gender.....	22
Ethnicity.....	24
Leadership Style.....	25
<b>School Board Factors.....</b>	<b>26</b>
Age, Marital Status, and Education of Board Members.....	26
Existence of Pressure Groups .....	27
Evaluation .....	31
<b>School District Factors .....</b>	<b>33</b>
Wealth of District .....	33
Size and Type of District .....	34
Elections .....	35
<b>Risk and Protective Factors .....</b>	<b>35</b>

## Table of Contents—continued

### CHAPTER

Summary .....	37
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....	40
Introduction .....	40
Purpose .....	40
Research Questions .....	41
Instrument Development and Field Testing .....	41
Population and Procedure .....	43
Data Analysis .....	44
Summary .....	49
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA .....	51
Introduction .....	51
Design of the Study .....	51
Definition of Criterion Variables .....	53
Description of Predictor Variables .....	54
Superintendent Factors .....	54
School District Factors .....	74
School Board Factors .....	80
Inferential Statistical Analysis .....	86
Logistic Analysis 1 .....	87

## Table of Contents—continued

### CHAPTER

Criterion Variable 2 .....	89
Summary .....	91
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	93
Summary of the Study .....	93
Summary of the Findings .....	94
Criterion Variable 1 .....	94
Criterion Variable 2 .....	95
Discussion of the Results .....	97
Conclusions and Implications .....	101
Limitations of the Study .....	103
Recommendations for Further Research .....	106

### APPENDICES

A. Survey of Factors Concerning Superintendent Tenure .....	108
B. Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval Letter .....	117
C. Reminder Postcard .....	119
D. Reasons Given for Not Sending Back the Survey .....	121
E. Comments on Question #37 .....	123
F. Definition of Criterion Variables .....	128
G. Number of Years Served as a Superintendent .....	130

## Table of Contents—continued

### APPENDICES

H. Variables Measured by Question Number .....	132
I. Survey Code Book.....	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	140

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Superintendent Factors .....	55
2. Highest Degree Earned .....	56
3. Ethnic Groups .....	56
4. Age.....	57
5. Gender.....	58
6. Family Status .....	58
7. Salary .....	59
8. Benefits - CV1 .....	60
9. Satisfaction .....	60
10. Any Issues That Would Drive One to Leave?.....	61
11. Issues That Would Cause a Superintendent to Leave the Position.....	61
12. Length of Time Within 25 Miles .....	62
13. Factors That Inhibit Effectiveness .....	63
14. Number of Hours Communicating With Board Members .....	64
15. How Important Is the Relationship With the Board? .....	64
16. Superintendent Turnover .....	65
17. Last Evaluation .....	65
18. Projected Career in Five Years .....	66
19. Perceived Stress of Superintendent Position .....	67



## List of Tables--continued

20. Higher Pay/Benefits .....	68
21. Moving to a Larger District .....	68
22. Moving to a Smaller District .....	69
23. Moving Family.....	70
24. Portable Pension .....	70
25. Circumstances of Last Job Change.....	72
26. Number of School Districts .....	73
27. Longest Time in a School District.....	73
28. Shortest Time in a School District.....	74
29. School District Factors .....	75
30. School District Factors for Those With More Than One Superintendency.....	75
31. Per Pupil Expenditures .....	76
32. How Important Are MEAPs to the Community?.....	77
33. How Important Are MEAPs to the School Board?.....	77
34. How Important Are MEAPs to the Staff?.....	78
35. Type of Community.....	78
36. District Change With Last Job Change.....	79
37. Bond/Millage Results .....	80
38. School Board Factors.....	81
39. School Board Factors for Those With More Than One Superintendency.....	81

## **List of Tables—continued**

<b>40. Quality of Relationship With Current Board.....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>41. Level of Solidarity Between Superintendent and Board .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>42. Community Pressure Groups .....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>43. Formal Job Description? .....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>44. Evaluated on Basis of Job Description? .....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>45. Evaluation Frequency?.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>46. Solidarity With Past Board .....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>47. Solidarity Effect.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>48. Protective Factors for Longevity, Criterion Variable 1 .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>49. Risk Factors for Longevity, Criterion Variable 1 .....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>50. Protective Factors for Longevity, Criterion Variable 2 .....</b>	<b>90</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. Predictor Variables .....	47
------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER I

### BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

#### Introduction

Is the school superintendency still an attractive, workable profession for men and women dedicated to quality education? The popular perception of the superintendency is that it is a position of power and control. However, within the profession the position is often viewed as an impossible job. The superintendent serves at the will of the school board, and therefore there is little or no job security. Special interest groups with their own agendas make demands that can be impossible to meet. It seems there is never enough money. Within the last few decades the applicants for this position have declined (Chion-Kenny, 1994). Is there a crisis in the superintendency or is this a position that can still attract the leaders that our schools so desperately need?

The position of superintendent has undergone many changes in the last few decades. During the 1960's the superintendent's traditional role of "expert" was challenged by many parents and board members because schools were not meeting community expectations (Spring, 1998). The growth of the teachers' unions and the increasing media attacks on the American schools put superintendents on the defensive. Nonetheless, the drive for hierarchical bureaucracy and the role of the superintendent as an expert manager continued until the late 1980's (Glass, Bjork, &

Brunner, 2000). The publication of A Nation at Risk (United States Department of Education, 1983) signaled widespread concern over the inability of high school graduates to compete successfully in world markets because of their low knowledge and skill levels. Thus began a reform movement that continues today. The 1990s were characterized as moving toward higher academic standards, and most of the states have developed assessment programs to monitor and track the learning progress of students and schools (Ravitch, 2000). President Clinton's first major education legislation, called Goals 2000, was enacted in 1994 (Ravitch, 2000). This program provided funds for states to develop standards and assessments, and it authorized a new federal board to certify national and state standards. The funds were distributed to the states, and "almost every state began developing academic standards" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 433). As the focus of the school district became that of curriculum, testing and assessment, the role of the superintendent shifted from manager to curriculum and testing expert (Glass et al., 2000).

Coupled with the changes in the role of the superintendent, turnover of superintendents has increased dramatically in certain types of school districts, such as those located in urban areas (Glass, 1992). Urban school districts retain their superintendents on average fewer than three years (Metzger, 1997). At a time when the nation's school districts are examining the issues in a search for better schools, public schools in major cities cannot easily find leaders. The problem is significant in that these districts educate more than 25 percent of America's students (Guthrie & Sanders, 2001). The number of available candidates for the position of superintendent has declined not

only in urban areas, but in rural and suburban districts as well. Chion-Kenny (1994) reported that many of the superintendents and superintendent search consultants she interviewed indicated that new candidates for the superintendency were shying away from the position. Reasons given by Chion-Kenny for declining interest in the superintendency were: (a) an unwillingness to relocate a two-career family, (b) uncertainty that the job will outlast the tenure of the sitting school board, (c) the increasing political nature of the job, (d) the rising incidence of single-issue board members, (e) the tendency of boards to micro-manage, (f) school district fiscal constraints, and (g) the seemingly endless reports of board/superintendent hostilities.

### Statement of the Problem

American superintendents have been the subject of study for the past century. In 1920 and 1930 the National Education Association's Department of Superintendents sponsored national surveys of the American school superintendency. The purpose of these studies was to compile demographic profiles, opinions on key educational issues, and "best practices" in the superintendency. After World War II, the American Association of School Administrators continued to survey superintendents. These studies have come to be known in the profession as the "Ten-Year Studies" (Glass et al., 2000). Data on longevity were compiled in each of these studies. Tenure for most superintendents has stayed about the same in the past four decades. In the 1971 study the tenure length was six years. In the 1982 study the average length of superintendent tenure was 5.6 years. The 1992 study found the average

tenure to be 6.4 years. The current estimate of 5-6 years in the 2000 study data is not a substantial departure from previous decades (Glass et al., 2000)

The responsibility for the quality of education, in a school district, rests in large measure with the superintendent. For quality to be addressed, superintendents need to stay in their positions for a longer period of time. Frequent shifts in leadership take a toll on districts and impede reform efforts (Glass et al., 2000). It takes a minimum of five years for any superintendent to make substantive reform a reality in a district (Fullan, 2001). With superintendents' longevity averaging 5-6 years, reform is just getting started when many superintendents move on to a different position. This study looked at the longevity of superintendents, and determined some of the reasons superintendents give for the decisions they make to stay with a district or to leave for another position.

The coming decade should be a decade of change in the superintendency as many superintendents reach retirement age. Currently about half of the superintendents are over age 50 with the average age of the superintendent at 53 (Glass et al., 2000). Considering that most states have early retirement programs beginning at age 55, and that most superintendents retire between the ages of 57 and 60, one can expect to see many openings in the position of superintendent during the next decade (Glass et al., 2000).

With potentially so many openings for the superintendent occurring in the coming decade, this study examined potential risk and protective factors for longevity. Risk factors were defined as those factors that would decrease the probability or

chances that a particular superintendent would stay in a position for more than six years. Protective factors were those factors that would increase the probability or chances that a superintendent would stay in a position for more than six years. "Risk" is a term often used in medical evaluations. Certain populations may be deemed "high risk" while other populations may be seen as "low risk" for a given disorder (Kraemer, 1992). Separating influences into risk and protective factors is characteristic of literature relating to drug use and prevention (Botvin, Schinke, & Orlandi, 1995; McCoy, Metsch, & Inciardi, 1996). Hawkins, Catalano and Miller (1992) summarized the possible risk and protective factors for youthful drug use. These factors were used to further describe potential causes of drug abuse in adolescence. The task then becomes one of reducing the risk factors and enhancing the protective factors in drug prevention programs. With superintendents, having more risk factors for longevity would result in the likelihood that a superintendent would stay in his/her position less than the average tenure.

This study examined characteristics of superintendents, school boards, and school districts as they relate to longevity. In particular, this study explored whether there were characteristics of superintendents, the districts in which they serve or the school boards who hire them, that would increase or decrease the likelihood that the superintendent would stay in his position longer than the average length of tenure. In the same way, if a school board knows which characteristics of a superintendent candidate are risk and protective for longevity, the board could take that information into consideration when hiring.



### **Superintendent Factors**

This study looked at the demographics of the superintendent such as age, gender, and ethnicity; financial factors like compensation packages, work history and attitudes that superintendents have about their position. Superintendents responding to this study are a very homogenous group. Michigan superintendents reflect the national statistics in that they are mostly male. The United States Census Bureau has characterized the superintendency as being the most male dominated executive position of any profession in the United States (Glass et al., 2000). Ascending to the superintendency for nonwhites and females means getting past a complex mix of unwritten selection criteria that continue to shape hiring practices (Tallerico, 2000).

Superintendents were surveyed as to their salary and fringe benefits. Salaries and fringe benefits vary from district to district. Anderson (1989) found salary to be the highest correlate in determining superintendent's longevity. Fringe benefits, such as annuity contributions, are also important since a large number of superintendents will be reaching retirement age in the next decade (Glass, 1992).

As the position of the superintendent has become more complex, superintendents are reporting more stress on the job than before (McCurdy & Hymes, 1992). More than half of all superintendents feel considerable or very great stress in the workplace (Glass et al., 2000).

### **School Board Factors**

The research confirmed that the position of board members is much more

political than in the past (Bennet, 1991; Funk & Funk, 1992; Hall & Diffort, 1992). School board members come to boardrooms with their own political agendas putting the job security of the superintendent at stake when there is disagreement. Conflict levels between superintendents and school boards are increasing (Hentges, 1985). As conflict rises, the evaluation of the superintendent is often in jeopardy since it is the school board that evaluates the superintendent. Koryl (1996) found the most important criterion in evaluation was the relationship that existed between the superintendent and the school board.

### School District Factors

The type of school district has a bearing on a superintendent's decision to accept a given position. Superintendents are more attracted to suburban districts, followed by rural districts. Urban districts were the least attractive (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000). Some districts cannot afford an intensive search for a qualified candidate (Montgomery, 1991), and are forced to take a less qualified candidate. Some superintendents cannot afford the cost of living in more affluent districts where owning a home in the school district is seen as desirable if not mandatory. In some rural districts, adequate housing is unavailable.

The wealth of a district was seen to have a positive effect on longevity in the study done by Newell (1997). Wealth, measured by per pupil expenditures, means more money in the district to provide necessary programs for students, buy much needed technology and attract the best teachers and administrators.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine potential risk and protective factors for longevity of superintendents in Michigan. This study compares superintendents who served in their current position for more than six years with superintendents who had six years or less in their current position. Six years was chosen because the current estimate of the average tenure for superintendents is 5-6 years (Glass et al., 2000).

### **Research Questions**

To determine the direction and significance of the predictor variables, Superintendent Factors, School District Factors and School Board Factors, with the criterion variable, Superintendent Longevity, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the superintendent factors that are protective for longevity?
2. What are the superintendent factors that are risk for longevity?
3. What are the school district factors that are protective for longevity?
4. What are the school district factors that are risk for longevity?
5. What are the school board factors that are protective for longevity?
6. What are the school board factors that are risk for longevity?

### **Assumptions**

The following assumptions relating to the study were made:

1. Factors relating to superintendent turnover are identifiable and measurable.
2. Some factors negatively impact superintendent longevity while others have a positive relationship.

### Limitations

1. Participants in the study are limited to the state of Michigan.
2. The study is limited to the validity and reliability of the instruments used.
3. The study is limited to the factors recognized on the survey instrument.
4. The study is limited to the perceptions of the superintendent regarding the factors listed on the survey instrument.
5. Superintendents who left their positions were not surveyed. This study is limited to only those superintendents currently holding a position as superintendent.

### Definitions

**Longevity** - The length of time a superintendent spends in his/her position.

**Rural School District** - A public school district in which the major economic activity is agriculture, ranching, mining or summer recreation. (Bahgat, 1993) and with an enrollment of less than 2,999 pupils.

**Suburban School District** - A public school district bordering an urban center of more than 250,000 people with an enrollment of between 3000 and 24,999 pupils.

**Superintendent** - The chief executive officer of a public school district.

**Urban School District** - A school district in a high density population center

where the school enrollment exceeds 25,000.

Wealth of District - The wealth of the district is measured by the per pupil expenditures.

### Outline of the Study

Chapter I contains background information and identifies the need for the study. Chapter I also presents the research question, hypothesis, assumptions, limitations, and definitions appropriate to the study.

Chapter II is a review of the literature relevant to factors influencing superintendent longevity.

Chapter III presents the methods and procedures used in the study. Included are details about the sample, the survey instrument, data gathering and data analysis procedures.

Chapter IV contains the results and statistical analysis of the study, in both a narrative and a tabular form.

A summary of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further study is presented in Chapter V.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **Introduction**

The school superintendency, now more than 150 years old in the United States, has grown in scope, size and complexity as education has taken on more functions. As the position has grown broader in scope, the superintendency has come under closer scrutiny by courts, governments and attentive publics. As we enter a new century, the profession of the school superintendency is more important than it has ever been. Superintendents must be well grounded in their knowledge of financial management, organizational and group behavior, child growth and development, instruction in the basic subject areas, current research on education, assessment and evaluation, and the current political climate (Blumberg, 1985). Superintendents today find themselves in roles that are different from even a decade ago. The rapid increase in both number and diversity of students in America's urban areas demands new skills of teachers and administrators (Houston, 2000). There has been an explosion in information and knowledge as a result of the wide use of the Internet that threatens to increase the digital divide between the wealthy and the poor. Add to this mixture the national commitment to high standards and the additional stress on the superintendency becomes clear. The problem is that most superintendents find their knowledge in these areas to be insufficient given the existing climate in American education

(Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

Is there a crisis in the superintendency? Current superintendents seem to think so. Superintendents believe there is a crisis in the profession, and are concerned about future recruiting of new and talented leaders (Cooper et al., 2000). As the demands increase for this position, so do the employment opportunities for superintendents of the 21st century. A prudent estimate is that during the coming decade half of the nation's superintendents will be replaced (Glass et al., 2000). Nationwide, stories abound about vacant superintendent positions attracting far fewer applicants than in the past (Glass et al., 2000). Reports from school boards and search consultants point to a shortage of people willing to take on the top district management post. Cities are finding fewer and fewer candidates willing to apply for these jobs. Paul D. Houston, executive director of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), laments that "administrators who may be considering the superintendency look at those already in those roles, see how unbalanced their lives often are, and say "Thanks but no thanks!" (Houston, 1998, p. 44).

### **Superintendent Longevity**

Short tenures create a public perception of increased instability, lowered morale, and a loss of organizational direction. Some observers describe the frequent turnover of urban superintendents as graphic evidence of the growing unmanageability of those large districts (Glass, 1992; McCurdy, 1992). They point to the relative stability of suburban districts or to former periods when tenures were longer,

leadership stable, and schools were perceived as successful in educating children. If tenures are short, a question is raised regarding how can big city superintendents launch long-lasting, substantive school reform?

Changing schools is a complex business. All change involves anxiety and struggle. School reform has generally been a top down reform and most school systems are suffering from overload (Fullan, 2001). Ownership of the process of change is essential. At the foundation, school reform is a cultural change and this cultural change is a three to five year process (Fullan, 2001). Leadership for change requires a careful mix of pressure and support as superintendents work with school boards and the principals in each school to bring about the needed reform.

Tenure is another term often used to indicate the length of time a superintendent has held the post (Yee & Cuban, 1996). Twentieth century trends in tenure indicate that the average tenure for superintendents in the 25 largest school districts ranged from a high of more than 15 years in 1937-39 to a low of 5.8 years in 1990 (Yee & Cuban, 1996). This confirms the suspicion that tenures are shorter than in the past, but it also challenges the conventional notion, reported in 1991 (Jackson & Cibulka, 1991; Winerip, 1993), that the average full tenure had fallen to less than 3 years.

One possible explanation for the apparent discrepancy between the published reports and the popular belief that tenures are less than 3 years could be that there was an attempt to distinguish between the interim superintendent and the permanent superintendent. Between two superintendents, there is usually an interim period,



sometimes lasting for more than a year. Often during that period an interim superintendent is hired, but the person knows from the beginning that his position is only temporary. This may account for some of the shorter tenures of superintendents.

### **Factors Affecting Superintendent Longevity**

This study examines potential risk and protective factors for longevity of superintendents in Michigan. Newell (1997) studied factors affecting superintendent tenure in Missouri and divided these possible mediators into the following three groups: (1) Superintendent Factors, (2) Board Member Factors, (3) and School District Factors. The balance of the literature will be presented within this framework.

### **Superintendent Factors**

#### **Retirement**

The 1992 AASA Study data indicated that a large number of superintendents would be reaching retirement age (57) in the later part of the decade (Glass, 1992). This suggests that superintendents' turnover will increase. The AASA 2000 Study data bore that out with nearly 50% of the superintendents in their first superintendency. There was an unusually high number of superintendents just entering the profession during the 1990s to fill the vacancies caused by these retirements.

Retirement continues to be a major reason for superintendents leaving their position. In a recent national survey (Glass et al., 2000), a random sample of 2,979 school superintendents was given a new survey instrument called the SPEAR

(Superintendents Professional Expectations and Advancement Review). The return rate was 57.7%. The majority of the respondents in this study (68.4%) were in the 50-59 age range. In addition, 10.7% of the respondents were over 60 years of age. Given the number of superintendents over the age of 50, retirement will continue to be a significant reason for superintendents leaving their positions (Cooper et al., 2000).

With so many superintendents over the age of 50, the pension system is critical for superintendents. Superintendents in the SPEAR survey were asked whether they were currently vested in their state pension program. This is an important issue because K-12 educators are often members of a retirement program that is specific to the state in which they work (Auriemma, Cooper, & Smith, 1991). The great majority of the sample superintendents (86.2%) were fully vested in a retirement program. Being vested means that an educator can reclaim both their pension contribution and whatever financial contributions the district and state have made. The SPEAR study also asked respondents to indicate the number of states in which they are vested—an indicator of previous job mobility. Most superintendents (80.3%) were vested in a single state (Cooper et al., 2000, p. 28). This shows a tendency for superintendents to remain in one state for their careers and thus to build a pension in that state's retirement program. These data indicate the importance of pensions in the mobility of superintendents, at least across states.

### Salary

The superintendent of a school district can be compared to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a corporation. He or she is responsible for the day to day running of the school district. When Chicago Public Schools found itself wanting to hire a new superintendent in 1993, they decided to also look at persons who currently held the position of CEO in a major firm. But in conducting their nationwide search, Chicago found that CEOs were not interested in the superintendency. Chicago board member Jack Valinote cited three major problems a district faces in attracting CEOs:

1. Pay is inadequate (only \$175,000 in Chicago as superintendent compared to anywhere from \$400,000 to several million that CEOs were used to).
2. They get treated like garbage.
3. They get run out of town. (Jones, 1994, p. 24)

Anderson (1989) found salary to be the highest correlate in determining superintendent turnover. She speculated that the reason for the high correlation could be two-fold. A school board wanting to retain a superintendent may offer the existing superintendent a higher salary. If a superintendent continues to get good raises, that was a reason why tenure was longer in those districts. Further, the higher salary could be an indicator that the superintendent was at the apex of his/her career and was therefore less mobile. Glass (1992) found superintendent salaries doubled between 1971 and 1982. In 1992, Glass found that while most superintendents are well-paid within their communities, they still did not have the benefits or "perks" of their counterparts in the private sector.

The 2000 AASA Study data (Glass et al., 2000) did not ask for salary amounts from their respondents. The reason given for this is that the financial composition of the superintendent's salary package is often very complex. The fringe benefits absent from the salaries reported in the earlier decade have now become very much a part of current superintendent's salaries. Among fringe benefits often found in superintendents' salary packages are: (a) annuity contribution, (b) paying all the superintendents' state retirement system costs, (c) district leased vehicle, (d) term life insurance, (e) whole life insurance, (f) professional development allowance, (g) social security contributions (Glass et al., 2000). Glass suggests that more study needs to be done on superintendents' compensation packages.

Superintendents' compensation becomes even more confusing when one looks at the number of hours most superintendents put on the job. Superintendents in some districts do not make as much as teachers on a daily or hourly basis (Glass, 1992). Superintendents are on call 24 hours a day. Glass points out that this has diminished the lure of higher salaries in administration and the motivation of classroom teachers to become administrators. Glass et al. (2000) states that:

Even a \$20,000 or \$25,000 salary increase may not be attractive to many potential superintendents, owing to the fact that they must move their families, endure many more work evenings, have virtually no job security, be on call 24 hours a day and take a barrage of criticism from board members, employees, unions, and unhappy community members. (p. 2)

In addition, the increase in pay may not be enough to offset the income from a spouse who has to leave a position when the other spouse wants to move.

### Academic Preparation

Academic preparation is an important part of any profession. The academic preparation of superintendents varies considerably from the orderly process encountered in many other professions such as medicine, law, accounting, and dentistry. The professional requirements for licensing in those professions are well defined. In contrast, the superintendent usually begins as a classroom teacher and then obtains his/her administrative credential on a part-time basis while teaching. The career path of the superintendent may include being a coach, a principal, a central office administrator and then a superintendent.

The superintendent may have a MA degree, a specialist degree, and/or a doctorate degree. Forty-five percent of superintendents have doctoral degrees, and nearly all those degrees are in educational administration (Glass et al., 2000, p. 128). This is a 12% increase over the 1992 study. About one quarter of superintendents rated their graduate programs in educational administration to be "fair" or "poor" (Glass et al., 2000, p. 142). Unlike previous studies, the 2000 study focused on the preparation of superintendents. There is very little literature focusing exclusively on superintendent preparation. Most published studies combine superintendents with principals and other types of administrators. Glass states in the 2000 AASA study that "Superintendents in the new century will be spending much more time working with community groups, responding to state-mandated assessment programs, and acting as champions of public education in the face of school choice, vouchers, privatization, and home schooling" (p.viii). Glass believes that preparing the superintendents of tomorrow

should become a much higher priority for states, higher education institutions and the profession itself.

There is a move among some urban districts to turn to the business community to search for their superintendents. Individuals with business backgrounds and no educational credentials have headed many districts including Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Minneapolis, Minnesota (Jones, 1994). Jones reported that the Chicago board of education included in its search for a new superintendent in 1993, hiring a person with military and/or business background. The above mentioned districts are urban districts, and many believe that it is the urban districts which are in the most trouble. School boards and the communities they represent, want to find a leader who will “fix” what is wrong with a district.

#### Total Years in District

Glass et al. (2000) found that very few superintendents (8.8 percent) have spent their entire careers in one school district. This means that most superintendents are likely to move several times from the time they begin as a teacher until they become superintendent. Most superintendents are over fifty years old with very few (.7%) less than forty (Glass et al., 2000, p. 19). If a person begins teaching in the early twenties, and very few of the superintendents are less than forty, the career path to superintendent is easily 20 or more years. During this period of time, one may need to move to other districts when opportunities for advancement do not present themselves in the district where one is currently employed.

The years a person served in the district prior to becoming a superintendent is a determining factor in superintendent turnover (Carlson, 1962). Carlson used the concept of career-bound and place-bound to differentiate between superintendents who ascended to the superintendency from a different position within the district and those who came in from outside the district to assume the superintendency. In his initial study in 1959-60, he found that the place-bound superintendents had an average tenure of 8.3 years as compared to 4.6 years for the career-bound superintendent. Fenske (1971) pointed out that mobility was influenced by whether a person was place-bound or career-bound. The place bound person tended to have ties to the area and was there prior to assuming the superintendency and would quite likely remain in the community after leaving the superintendency. The career bound superintendent values opportunity over ties to a single community and is one who is more open to new positions in other locales.

### Perceived Stress

A certain amount of stress is present in any professional position. Stress is not necessarily an unhealthy condition, but if frustrations become too extreme, and superintendents have no healthy ways to release them, stress can become disabling. Superintendents under high levels of stress might make decisions without benefit of reflection and rational thought. Personal relationships may suffer. Nevertheless, pressure on superintendents is being felt at varying degrees in all of the nation's schools.

McCurdy and Hymes (1992) found that superintendents report more stress

than in the past. Glass (1992) found stress among superintendents to be reported more often in the AASA study of American superintendents than in the 1982 study. Glass et al. (2000) report that stress levels perceived by superintendents in the 2000 study show a “disturbing, but largely predictable trend” (p. 72) with even a higher number of superintendents reporting considerable stress on the job. More than half (51.5%) of all reporting superintendents indicated that they feel considerable or very great stress in the superintendency. Another 40.9% indicated a moderate level of stress. Interestingly, very great stress is felt more often by superintendents of very small school districts (Glass et al., 2000, p. 73). Glass recommended the higher education preparation programs might consider incorporating stress management training within their educational administration course work. Additionally, Glass et al. (2000) found that very great stress is felt more often by superintendents in the 40 to 44 year old category (p. 73).

When stress continues and becomes habitual, it can lead to burnout. Burnout can occur when superintendents feel high stress and have no healthy way of releasing that stress. They generally do not perform as well because leaders become more pre-occupied with handling the stress than with developing the organization’s potential (Graf, 1996). Graf, in his study on superintendent burnout in public schools, sought to identify whether demographic factors including gender, size of district, years of experience, age of superintendent, type of district or type of community were factors in superintendent burnout. The Burnout Assessment Inventory along with a survey was sent to 265 superintendents in California Public Schools. The three environmental



variables of isolation, board support and staff support were significant factors in superintendent burnout. This study reinforces the strong need for healthy superintendent/board relations.

Superintendents may be drawn to the human services through what is described by Edelwich and Brodsky (1981) as noble aspirations and high enthusiasm. With the pressures attributed to this position, and the isolation connected to the job, disillusionment sets in. Superintendents often complain that their jobs have turned out to have little to do with the educating of children. Edelwich and Brodsky indicate that as administrators rise in pay and status they find themselves getting farther from the people they seek to serve. Once promoted, these individuals often find that they miss their students and co-workers.

### Gender

In 1993, women comprised 5.6 percent of the superintendencies in the nation's K-12 school districts (Burstyn & Tallerico, 1996). Of the 2,262 superintendents responding to The 2000 Study of the American Superintendency, 297 were women (Glass et al., 2000, p. 78) or 13% of the total number of respondents. The question arises as to why is the top job of the education field so under represented with women?

Increases in the numbers of women superintendents have occurred in very small rural districts and for women of color in large urban districts (Ortiz & Whisler, 1988). There is a hierarchy in districts that make one district more desirable than

another. Ortiz and Marshall (1988) suspect that district size, type of population, and budget are the key indicators. Opportunities for women in small rural districts where salaries are lower and large urban districts where the problems abound have increased for women primarily because of the reluctance of white males to pursue these positions (Burstyn & Tallerico, 1996).

Fatigue is particularly acute among women superintendents in small rural areas (Burstyn & Tallerico, 1996). These smaller districts can be the most difficult for a superintendent because there are fewer central office personnel to help make decisions and share the workload. Since budgets are determined by enrollments, smaller districts have less money to hire needed personnel. Superintendents' salaries are less in the small rural districts. With a larger workload and smaller pay, these positions may be the least satisfying. Greater stress is reported among superintendents in small districts (Glass, 1992; Glass et al., 2000).

Discriminatory practices and barriers limiting opportunities for women abound. The 1992 AASA study found that female superintendents reported that discriminatory hiring practices were a problem four times more often than their male counterparts. The majority of men in the 2000 sample believe that most of the barriers listed in the survey were not factors limiting administrative opportunities for women, while women themselves reported all of the factors to be either important or somewhat important factors (Glass et al., 2000 p. 89). Perceptions were very different. Unless these practices and barriers are addressed, attaining the position and mobility within the profession will remain difficult for women.

The United States Census Bureau has characterized the superintendency as being the most male-dominated executive position of any profession in the United States (Glass et al., 2000). Seventy-one percent of female superintendents responded that they were working under their first contract. More than one-third of the 297 female superintendents had been superintendents for fewer than 3 years and 58% had served fewer than 5 years (Glass et al., 2000, p. 17). This suggests that the gains for women as superintendents are very recent.

### Ethnicity

The most recent data on minorities in the position of superintendent can be found in the 2000 AASA Study data. Of the 2,262 superintendents responding to the 2000 study, only 117 are minorities. African Americans account for 5.3% of the sample followed by 2.7% Hispanic superintendents (p. 104). In no small measure, minorities in the superintendency are underrepresented. Enrollment data as of January 1999 (p. 109) show that white male and female superintendents are serving in districts that have smaller enrollments than districts where minorities are serving as superintendents. Nearly half (46%) of the minority superintendents are employed in urban districts with more than 50,000 students (Glass, 1992).

It can be a difficult task for minorities to acquire their first position as a superintendent. Ascending to the superintendency for nonwhites means getting past a complex mix of unwritten selection criteria that shape superintendent search and hiring practices (Tallerico, 2000). These criteria are largely invisible because they do not

appear in either advertisements of desired qualifications or public forums typically associated with employing a new superintendent. These unwritten rules involve “headhunters’ and school board members’ hypervaluing “how we connected with the candidate” and “who we could relate to best”. This is more likely to disadvantage people of color who often are different from the white males doing the headhunting and interviewing (Tallerica, 2000).

### Leadership Style

Harmony between superintendents and boards can be enhanced by similarities of leadership styles. Katz (1993) examined two basic kinds of styles: nomethetic (task-centered) and idographic (relationship-centered). These two extremes when applied to boards of education are sometimes referred to as corporate style and familial style. Superintendents and boards of education at opposite ends of this leadership spectrum are a recipe for disaster, while superintendents and boards with similar styles can build tighter alliances. Differences in leadership style correlate positively with superintendent turnover (Katz, 1993). Leadership style needs to be more closely examined when hiring occurs.

Superintendents were asked to state the specific number of hours they spent per week in direct communication with board members (Glass et al., 2000). The 2000 study indicates that 62.1% of superintendents spend three or fewer hours per week communicating directly with board members. On a seven-member board, this represents an average of 1/2 hour per week per board member. A 1994 study showed

that superintendents who were judged to be exemplary, spent more than double the amount of time reported in the 2000 study (Carter, Glass, & Hord, 1994). This study would suggest that a close relationship with the board, evidenced by communication that occurs on a regular basis is the one of the most important things a superintendent can do to ensure his/her success. The importance of this communication with the board cannot be underestimated.

### School Board Factors

#### Age, Marital Status, and Education of Board Members

Freeman, Underwood, and Fortune (1991) defined the typical board member in America as married, white male, age 41-50, with children in school. He has a college degree, is a professional and earns \$40,000-\$50,000 per year. He was recently elected to the board, has three years or less service, and serves on a seven member board. Female representation is increasing with 34% of board members being female (York, Keough, Underwood, & Fortune, 1991). These changes promise to continue with ever increasing minority and female representation on boards across the country. Pacific states are moving faster toward a changing board with 45% female representation on their boards (Freeman et al., 1991). Freeman and associates see boards beginning to move toward more closely resembling the ethnicity and gender of their constituency.

### Existence of Pressure Groups

The existence of pressure groups in their school districts is confirmed by 57.6 percent of the superintendents (Glass et al., 2000). Pressure groups can form over many issues. Looking at a local newspaper often will give the reader insight into the educational politics of that community. Issues such as school prayer, vouchers, budget, aspects of the curriculum, or the urging of the board to fire or retain a staff member are among issues that account for most of the 800 pressure groups mentioned by the superintendents in the recent 2000 AASA study.

Sometimes the pressure groups are represented by members of the school board. A pressure group may support a certain candidate for the board election thereby ensuring their particular agenda is addressed. When board members themselves represent special interest and pressure groups, this tends to create board divisiveness and problems in district administration (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Sixty-five percent of superintendents say that community pressure groups have emerged in their districts to influence the board (Glass, 1992). The larger the district the higher the predominance of pressure groups with 87.3% of the superintendents in districts with an excess of 25,000 enrollment indicating the presence of pressure groups (Glass, 1992). More recently, it was found that 90.5 percent of responding superintendents in larger districts cite the existence of pressure groups (Glass et al., 2000).

The research confirms that the position of board member is much more political than in the past (Bennett, 1991; Funk & Funk, 1992; Hall & Diffort, 1992;

Szeptycki & Dodge, 1993). Political agendas include, integration, nepotism, the “fundamentalist right”, spending issues, vouchers, charter schools, achievement issues, athletics, and sex education to name a few. This is really nothing new. Historically, the boards across the country have been composed of individuals seeking to extol their own political agenda on the public schools. Dancing in the 40’s and 50s was an issue. Objections were raised about flag salutes and the Pledge of Allegiance in the 60’s. Busing to achieve racial balance in the schools was also a hot topic in the 60s and early 70s. The 80’s and 90’s have seen the emergence of a new kind of dissident. Biblical creationism as science has reemerged in some localities. Mastery learning, cooperative learning, restructuring, sex education, thematic units, drug awareness programs are all topics that are talked about for hours in board meetings across the country.

As board members increasingly come to boardrooms with their own political agendas, the future does not look bright for superintendents. Disharmony appears to be one of the major reasons for superintendent turnover. In a survey of 246 superintendents in California, the following was revealed:

1. At the time the superintendents vacated their positions, a full two-thirds of the boards indicated dissatisfaction with the superintendent.
2. A majority of the superintendents leaving under a disharmonious situation failed to have their contracts renewed.
3. Board/superintendent disharmony is the major cause of superintendent seat vacancies by a very wide margin (Giles & Giles, 1990, p. 4).

These data identify an important source of problems between many superintendents and their boards. Many superintendents coming from the teaching ranks are suspicious of parents when they are teachers and of board members when they become superintendents. This might be one of the reasons why superintendents spend so few hours communicating with the board. Board meetings are far from ideal as a time and place for a superintendent to communicate with board members. It would seem that superintendents need to make a concerted effort to telephone, email or meet informally with their board each week.

Joseph Hentges (1985) looked at the politics of superintendent and school board linkages. His study consisted of 188 superintendents and 379 school board members in districts with student enrollments above 25,000. Pertinent in this data are the findings that conflict levels in general proved higher than had been indicated in earlier research. Some argue that school boards are too impatient today, that they become too involved in the day to day affairs of running a school district, and that they challenge the superintendent for power and control over the district, to the detriment of the educational program (Bradley, 1990)

Carson (1999) chose to investigate superintendent turnover in five small, rural school districts in Montana, which showed a historically low rate of superintendent tenure over the last 21 years. All five schools historically employed a superintendent in the dual role of principal and superintendent. Agriculture was the primary industry in these locals and each district was geographically isolated from other districts. The sample included school board chairpersons in the districts observed. The researcher



used the term solidarity to describe the relationship between the school board chiefs and the superintendents in these five districts. Solidarity is defined in this context as the sharing of a common identity through the use of sacred symbols. This comes about through frequent interactions across a variety of contexts says Carson (1999), and solidarity was found to be the major contributing factor to the longevity of the superintendents in these five districts. Solidarity seems to go beyond shared communication. It means a oneness of purpose between the board and the superintendent and the use of common symbols to describe it

The changing political climate can be problematic for a superintendent not only in relationship to the school board, but also with other local political figures. Pressure groups can be just a few very influential people. Hunter (1997) looked at the role of the mayor of several large cities as it pertains to superintendent longevity. In these communities, the mayor had begun to assert greater control over public schools. These officials had everything to gain and nothing to lose in promising to reform local schools. Schools, unlike superintendents, do not have to demonstrate tangible improvement. Officials can also scapegoat superintendents for any lack of real improvement that becomes apparent. Rhetoric can sway people's opinion, but it often does little to show real improvement in student achievement and promote long lasting school reform.

Most superintendents and school boards see community/school activities through a lens of involvement rather than as "pressure" politics (Glass, 2000). However, for various reasons, some of these groups become pressure groups. When a

school district relies heavily on local property taxes for funding, local taxpayer groups can pressure school boards over budget matters. Pressure groups can be a major reason that a superintendent would leave a district. Glass noted that almost 15% of the superintendents indicated that a conflict with school boards precipitated their move. Only 10.2% of the superintendents in the largest districts said this was the case. In contrast 24.8% of superintendents in the smallest districts indicated they had left because of board conflict (p. 69).

### Evaluation

Evaluation often plays a part in a person's desire to stay in a position or leave that position. If the expectations are clearly defined and a person's performance is based on some objective measurement, there should be some job security. Superintendents are no different. Klenow (1996) found that nearly all superintendents in Michigan public school districts reported that formal personnel evaluations were conducted for executive administrators in their school districts. Respondents reported that evaluations served multiple purposes which included decisions about salary, retention and performance improvement.

In a study of superintendents' evaluations in Indiana public schools, Koryl (1996) found that more than 78% of the superintendents were being formally evaluated by the school board. The most important criterion in evaluation was board and superintendent relations. In this study, there was found to be a positive correlation between the salary of the superintendent and the presence of a formal evaluation--the

higher the superintendent's salary, the more likely it was that the superintendent received a formal evaluation.

Glass (1992) also investigated the extent to which superintendent job descriptions are used to establish the criteria for performance evaluation. He found that the majority (88%) of responding superintendents do have a written job description, however only 57% of them are evaluated according to the written criteria contained in their job description. The criteria used most often to evaluate superintendents currently is to assess how well the district attempts to meet the state assessment standards (Glass et al., 2000). The accountability theme is strong, and reflects a decade-long trend toward high stakes testing throughout the nation.

Illinois has enacted legislation mandating that pay raises be allotted to superintendents where the district has seen increased student performance on standardized tests. Variations of this concept has been the case in many districts--Houston, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and Palm Beach County Florida--as well as smaller districts across the country (Bushweller, 1997). This may well be a trend for the 21st century (Glass et al., 2000). A national survey revealed that 55% of school board members believe pay for performance could help improve student achievement, but that 62% of superintendents do not believe pay for performance would help improve the performance of students (Bushweller, 1997).

## School District Factors

### Wealth of District

Some districts cannot afford an extensive search for a qualified superintendent. Turnover in superintendents triggers expenditures for job searches, which range from \$1,500 to \$50,000 (Montgomery, 1991) and take as many as eight months or more. Expenses related to the search include substitute compensation for staff participating in the screening committees, lodging for the candidate, visitation costs for the committee, extra secretarial costs, and after hours custodial and utilities costs. Even greater costs may result if the district decides to compensate a superintendent for the remaining term of the contract. These costs could range from fifty thousand to several hundred thousand dollars, depending upon the years remaining and costs of vacation and/or health benefits.

Glass et al. (2000) wrote of the concerns that superintendents had in applying for new positions. When a superintendent signs a contract, most of the time a family moves--not just the applicant. Housing can be a serious problem, especially when moving to a district with high housing costs, or to a rural district where adequate housing does not exist. Superintendents' salaries often do not make it financially practical to live in certain districts, even though this may be a requirement of the position. When factoring in the higher cost of living, what looks like a pay increase may actually be a decrease in spendable dollars. In these cases superintendents may be moving up the career ladder, but losing ground financially. For those who look below

the surface, situations like these may actually inhibit those who may otherwise move into another superintendency.

### Size and Type of District

A large percentage of superintendents (92.9%) prefer to work in the type of district in which they currently work (Cooper et al., 2000). Overall, superintendents were most attracted to suburban districts, followed by rural districts. Urban districts were the least attractive overall, with 81.7 percent of superintendents in this study indicating “low or no” attraction to urban districts.

There is an inherent danger in treating the superintendency market as unitary or unidimensional (Cooper et al., 2000). The superintendent market is segmented by type and size. Suburban systems alone come in all sizes and with a range of racial, social and economic differences. The United States has more suburban districts than large urban or small rural districts (Cooper et al., 2000). Large urban districts tend to either hire “from within” or select leaders from other big cities (Kowalski, 1995). Large urban districts have a substructure which often includes assistant superintendents and other supervisory positions that provide a ready source for applicants when a vacancy in a superintendent position occurs. It may be difficult to recruit across types of districts (rural to urban, urban to rural, suburban to rural or urban). For this reason there may be a shortage of superintendents in suburban districts for example, while rural and urban districts may have enough applicants for an open position.

## Elections

The total number of board member elections have been shown to impact both board and superintendent longevity. Loomis (1995) investigated the relationship between the turnover of incumbent board members and turnover of the district's superintendents. Findings indicated that the total number of elections did in fact impact both board member and superintendent longevity. It was not so much the relationship that the superintendent had with the changing board that was the determining factor, according to Loomis, but the changing political climate reflected in these elections that contributed to the higher turnover.

## **Risk and Protective Factors**

The review of literature focused upon the factors relating to superintendent longevity. The literature indicated that there are a number of reasons for superintendent longevity, and these reasons are many and varied. These factors were divided into Superintendent Factors, School District Factors and School Board Factors. Superintendent Factors can be further divided into demographic factors such as age, ethnicity, and gender; financial factors such as salary and benefits; attitudinal data such as perceived satisfaction of the superintendent or perceived stress; and work history such as outcome of last evaluation and reasons for leaving last position. School District Factors focus on the type of community - rural, suburban, urban; the wealth of the district based on the per pupil expenditures; and the prevalence of pressure groups around various issues associated with that particular community.

School Board Factors include the superintendent's evaluation, and the perceived solidarity or oneness of purpose between the superintendent and the board.

Among the factors affecting superintendent longevity, the literature supports a view that some of the factors positively affect longevity, while other factors have a negative effect. These factors could also be termed "risk factors" for longevity and "protective factors" for longevity. In this study, risk factors are defined as those factors that would decrease the probability or chances that a particular superintendent would stay in a position longer than the average tenure, while protective factors are the factors that would increase the probability or chances that a superintendent would stay in a position longer than the average tenure.

Kraemer (1992) looked at the concept of "high risk" populations in medical research. A "high risk" population for a given disorder is a population where there are many risk factors present. Those who are at risk for heart disease may have high cholesterol, a history of heart disease in their family and a smoker. With each added risk factor, the person becomes more likely to have heart disease. Research in the prevention of adolescent drug use utilizes the terms risk and protective factors to determine which factors are more characteristic of the drug using population (risk) and which factors are more characteristic of the non-drug using population (protective). Moncher, Holden, and Trimble (1990) showed that a multiple risk factor index was linearly related to reported prevalence of using beer, wine, inhalants, marijuana, and cocaine among a sample of Native American adolescents. The converse of risk factors for drug use is protective factors that reduce the likelihood of drug use.

Protective factors buffer or moderate the association between risk factors and drug use and abuse (Botvin et al., 1995).

In the same way, factors can be separated into risk and protective as they relate to superintendent longevity. Fenske (1971) found that “career bound” superintendents had a shorter tenure than “place bound” superintendents. Using the concept of risk and protective factors as defined in this study, “career bound” would be termed a risk factor, while “place bound” would fall into the protective factors for longevity.

### Summary

The literature is inconclusive as to whether there is a real crises in the superintendency. On the one hand, Glass et al. (2000) reports that the turnover rate has not changed that drastically over the last few decades, but the same author shows alarm when writing about a “shrinking applicant pool” for the many job openings. There is much in literature about the distasteful attributes of this position, yet Glass et al. (2000) reports that a full two thirds of the responding superintendents said they would choose the superintendency as a profession all over again.

The role of the superintendent is changing rapidly as school reform becomes the order of the day. Tests scores published in the local newspapers and real estate ads that say, “buy your house here because of the high scores,” are adding a pressure to the position that has not been evidenced before. Superintendents are being held accountable for the test scores of the students in each of the schools in their district.



Since test scores are often lower in poorer neighborhoods, districts where the majority of students are poor are becoming the least desirable places to become a superintendent. Yet a large number of students reside and learn in these districts and good leadership is essential. These districts are just the districts where our greatest leaders are needed.

Articles written by educators are quick to blame school boards for wanting to “micro-manage” the system or for having a narrow agenda when elected to the board. Some of the blame for poor relationships between the boards and the superintendents must also go with the superintendent. Superintendents are typically not trained in problem solving models and cooperative negotiation. Many superintendents ascend to that position because of the power they believe that position will give them, only to find out that they have gone from having one boss to having several. This is distasteful to many leaders, but it is reality. The research shows that a superintendent must make time to be with and communicate with board members over a variety of contexts. Time is something that many superintendents do not have. This is often where this position becomes impossible to manage.

The question that needs to be asked is how can we make this position more attractive so that good, dedicated educators will aspire to the position, and will stay in the position long enough to make an impact. This study examines potential risk and protective factors for longevity of superintendents in Michigan. Using this information will enable school boards and potential superintendent candidates to make better decisions as to whether a particular person is right for a given opening. Enhancing the

probability of a superintendent's leadership to make a lasting impact on a district is important and is deserving of attention.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures used to conduct this study. The chapter includes a description of: (a) the purpose, (b) research questions, (c) instrument development and field testing, (d) population and procedure, (e) data analysis, and (f) summary.

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to examine potential risk and protective factors for longevity of superintendents in Michigan. This study compared superintendents who served in their current position for more than six years with superintendents who had six years or less in their current position. Risk factors are defined as those factors that would decrease the probability or chances that a particular superintendent would stay in a position more than six years. Protective factors are the factors that would increase the probability or chances that a superintendent would stay in a position for more than six years.

Three areas of influence on longevity were reviewed in Chapter II and can be described as: superintendent factors, school board factors and school district factors.

This grouping of variables was used by Newell (1997) when he examined longevity of superintendents in Missouri. The current study commissioned by the American Association of School Administrators (Glass et al., 2000) looked at superintendent factors and school board factors, but not at factors relating to the school district itself. However, the literature supports the consideration of school district factors and their influence on longevity (Cooper et al., 2000; Glass 1992; Hunter 1997; Klenow, 1996; Montgomery 1991).

### Research Questions

To determine the direction and significance of the predictor variables, Superintendent Factors, School District Factors and School Board Factors, with the criterion variable, Superintendent Longevity, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the superintendent factors that are protective for longevity?
2. What are the superintendent factors that are risk for longevity?
3. What are the school district factors that are protective for longevity?
4. What are the school district factors that are risk for longevity?
5. What are the school board factors that are protective for longevity?
6. What are the school board factors that are risk for longevity?

### Instrument Development and Field Testing

The data used in this study were collected by means of a mail out survey

which included variables described in the literature as having a potential to influence longevity of superintendents. Questions were compiled using three surveys as models.

First, the survey was the approximate length of The Superintendents' Professional Expectations and Advancement Review (SPEAR) Instrument (Cooper et al., 2000). Questions on education level also were modeled after the SPEAR. Demographic data was gathered by similar questions as those used by Newell when he studied the tenure of superintendents in Missouri (Newell, 1997). Survey questions focusing on evaluation of the superintendent were patterned after similar questions from the survey instrument used in the 2000 Study done by the American Association of School Administrators (Glass et al., 2000). Additional items were taken from the literature and compiled with the help of a panel of faculty members of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Leadership and the Department of Educational Studies at Western Michigan University.

The survey was then field tested with a pilot group of four Michigan superintendents. The purpose of the field testing was to determine if the questions on the survey were worded precisely and the instructions were clear. Those piloting the survey were also asked for input on the quality of the questions, the type of questions asked, and the time it took to fill out the survey. Field testing involved administering the survey in an interview format. This sample included one superintendent who had served in three positions as superintendent with the other three serving in their first superintendency. Of the three in their first superintendency, two had served longer

than 6 years and one served less than six years. They were encouraged to be critical and make suggestions for improvements. Review of the four interviews indicated that one item needed an additional answer category. No other changes were made to the instrument following field testing. The information gathered from this group of four superintendents was not included in the study.

A measure of the wealth of the district was taken from the data gathered by the Michigan Department of Education ([www.mde.state.mi.us](http://www.mde.state.mi.us)). The wealth of the school district was measured by the per pupil expenditures of each district. Since this information was readily available on the internet, there was no survey question asking for that information.

### Population and Procedure

The population for this study was all the public school superintendents in Michigan minus the four superintendents used in the field testing. Data were collected from this population by means of a mail out survey (see Appendix A). The names and school district addresses of all the superintendents in Michigan were provided by the Michigan Association of School Administrators in Lansing, Michigan. Respondents were assured that their confidentiality was protected and that the master list would be destroyed as soon as the data were collected. The survey and the collecting process, was approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University (see Appendix B). In July, 2001, the survey was sent to each superintendent in Michigan ( $n = 524$ ) with a stamped, self-addressed

return envelope. The surveys were numbered and matched to a master list so that a follow-up mailing could be sent to those who did not respond to the first mailing. The reminder postcard was sent on September 1, 2001 (see Appendix C).

The surveys that were returned do not represent a random sampling of the superintendents in Michigan, but rather the data from those superintendents who chose to return the survey. Phone calls were made on October 10, 2001 to a random list of six of the superintendents who did not respond after the reminder note, as to the reasons for not responding to the survey (see Appendix D for their responses). Most superintendents said that they had forgotten to send in the survey or either the superintendent or the secretary was on vacation. Included in this study was information collected from all surveys received by October 1, 2001. There were 338 surveys returned by this date, representing a response rate of 64.5%.

### Data Analysis

The respondents to the survey were divided into two groups. These two groups were determined by question 1 and question 3 on the survey. Question 1 asks: "Is this your first superintendency?" Question 3 asks: "How many years have you served in your current position?" Superintendents were then categorized into stayers or leavers. The stayers were defined as those superintendents who have been in their current position longer than six years. The leavers were those superintendents who have been in their current position six years or less. Criterion variable 1 (CV1) included superintendents who were in their first position as superintendent as well as

superintendents who had more than one superintendent position.

**Group 0 = Leavers** I have six years or less in my current position (n=164) and I have more than one superintendency. (n=115)  
(Combined n=78)

**Group 1 = Stayers** I have more than six years in my current position (n=161) and I am in my first superintendency (n=227) or I have more than one superintendency (n=115).  
(Combined n=107)

The second criterion variable (CV2) was formed by looking at only those superintendents who had more than one superintendency. These superintendents were divided into two groups - those who had more than six years in their current position and those who had six years or less in their current position. Those in their first superintendency were eliminated from this data.

**Group 0 = Leavers** I have six years or less in my current position (n=164) and I have more than one superintendency (n=115)  
(Combined n=78)

**Group 1 = Stayers** I have more than six years in my current position (n=181) and I have more than one superintendency (n=115) (Combined n=35).

This classification scheme excluded a group (n=62) of superintendents who were in their first superintendency for less than six years. The reason this group was left out was because one cannot ascertain from the data whether this superintendent will be a stayer or a leaver. The data recorded from this group of superintendents, however, were important to this study and were presented in the description of the sample population.

The remaining questions on the survey were clustered into three groups: (1)



Superintendent Factors, (2) School District Factors, and (3) School Board Factors. The information gathered from these questions formed the predictor variables in this analysis. The variables were classified as shown in Figure 1.

In this data analysis, these variables were examined in order to determine the unique set of variables that were characteristic of a superintendent who is a stayer or a leaver. Those factors most associated with stayers were said to be protective for longevity, while those associated with leavers were defined as risk for longevity.

Stepwise logistic regression analysis in SAS was used with the predictor variables (Superintendent Factors, School Board Factors, and School District Factors) to determine if the variables were protective or risk factors for longevity relative to CV1 and CV2. The stepwise logistic regression analysis was especially suited for this study because:

1. The criterion variable is dichotomous (Stayer or Leaver).
2. The survey included binary responses (for example, male and female), ordinal responses (for example, crucial, very important, important, not important), nominal responses (for example, number of years spent in a district), and ratio responses (for example, age).

Stepwise regression is a combination of forward selection and backward selection analysis. In the forward selection, predictor variables are determined one at a time in the order in which they contribute to the regression. In the backward procedure, all variables are first entered and then variables are eliminated one at a time starting with the smallest contributor to the predictive model. A stepwise procedure

**Superintendent Factors****Demographic Data**

**Education of the Superintendent**

**Ethnicity of the Superintendent**

**Age of the Superintendent**

**Gender of the Superintendent**

**Family status of the Superintendent**

**Length of time the Superintendent lives within 25 miles of current position**

**Financial Data**

**Salary of the Superintendent**

**Additional Financial Benefits**

**Attitudinal Data**

**Perceived satisfaction of the Superintendent**

**Issues that would cause Superintendent to leave the current position**

**Factors that inhibit effectiveness**

**Importance of the quality of the relationship with the board**

**Potential incentives to leave current position**

**Effect of family on willingness to move to another Superintendency**

**Number and type of factors that inhibit effectiveness**

**Perceived Superintendent turnover**

**Perceived stress associated with position**

**Figure 1. Predictor Variables.**

Figure 1--Continued

**Work History**

Average number of hours per week spent in direct contact with board members

Five year plan of the Superintendent

Outcome of last evaluation

Reasons for leaving prior position

Number of school districts worked for as a Superintendent

Longest time spent in a district as a Superintendent

Shortest time spent in a district as a Superintendent

**School District Factors**

Importance of district's MEAP scores to community, school board and staff

Prevalence of community pressure groups

Type of community - Rural, Suburban, or Urban

Type of district moved from as a Superintendent

Effect of the results of a bond election on decision to move

Wealth of School District

**School Board Factors**

Perceived solidarity with board by the Superintendent

Presence of a formal job description

Evaluation based on job description

Regularity of evaluation

Perceived solidarity between Superintendent and past board

Importance of solidarity as a factor for leaving last position

Perceived quality of relationship with the current board

begins like a forward procedure, but after the second predictor is entered, a second significance test is conducted to determine the contribution of each of the previously selected predictor variables. Therefore it is possible for a predictor variable to be deleted if it loses its effectiveness as a predictor when considered in combination with newly entered predictors (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1994). The variable was considered a protective factor if it was shown to increase the probability that a superintendent would stay in a position for more than six years. The variable was considered a risk factor if it was shown to decrease the probability that a superintendent would stay in a position for more than six years.

A .10 confidence interval was used to determine if a factor had a significant effect on longevity. The width of this confidence interval is wider than the standard .05 interval in most educational research. A higher type I error rate is justifiable in this exploratory study to decrease the possibility of making a type II error by potentially missing a possible risk or protective factor.

### Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine potential risk and protective factors as they relate to longevity of superintendents in Michigan. This study compared superintendents who served in their current position for more than six years with superintendents who have six years or less in their current position. The predictor variables were divided into three groups: (1) School District Factors, (2) School Board Factors, and (3) Superintendent Factors. Longevity in the superintendency was

defined by two groups - Criterion Variable 1 (CV1) and Criterion Variable 2 (CV2). Criterion Variable 1 (CV1) grouped both superintendents in their first position and those having more than one position, into stayers and leavers. Criterion Variable 2 (CV2) grouped only those superintendents who have more than one superintendency. One "open ended" question was asked of those superintendents with more than one superintendency: "Has your family status had any effect (positive or negative) on your willingness to move to another superintendency?" The answers from that question will be discussed in chapter four along with descriptive data of the sample population taken from the survey.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to examine potential risk and protective factors for longevity of superintendents in Michigan. The study compared superintendents who served in their current position for more than six years with superintendents who had more than one superintendency and served six years or fewer in their current position. The variables considered to be risk or protective were divided into (a) Superintendent Factors, (b) School Board Factors, and (c) School District Factors. This chapter includes a description of the (a) design of the study, (b) definition of criterion variables, (c) description of predictor variables, (d) inferential statistics, and (e) summary.

#### **Design of Study**

A mail out survey was sent to the entire population of Michigan superintendents ( $N=524$ ). A total of 338 Michigan superintendents returned the survey. There were 41 questions on the survey. Superintendents in their first superintendency completed the first 32 items in the survey, while those having more than one superintendency completed the entire survey. Additional data on per pupil expenditures were obtained from the Michigan Department of Education. The data

were collected for the 2000-2001 school year.

Longevity was defined in two ways. Criterion Variable 1 (CV1) divided the superintendents into two groups: Superintendents who had more than one superintendency and had six years or fewer in their current position (Leavers), and superintendents who had more than six years in their current position regardless of the number of superintendencies they had in their career (Stayers). Criterion Variable 2 (CV2) looked at only those superintendents who had more than one superintendency. The two groups consisted of those having six years or fewer in their current position (Leavers) and those with more than six years in their current position (Stayers).

The predictor variables consisted of variables measured by the survey and divided into: (a) Superintendent Factors, (b) School District Factors, and (c) School Board Factors. Six research question were addressed by this study:

1. What are the superintendent factors that are protective for longevity?
2. What are the superintendent factors that are risk for longevity?
3. What are the school district factors that are protective for longevity?
4. What are the school district factors that are risk for longevity?
5. What are the school board factors that are protective for longevity?
6. What are the school board factors that are risk for longevity?

Statistical analysis of the data included descriptive statistics, chi-square analysis, t -tests and stepwise regression analysis. All statistical analyses of data were calculated using SAS software.

The data analysis is presented in three sections. The first section defines the

criterion variables. The second section describes each of the predictor variables by category: (a) Superintendent Factors, (b) School Board Factors, and (c) School District Factors. The third section presents results of the stepwise logistic regression analyses that were used to address the research questions.

### Definition of Criterion Variables

Longevity in superintendents was defined in two different ways. These two groups were determined by question 1 and question 3 on the survey. Question 1 asks: "Is this your first superintendency?" Question 3 asks: "How many years have you served in your current position?" The stayers are defined as those superintendents who have been in their position longer than six years. The leavers are those superintendents who have been in their position six years or fewer. Criterion Variable I (CV1) includes superintendents who are in their first position as superintendent as well as superintendents who had more than one position as superintendent.

#### **Criterion Variable 1 (CV1)**

**Group 0 = Leavers** I have six years or fewer in my current position ( $\underline{n}=164$ ) and I have more than one superintendency. (Combined  $\underline{n} = 78$ )

**Group 1 = Stayers** I have more than six years in my current position ( $\underline{n}=161$ ) and I am in my first superintendency or I have more than one superintendency. (Combined  $\underline{n}=107$ )

Looking at only those superintendents who have more than one superintendency forms the second Criterion Variable. These superintendents are divided into two groups - those who have more than six years in their current position and those who



have six years or fewer in their current position. Those in their first superintendency are eliminated from these data.

### **Criterion Variable 2 (CV2)**

**Group 0 = Leavers** I have six years or fewer in my current position ( $\underline{n}=164$ ) and I have more than one superintendency. (Combined  $\underline{n}=78$ )

**Group 1 = Stayers** I have more than six years in my current position ( $\underline{n}=181$ ) and I have more than one superintendency. (Combined  $\underline{n}=35$ )

### **Description of Predictor Variables**

The rest of the data taken from the survey were grouped as: (a) Superintendent Factors, (b) School District Factors, and (c) School Board Factors. The data were taken from perceptions that the superintendent had about the school district, the school board, the reasons for staying or leaving a given position and other aspects of the position of superintendent.

Answers to the questions classified as superintendent factors were expressed as the number of respondents, the percentage of the whole, the number of stayers (those in current position more than six years) the number of leavers (those having six year or fewer in their current position), and the number of stayers and leavers having more than one superintendency. Where applicable, the data were expressed with means and standard deviations.

### **Superintendent Factors**

Questions categorized as superintendent factors may be seen in Table 1.

Table 1  
Superintendent Factors

Question #	Question
4	What is the highest degree you have earned?
5	To what ethnic group do you belong
6	How old are you?
7	Gender?
8	What is your present family status?
9	What is your present salary?
10	Check the additional financial benefits
11	How much of a feeling of satisfaction does the position of superintendent provide you?
12	Are there any issues that would cause you to leave your current position? If yes, check all that apply.
13	How long have you lived within a radius of 25 miles of your current position?
14	What are the factors that inhibit your effectiveness in your current superintendency?
15	What is the average number of hours per week you spend in direct communications with board members?
16	How do you perceive the quality of your relationship with your current board?
17	How important to you is the quality of the relationship with your board?
21	How do you perceive superintendent turnover in Michigan?
25	In your career, where do you plan to be in five years?
26	How do you perceive the stress associated with your position as superintendent?
28	Higher pay and better benefits would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.
29	Moving to a larger district would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.
30	Moving to a smaller district would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.
31	Moving my spouse/significant other and family would be a strong incentive if I were to consider a different superintendent position.
32	Having a portable pension would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.
33	If this is not your first superintendency, what were circumstances under which you left your last position?
34	How many school districts have you worked for as a superintendent?
35	What was the longest time you spent in a district as a superintendent?
36	What was the shortest time you spent in a district as superintendent?
37	Has your family status had any effect on your willingness to move to another superintendency?

**Question #4 - What is the highest degree you have earned?**

The largest group of participants indicated their highest degree earned was a master's degree. All but two of the respondents had a Masters degree or higher but were excluded by the definitions of CV1 And CV2, (see Table 2). Chi-square analyses of highest degree by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant,  $\chi^2(2, N = 183) = 2.53, p = .2823$  and  $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 1.11, p = .5727$  respectively.

Table 2  
Highest Degree Earned

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Bachelor's</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Master's</b>	42.3	31.8	42.3	34.3
<b>Specialists</b>	25.6	34.6	25.6	34.3
<b>Doctorate</b>	32.1	33.6	32.1	31.4

**Question #5 - To what ethnic group do you belong?**

The superintendency in Michigan is a position held primarily by Caucasians. There were no Hispanics or Asians that responded to this survey (see Table 3).

Table 3  
Ethnic Groups

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Caucasian</b>	41.76	56.04	68.47	29.73
<b>African-American</b>	0.55	0.55	0.90	0.00
<b>Hispanic</b>	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.00
<b>Asian</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Other</b>	0.55	0.00	0.90	0.00

However, in all analyses the non-caucasians were grouped together. Chi-square analyses of ethnic by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant,  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 0.01, p = .9043$  and  $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 0.01, p = .9095$  respectively.

#### **Question #6 - How old are you?**

The mean age for all the respondents was 51.82 with a standard deviation of 5.89. Age data is presented for each CV in Table 4. Independent t-tests were conducted for both CV1 and CV2. Results indicated that for CV1, there was a statistically significant difference in mean age  $t(176) = -3.16, p = .0019$  between leavers and stayers such that stayers are significantly older than the leavers. Results for CV2 revealed no statistically significant difference in mean age between the two groups,  $t(107) = -1.39, p = .1684$ .

Table 4

#### **Age**

	<b>CV1</b>		<b>CV2</b>	
	<b>Leavers</b>	<b>Stayers</b>	<b>Leavers</b>	<b>Stayers</b>
<b>N</b>	78	107	78	35
<b>Mean</b>	52.25	54.41	52.25	63.67
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	4.63	4.44	4.63	5.49

#### **Question 7 - Gender?**

There were remarkably few females serving as superintendents among the Michigan superintendents sampled, only 10.75% overall. Presented in Table 5 is the breakdown of gender for each independent variable. Chi-square analyses of gender by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant, Chi-square analysis of highest

Table 5

## Gender

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Male</b>	41.76	53.85	67.86	29.46
<b>Female</b>	1.10	3.30	1.79	.89

degree by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant.  $\chi^2(2, N = 182) = 1.09, p = .2966$  and  $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 0.01, p = .9095$  respectively.

**Question #8 - What is your family status?**

Presented in Table 6 is the breakdown of family status for each independent variable. Chi-square analysis of family status by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant,  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 2.42, p = .4890$  and  $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 2.47, p = .4806$ .

Table 6

## Family Status

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Single</b>	0.55	2.19	0.89	0.89
<b>Married; no children</b>	5.46	4.37	8.93	1.79
<b>Married; children</b>	35.52	49.73	58.04	27.68
<b>Divorced *</b>	1.09	1.09	1.79	0.00

\*Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

**Question # 9 - What is your yearly salary?**

The mean salary for all respondents was \$96,942 with a standard deviation of \$19,253. The highest reported salary was \$230,000 and the lowest salary was

\$51,000. Salary data is presented for each CV in Table 7. Independent t-tests were conducted, results indicated that for CV1 and CV2 there was no statistically significant difference in mean salary,  $t(176) = .55$ ,  $p = .5810$ , and  $t(108) = -0.78$ ,  $p = .4377$  respectively.

Table 7

## Salary

	CV1		CV2	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
N	77	101	77	33
Mean	\$100,508	\$99,092	\$100,508	\$103,333
Standard Deviation	\$16,256	\$17,412	\$16,256	\$19,953

**Question #10 - In addition to your current salary, check the additional financial benefits of your position.**

The respondents were asked to check all the benefits they received from a list of nine. Results are summarized in Table 8 for CV1 and CV2. The benefits most often checked by Michigan superintendents were additional life insurance, opportunity to attend national conferences, annuities, and district leased vehicle. The benefit least identified was a membership in a country club. Chi-square analysis of each benefit by CV1 and CV2 were statistically significant for the following benefits: Additional Retirement Contributions (CV1),  $\chi^2(1, N = 182) = 4.10$ ,  $p = .0427$  and Additional Life Insurance (CV2),  $\chi^2(1, N = 111) = 3.10$ ,  $p = .0781$ .

**Question # 11 - How much of a feeling of satisfaction does the position of superintendent provide for you?**

Table 8  
Benefits - CV1

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>District Leased Vehicle</b>	21.98	28.02	36.04	16.22
<b>+Annuities</b>	26.52	35.91	43.24	23.42
<b>+Additional Life Insurance</b>	34.07	43.96	55.86	24.32
<b>+Paid Board Positions</b>	1.65	1.65	3.85	0.00
<b>+Additional Retirement Contributions</b>	8.24	18.69	13.51	13.51
<b>+Additional SS Contributions</b>	3.30	6.04	5.41	2.70
<b>+Expense Account</b>	11.54	18.68	26.92	33.33
<b>+Country Club Membership</b>	1.28	0.00	1.28	0.00
<b>+Opportunity to Attend National Conferences</b>	31.32	39.56	51.35	21.62

+Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

Although superintendents continue to face challenges in their jobs, they indicated that they gain a great deal of satisfaction from their jobs. Most superintendents (69) responded that they experienced considerable satisfaction (see Table 9). Chi-square analysis of satisfaction by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant,

Table 9  
Satisfaction

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>None *</b>	0.00	1.10	0.00	0.90
<b>Little</b>	.55	1.65	.55	0.90
<b>Moderate</b>	10.99	13.19	10.99	7.21
<b>Considerable</b>	31.32	41.21	31.32	20.72

\*Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

$\chi^2(3, N = 182) = 2.14, p = .5423$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 111) = 2.81, p = .4216$ , respectively.

**Question #12 - Are there any issues that would cause you to leave your current position of superintendent? Check all that apply.**

Most of the responding superintendents said there were issues that would cause them to leave their position. Results are presented in Table 10 and 11. Chi-square analysis of this question by CV1 indicated there was a statistically significant difference in whether a stayer or leaver had issues that would cause him/her to leave the position,  $\chi^2(1, N = 178) = 2.86, p = 0.0903$ . Results for CV2 revealed no statistically significant difference,  $\chi^2(1, N = 108) = 1.22, p = .2690$ .

Table 10

Any Issues That Would Drive One to Leave?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>No</b>	9.55	19.10	15.74	9.26
<b>Yes</b>	33.71	37.64	55.56	19.44

Table 11

Issues That Would Cause a Superintendent to Leave the Position

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>+Lack of board member support</b>	13.38	15.49	20.88	6.59
<b>Lack of community support</b>	23.40	23.40	36.67	13.33
<b>+Lack of financing to adequately fund operations of district</b>	36.17	38.30	56.67	18.89
<b>+Increased family responsibilities</b>	5.67	9.22	8.89	5.56
<b>+Media attacks on school district</b>	4.96	9.22	7.78	5.56



**Question # 13 - How long have you lived within a radius of 25 miles of your current position?**

Most of the superintendents have lived in the community far longer than they have been superintendents. The mean number of years the responding superintendents lived within a radius of 25 miles from their job was 14.65 years with a standard deviation of 15.73. As a group, they were part of the community with only three of the responding superintendents not living within a 25-mile radius. Data is presented for each CV in Table 12. Independent t-tests were conducted for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the length of time lived within a 25 mile radius for each independent variable (CV1, CV2) between stayers and leavers,  $CV1 = t(179) = -5.38, p = .001$ ;  $CV2 = t(109) = -1.88, p = .0632$ .

**Question #14 - What are the factors that inhibit your effectiveness in your current superintendency? (Check all that apply)**

State reform mandates led the list as the most often checked factor that inhibits the effectiveness of the responding superintendents. Close behind was inadequate financing (see Table 13). Chi-square analysis of each factor by CV1 and Cv2 were

**Table 12**

**Length of Time Within 25 Miles**

	<b>CV1</b>		<b>CV2</b>	
	<b>Leavers</b>	<b>Stayers</b>	<b>Leavers</b>	<b>Stayers</b>
<b>N</b>	78	103	78	33
<b>Mean</b>	4.77	15.85	4.77	10.29
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	13.43	12.85	13.43	5.85

Table 13

## Factors That Inhibit Effectiveness

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Inadequate financing</b>	21.98	28.02	36.04	15.32
<b>Too many insignificant demands</b>	21.31	26.23	34.82	12.50
<b>State reform mandates</b>	21.31	34.43	34.82	17.86
<b>Collective bargaining agreements</b>	15.30	21.31	25.00	15.18
<b>Racial/ethnic problems</b>	0.00	1.09	0.00	0.00
<b>Too much added responsibility</b>	7.10	7.10	11.61	6.25
<b>Insufficient administrative support</b>	8.79	6.59	14.29	5.36
<b>Difficulty with board members</b>	7.69	9.34	12.61	8.11
<b>Ineffective staff members</b>	6.01	9.29	9.82	5.36
<b>Size of district</b>	1.09	4.37	1.79	2.68
<b>Lack of community support</b>	3.30	2.75	5.36	1.79
<b>Board Micromanagement</b>	10.99	12.64	17.86	8.04
<b>Board elections - changed expectations</b>	5.46	7.65	8.93	4.46
<b>Other</b>	0.00	2.20	0.00	1.79

statistically significant for the following variables:

CV1 - Factor 7, Insufficient administrative support.  $\chi^2(1, N = 182) = 2.75, p = .0968$

CV1 - Factor 14, Other.  $\chi^2(1, N = 182) = 3.06, p = .0799$ .

**Question # 15 - What is the average number of hours per week you spend in communications with board members?**

The mean number of hours all respondents spent in direct communications with board members was 4.62 with a standard deviation of 3.64. Hours data is presented for each CV in Table 14. Independent t-tests were conducted for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Results indicated no statistically significant difference in mean hours for CV1 and CV2 between stayers and leavers, ( $t(179) =$

Table 14

## Number of Hours Communicating With Board Members

	CV1		CV2	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>N</b>	78	103	78	33
<b>Mean</b>	4.61	4.39	4.61	5.12
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	3.52	3.21	3.52	3.71

0.43,  $p = .6661$ ;  $t(109) = 0.68$ ,  $p = .4975$ , respectively.

**Question #17 - How important to you is the quality of the relationship with the board?**

The majority felt that their relationship with the board was crucial. Presented in Table 15 is the breakdown of the quality of the relationship with the board for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Chi-square analysis by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant,  $\chi^2(2, N = 183) = 0.12$ ,  $p = .9429$ ;  $\chi^2(2, N = 112) = 0.96$ ,  $p = .6188$ .

**Question # 21 - How do you perceive superintendent turnover in Michigan?**

Table 15

## How Important Is the Relationship With the Board?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Crucial</b>	33.88	46.45	55.36	24.11
<b>Very important</b>	7.65	9.84	12.50	6.25
<b>Important</b>	1.09	1.09	1.79	0.00
<b>Not important *</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

\*Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

Most superintendents thought that turnover was on the increase in Michigan. Presented in Table 16 is the perceived turnover for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Chi-square analyses were not statistically significant.  $\chi^2(3, N=182) = 1.94, p = .5852$ ;  $\chi^2(3, N = 111) = 2.77, p = .4285$ .

Table 16  
Superintendent Turnover

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Decrease</b>	0.55	2.20	0.90	1.80
<b>Increase</b>	30.22	39.56	49.55	22.52
<b>Same</b>	8.24	9.34	13.51	5.41
<b>Don't Know</b>	3.30	6.59	5.41	0.90

**Question #24 - What was your last evaluation?**

Superintendents report that they were evaluated in the excellent category most of the time. Table 17 shows the breakdown of last evaluations between stayers and leavers in CV1 and CV2. Chi-square analysis of the level of last evaluations by CV1

Table 17  
Last Evaluation

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Excellent</b>	29.71	44.00	49.52	25.71
<b>Good</b>	9.14	13.14	15.24	5.71
<b>Fair *</b>	2.29	1.71	3.81	0.00
<b>Poor *</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

\*Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

and CV2 were not statistically significant,  $\chi^2(2, N = 175) = .78, p = .6780$ ;  $\chi^2(2, N = 105) = 2.29, p = .3188$ .

**Question # 25 - Where do you plan to be in five years?**

The greatest number of respondents said they would be retired in five years. Chi-square analysis were conducted for each independent variable (CV1, CV2) with the outcome reported in Table 18. Results indicated that for CV1 and for CV2, there were two variables that were statistically significant:

CV1, CV2 - Continue in my current position,  $\chi^2(1, N = 182) = 7.56, p = .0060$ ;

$\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 4.34, p = .0368$ , respectively.

CV1, CV2 - In a profession outside education,  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 9.06, p = .0026$ ;

$\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 5.18, p = .0228$  respectively.

**Question # 26 - How do you perceive the stress associated with your position of**

Table 18

**Projected Career in Five Years**

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Continue in my current position</b>	17.58	12.64	28.57	6.25
<b>In a superintendency in a larger district</b>	6.01	6.56	9.82	4.46
<b>In a superintendency in a smaller district *</b>	.55	0.00	.89	0.00
<b>Working in a university</b>	1.10	4.40	1.79	1.79
<b>In a profession outside education</b>	5.46	4.37	8.93	1.79
<b>Retirement</b>	16.39	34.97	26.79	18.75
<b>Working in an education-related position</b>	2.73	6.56	4.46	3.57

\* Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

### superintendent?

The position of superintendent was perceived as stressful as rated on a 4-point scale. More than half of the responding superintendents said they had moderate stress in their jobs, with the percentage of superintendents who felt they had very great stress in the job close behind (39%). Chi-square analyses were conducted on the two independent variables (CV1, CV2). Results reported in Table 19, were not statistically significant for CV1 or CV2,  $\chi^2(2, N = 183) = .36, p = .8346$ ;  $\chi^2(2, N = 112) = .17, p = .9205$ .

Table 19  
Perceived Stress of Superintendent Position

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
No stress	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Little stress	1.09	2.19	1.79	.89
Moderate stress	23.50	18.03	38.39	17.86
Very great stress	32.79	22.40	29.46	11.61

Overall Chi-square significant at the .10 confidence level.

The following group of questions on the survey asked respondents to reply using a four point scale (4 = Strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree).

**Question # 28 - Higher pay and better benefits would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.**

Chi-square analysis by CV1 indicated there was a statistically significant

difference between stayers and leavers as to whether pay was a strong incentive to move.  $\chi^2(3, N = 181) = 11.45, p = .0095$ . Presented in Table 20 is the breakdown of higher pay/benefits by CV1 and CV2.

Table 20  
Higher Pay/Benefits

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Strongly agree</b>	17.13	9.94	28.18	5.45
<b>Agree</b>	12.15	20.99	20.00	10.00
<b>Disagree</b>	11.05	19.34	18.18	10.00
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	2.76	6.63	4.55	3.64

**Question #29 - Moving to a larger district would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.**

Most superintendents disagreed with that statement. Larger districts were not what seem to entice superintendents to move. Table 21 shows the breakdown of moving to a larger district for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Chi-square analysis indicate there was no statistically significant difference between CV1 and

Table 21  
Moving to a Larger District

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Strongly agree</b>	3.87	2.21	6.36	0.91
<b>Agree</b>	5.52	9.94	9.09	3.64
<b>Disagree</b>	24.31	28.73	40.00	16.36
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	9.39	16.02	15.45	8.18

CV2,  $\chi^2(3, N = 181) = 3.51, p = .3188$ ;  $\chi^2(3, N = 110) = 1.45, p = .6929$ , respectively.

**Question # 30 - Moving to a smaller district would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.**

Table 22 shows the breakdown of moving to a smaller district as an incentive to leave between stayers and leavers by each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Chi-square analysis indicates there was no statistically significant difference between CV1 and CV2.  $\chi^2(3, N = 181) = .99, p = .8018$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 110) = .90, p = .8262$ , respectively.

Table 22  
Moving to a Smaller District

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Strongly agree *</b>	0.55	0.55	0.91	0.00
<b>Agree</b>	5.52	4.97	9.09	3.64
<b>Disagree</b>	14.36	21.55	23.64	11.82
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	22.65	29.83	37.27	13.64

\* Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

**Question # 31 - Moving my spouse/significant other and family would be a strong incentive if I were to consider a different superintendent position.**

Most superintendents disagreed with this statement meaning that family considerations are important to them. Table 23 shows the breakdown of moving spouse between stayers and leavers for the two independent variables (CV1, CV2). Chi-square analysis of moving spouse by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant,



Table 23  
Moving Family

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Strongly agree</b>	10.00	15.56	16.36	10.91
<b>Agree</b>	11.11	10.56	18.18	5.45
<b>Disagree</b>	8.89	12.22	14.55	4.55
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	13.33	18.33	21.82	8.18

$\chi^2(3, N = 180) = 1.39, p = .7072$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 110) = 2.52, p = .4711$ , respectively.

**Question # 32 - Having a portable pension would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position.**

Superintendents were interested in their pensions as indicated by their response to this question. Table 24 shows the breakdown of having a portable pension between stayers and leavers by the two independent variables. Chi-square analysis of this question by CV1 indicated there was a statistically significant difference.  $\chi^2(3, N = 157) = 6.27, p = .0990$ . Chi-square analysis by CV2 showed no statistically significant difference,  $\chi^2(3, N = 108) = 5.18, p = .1590$ .

Table 24  
Portable Pension

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Strongly agree</b>	11.73	8.94	19.44	4.63
<b>Agree</b>	13.41	15.64	22.22	6.48
<b>Disagree</b>	10.06	21.79	16.67	12.96
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	7.26	11.17	12.04	5.56

The rest of the Superintendent Factor questions were asked only of those superintendents who had more than one superintendency.

**Question # 33 - If this is not your first superintendency, what were the circumstances under which you left your last position? Check all that apply.**

Most of the responding superintendents said they left for a larger district. Along with that, most superintendents said their leaving was voluntary and that they left for a higher salary. Chi-square analysis of each circumstance by CV1 and CV2 were statistically significant for the following variables.

#### CV1

- Circumstance 2 Left for a larger district  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 31.61, p = .0001$
- Circumstance 3 Conflict with board members  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 17.00, p = .0001$
- Circumstance 4 Lack of funding  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 5.26, p = .0217$
- Circumstance 5 Board elections  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 4.20, p = .0403$
- Circumstance 6 Family considerations  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 18.49, p = .0001$
- Circumstance 7 Higher education opportunities  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 5.50, p = .0190$
- Circumstance 8 Job in a better financed district  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 13.05, p = .0003$
- Circumstance 9 Conflict with the community  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 6.91, p = .0085$
- Circumstance 10 Conflict with an employee  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 5.50, p = .0190$
- Circumstance 11 I had been there "long enough"  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 9.51, p = .0020$
- Circumstance 12 Left for a higher salary  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 24.12, p = .0001$
- Circumstance 14 Board vote of no confidence  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 11.26, p = .0008$

#### CV2

- Circumstance 14 Board vote of no confidence  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 3.75, p = .0526$

The breakdown of circumstances that caused a superintendent to leave his/her position by CV1 and CV2 is presented in Table 25.

**Question #34 - How many school districts have you worked for as a superintendent?**

The mean number of positions held by all responding superintendents having more than one superintendency was 2.4 with a standard deviation of 1.0. The number

Table 25

## Circumstances of Last Job Change

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Community Pressure</b>	.55	.55	.89	.89
<b>Left for a Larger District</b>	27.32	13.11	44.64	20.54
<b>Conflict with Board Members</b>	12.57	3.83	20.54	5.36
<b>Lack of Funding</b>	15.49	2.20	9.01	3.60
<b>Board elections</b>	2.73	.55	4.46	.89
<b>Family Considerations</b>	16.39	6.56	26.79	10.71
<b>Higher Education Opportunities *</b>	2.19	0.00	3.57	0.00
<b>Job in Better Financed District</b>	14.21	6.56	23.21	10.71
<b>Conflict with Community *</b>	2.73	0.00	4.46	0.00
<b>Conflict with an Employee *</b>	2.19	0.00	3.57	0.00
<b>Had been there "Long Enough"</b>	12.02	6.01	19.64	8.93
<b>Left for a Higher Salary *</b>	22.40	10.38	4.37	0.00
<b>Voluntary</b>	46	18	46	18
<b>Board Vote of No Confidence *</b>	4.37	0.00	7.14	0.00
<b>Dismissal</b>	.55	.55	.89	.89

• Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

of school districts in which a superintendent served by CV is presented in Table 26. Independent t-tests were conducted for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Results indicated that for CV1 there is a statistically significant difference in mean number of years spent in a previous position  $t(181) = 11.34$ ,  $p = .001$  between stayers and leavers. The mean number of years spent in a previous position  $t(110) = 2.27$ ,  $p = .0249$  is also statistically significant.

**Questions # 35 -What was the longest time you spent in a district as superintendent?**

The mean number of years for the longest time spent in a district by all

Table 26  
Number of School Districts

	CV1		CV2	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>N</b>	78	105	78	34
<b>Mean</b>	2.48	.66	2.48	2.00
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	1.20	.98	.49	1.04

respondents was 7.6 with a standard deviation of 4.3. This data is presented for each CV in Table 27. Independent t-tests were conducted for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Results indicated that for CV1 there is a statistically significant difference in the mean number of years  $t(181) = 2.93$ ,  $p = .0039$  between leavers and stayers, and a statistically significant difference in the mean number of years for CV2  $t(110) = -7.63$ ,  $p = .001$  between leavers and stayers.

Table 27  
Longest Time in a School District

	CV1		CV2	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>N</b>	78	105	78	34
<b>Mean</b>	5.50	3.50	5.50	10.62
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	2.60	5.58	2.60	4.43

**Question #36 - What was the shortest time you spent in a district as superintendent?**

For the shortest time spent in a district, the mean for all respondents was 3.4 years with a standard deviation of 2.1. This data is presented for each CV in Table

28. Independent t-tests were conducted for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Results indicated that for CV1 there is a statistically significant difference in the mean number of years for the shortest time spent in a position  $t(181) = 5.24, p = .0001$  between leavers and stayers, and a statistically significant difference in the mean number of years for shortest time for CV2  $t(110) = -2.21, p = .0293$  between leavers and stayers.

Table 28  
Shortest Time in a School District

	CV1		CV2	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>N</b>	78	105	78	34
<b>Mean</b>	3.00	1.29	3.00	3.97
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	2.16	2.21	2.16	1.10

**Question #37 - Has your family status had any effect (positive or negative) on your willingness to move to another superintendency? If yes, please explain.**

More than half of the responding superintendents (57%) felt that their family had an effect on their willingness to move. See Appendix E for a complete listing of the comments made by each of the respondents.

#### School District Factors

The following questions were categorized as school district factors. These questions were the perceptions of the superintendent regarding issues in their school district (see Table 29).

Table 29  
School District Factors

Question #	Question
18	How important are your district's MEAP scores as a factor of the support you feel from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The community</li> <li>▪ The school board</li> <li>▪ The staff</li> </ul>
27	How would you describe your current community? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rural</li> <li>▪ Suburban</li> <li>▪ Urban</li> </ul>

The following questions were filled out by superintendents who had more than one superintendency (see Table 30).

The wealth of the school district was determined by the per pupil expenditures for each district. This information was obtained from the Michigan Department of

Table 30  
School District Factors for Those With More Than One Superintendency

Question #	Question
38	When you last changed districts as a superintendent, the type of district you moved from was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rural to rural</li> <li>▪ Rural to suburban</li> <li>▪ Rural to urban</li> <li>▪ Suburban to rural</li> <li>▪ Suburban to suburban</li> <li>▪ Suburban to urban</li> <li>▪ Urban to rural</li> <li>▪ Urban to suburban</li> <li>▪ Urban to urban</li> </ul>
39	Did the results of a bond/millage election have any influence on your leaving your last position?

Education ([www.mde.state.mi.us](http://www.mde.state.mi.us)) and not from the survey. The per pupil expenditures ranged from a high of \$11,134 to a low of \$5,388. The mean per pupil expenditures for all respondents was \$6,792.80 with a standard deviation of \$955.40 (see Table 31). Per pupil data is presented for each CV in Table 31. Independent t-tests were conducted for each independent variable (CV1, CV2). Results indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in mean per pupil expenditures for CV1 or CV2 between stayers and leavers.  $t(172) = .60$ ,  $p = .5493$  and  $t(40.1) = -0.87$ ,  $p = .3897$ .

Table 31  
Per Pupil Expenditures

	CV1		CV2	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>N</b>	73	101	73	32
<b>Mean</b>	6682.50	6762.10	6682.50	6889.90
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	718.05	1033.00	718.05	1262.80

**Question # 18 - How important are your district's MEAP scores as a factor of the support you feel from:**

- **The community**
- **The school board**
- **The staff**

From a choice of crucial, very important, important or not important, the most often checked was important. Superintendents perceived that the MEAP scores were most important to the school board. Superintendents felt the community saw the

MEAP scores as being more important than did the staff (see Tables 32-34). Chi-square analysis of importance of MEAP scores to the community, the school board and the school district by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant.

CV1, CV2 - Community  $\chi^2(3, N = 154) = .68, p = .8789$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 111) = .10, p = .9915$ , respectively.

CV1, CV2 School Board  $\chi^2(3, N = 181) = .10, p = .9915$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 110) = 1.46, p = .6912$ , respectively.

CV1, CV2 Staff  $\chi^2(3, N = 182) = .70, p = .8722$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 111) = 1.70, p = .6381$ , respectively.

Table 32

How Important Are MEAPs to the Community?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Crucial</b>	3.30	6.59	5.41	3.60
<b>Very important</b>	18.13	24.18	29.73	11.71
<b>Important</b>	16.48	21.43	27.03	11.71
<b>Not important</b>	4.40	5.49	7.21	3.60

Table 33

How Important Are MEAPs to the School Board?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Crucial</b>	4.42	6.63	7.27	5.45
<b>Very important</b>	21.55	28.18	35.45	14.55
<b>Important</b>	14.36	19.34	23.64	8.18
<b>Not important</b>	2.21	3.31	3.64	1.82



Table 34

## How Important Are MEAPs to the Staff?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Crucial</b>	2.20	2.75	3.60	2.70
<b>Very important</b>	12.64	20.33	20.72	11.71
<b>Important</b>	22.53	27.47	36.94	12.61
<b>Not important</b>	4.95	7.14	8.11	3.60

**Question # 27 - How would you describe your current community?**

Most of the superintendents in Michigan are from communities characterized by the term rural. The urban school districts represent large numbers of our school population, yet represent only a small percentage of our respondents. Chi-square analysis of type of community by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant:  $\chi^2(2, N = 183) = 3.84$ ,  $p = .1467$  and  $\chi^2(2, N = 112) = 2.14$ ,  $p = .3423$  respectively. The breakdown of type of community for each independent variable is presented in Table 35.

Table 35

## Type of Community

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Rural</b>	26.78	34.97	43.75	18.75
<b>Suburban</b>	11.48	20.22	18.75	10.71
<b>Urban</b>	4.37	2.19	7.14	.89

Only those superintendents who had more than one superintendency answered the following survey questions.

**Question # 38 - When you last changed districts as a superintendent, the type of district you moved from was:**

The majority of our respondents were from rural communities (65%). This is reflected in the responses to this question. Most of the superintendents moved from one rural community to another rural community. The next highest group moved from a rural community to a suburban community. Chi-square analysis of each type of community by CV1 and CV2 were statistically significant for the following variables:

CV1 - Rural to Rural  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 25.78, p = .0001$   
 Rural to Suburban  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 8.05, p = .0046$   
 Rural to Urban  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 8.35, p = .0039$   
 Suburban to Urban  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 4.20, p = .0403$   
 CV2 - Rural to Urban  $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 2.76, p = .0964$   
 Suburban to Suburban  $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 10.35, p = .0013$

Results are summarized in Table 36 for CV1 and CV2.

**Question # 39 - Did the results of a bond/millage election have any influence on**

Table 36

District Change With Last Job Change

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Rural to rural</b>	20.77	8.20	33.93	13.39
<b>Rural to suburban</b>	8.20	3.28	13.39	4.46
<b>Rural to urban *</b>	3.28	0.00	5.36	0.00
<b>Suburban to rural</b>	1.64	0.55	2.68	0.89
<b>Suburban to suburban</b>	1.64	4.37	2.68	7.14
<b>Suburban to urban</b>	2.73	0.55	4.46	0.89
<b>Urban to rural *</b>	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.89
<b>Urban to suburban</b>	0.55	0.00	0.89	0.00
<b>Urban to urban *</b>	0.55	0.00	0.89	0.00

\*Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

### **your leaving your last position?**

Those who had been in their position 6 years or less were more likely to have left as a result of an election. Presented in Table 37 is the breakdown of the results of an election as influencing a superintendent for each independent variable. Chi-square analysis of results by CV1 and CV2 were statistically significant.  $\chi^2(1, N = 183) = 12.74, p = .0004$  and  $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 4.26, p = .0389$  respectively.

**Table 37**

#### **Bond/Millage Results**

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Yes</b>	4.92	0.00	8.04	0.00
<b>No</b>	37.70	57.38	61.61	30.36

\* Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

### **School Board Factors**

The following questions were categorized as school board factors. The data represent the perceptions the superintendent has about the school board (Table 38). The following questions were filled out only by those superintendents having more than one superintendency (see Table 39).

#### **Question # 16 - How do you perceive the quality of your relationship with your current board?**

Superintendents characterized the quality of their relationship to the board as excellent or good. Only three respondents characterized this relationship as poor.

Table 38

## School Board Factors

Question #	Question
16	How do you perceive the quality of your relationship with your current board?
19	Solidarity means a oneness of purpose between a superintendent and the board. How would you rate the solidarity between you and your current board?
20	Have community pressure groups emerged in the past year pressure the board?
22	Do you have a formal job description? If yes, are you evaluated on the basis of that job description?
23	Are you evaluated annually, every two years, every three years, or not at regular intervals?

Table 39

## School Board Factors for Those With More Than One Superintendency

Question #	Question
40	Solidarity means a oneness of purpose between a superintendent and the board. How would you rate the solidarity between you and your past board?
41	How important was "solidarity" as a factor for leaving your last position?

Chi-square analysis of quality of board relationship by CV1 and Cv2 were not statistically significant.  $\chi^2(3, N = 183) = 3.29, p = .3486$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 112) = 4.22, p = .2378$  respectively. Results of the breakdown of quality of board relationship by CV1 and CV2 are presented in Table 40.

**Question # 19 - Solidarity means a oneness of purpose between a superintendent and the board. How would you rate the solidarity between you and your current board?**

**Table 40**  
**Quality of Relationship With Current Board**

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Excellent</b>	30.60	36.61	50.00	18.75
<b>Good</b>	9.29	15.85	15.18	9.82
<b>Average</b>	2.73	3.28	4.46	.89
<b>Poor *</b>	0.00	1.64	0.00	.89

\*Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

There seems to be a tight relationship with the majority of superintendents and their boards. Solidarity was rated “good” or “excellent” by 89% of the entire group of respondents. Chi-square analysis of solidarity by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant.  $\chi^2(3, N = 182) = 1.15$ ,  $p = .7627$  and  $\chi^2(3, N = 111) = 2.64$ ,  $p = .4491$ , respectively. The breakdown of solidarity with the board for each independent variable is presented in Table 41.

**Table 41**  
**Level of Solidarity Between Superintendent and Board**

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Excellent</b>	24.18	30.77	39.64	14.41
<b>Good</b>	13.19	17.03	21.62	9.01
<b>Average</b>	3.85	8.24	6.31	5.41
<b>Poor</b>	1.10	1.65	1.80	1.80

**Question # 20 - Have community pressure groups emerged in the past year to pressure the board?**

Superintendents were quite evenly divided on this question. Almost half of the superintendents felt that community pressure groups have emerged in the past year to pressure the board. Chi-square analysis of pressure groups by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant.  $\chi^2(2, N = 180) = 2.23$ ,  $p = .3268$  and  $\chi^2(2, N = 110) = .11$ ,  $p = .9455$ , respectively. Data on pressure groups is presented for each CV in Table 42.

Table 42

## Community Pressure Groups

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Yes</b>	20.00	31.11	32.73	15.45
<b>No</b>	20.56	26.11	33.64	14.55
<b>Don't Know</b>	1.67	0.56	2.73	0.91

**Question # 22 - Do you have a formal job description? If yes, are you evaluated on the basis of that job description?**

The majority of all respondents reported having a formal job description (75%) although fewer were evaluated on the basis of that job description (64%). Chi-square analysis of formal job description by CV1 and CV2 were not statistically significant.  $\chi^2(1, N = 180) = .09$ ,  $p = .7650$  and  $\chi^2(1, N = 109) = .18$ ,  $p = .6699$ . Data on formal job description for each CV is presented in Tables 43 and 44.

**Question # 23 - Are you evaluated annually, every two years, every three years or not in regular intervals?**

The majority of superintendents in Michigan reported that they were evaluated annually (94%). Chi-square analysis of evaluation frequency by CV1 was statistically

Table 43

## Formal Job Description?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Yes</b>	31.67	44.44	52.29	23.85
<b>No</b>	10.56	13.33	17.43	6.42

Table 44

## Evaluated on Basis of Job Description?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Yes</b>	25.33	38.67	41.76	20.88
<b>No</b>	16.00	20.00	26.37	10.99

significant.  $\chi^2(2, N = 182) = 5.01, p = .0814$ . Chi-square analysis of evaluation frequency by CV2 was not significant.  $\chi^2(2, N = 111) = 2.81, p = .2445$ . The breakdown of evaluation frequency by CV1 and CV2 is presented in Table 45.

Table 45

## Evaluation Frequency?

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Annual</b>	41.21	53.85	67.57	27.93
<b>Every* 2 years</b>	1.10	0.00	1.80	0.00
<b>Every* 3 years</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>NOT</b>	0.55	3.30	0.90	1.80

\*Chi-square results may be unstable due to low expected frequencies.

Only those superintendents who had two or more superintendencies answered the following questions.

**Question # 40 - Solidarity means a oneness of purpose between a superintendent and the board. How would you rate the solidarity between you and your past board?**

About half of the responding superintendents gave an "excellent" rating to the solidarity they felt between themselves and the past board. Almost one-fourth reported the relationship between themselves and their past board to be either average or poor. Chi-square analysis of solidarity with past board by CV1 was statistically significant.  $\chi^2(3, N = 183) = 60.61, p = .0001$ . Chi-square analysis of solidarity by CV2 was not statistically significant.  $\chi^2(3, N = 112) = 2.72, p = .4364$ . Table 46 shows the breakdown of solidarity for each independent variable (CV1, CV2).

**Question # 41 - How important was "solidarity" as a factor for leaving your last position?**

The majority (53%) of the reporting superintendents responded that "solidarity" played a part in their decision to leave their last position. Chi-square

Table 46  
Solidarity With Past Board

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Excellent</b>	21.31	39.89	34.82	15.18
<b>Good</b>	8.74	1.64	14.29	9.82
<b>Average</b>	7.10	6.56	11.61	2.68
<b>Poor</b>	5.46	9.29	8.93	2.68



analysis of solidarity as a factor for leaving by CV1 was statistically significant.  $\chi^2(2, N = 183) = 32.44, p = .0001$ . Solidarity as a factor for leaving by CV2 was not significant.  $\chi^2(2, N = 112) = 4.77, p = .1890$ . Solidarity as a factor for leaving by CV1 and CV2 is presented in Table 47.

Table 47

## Solidarity Effect

	CV1 (%)		CV2 (%)	
	Leavers	Stayers	Leavers	Stayers
<b>Crucial</b>	10.93	3.83	17.86	5.36
<b>Very important</b>	8.20	1.64	13.39	2.68
<b>Important</b>	3.28	3.28	5.36	5.36
<b>Not important</b>	20.22	48.63	33.04	16.96

## Inferential Statistical Analysis

Longevity was defined by classifying the respondents into stayers or leavers two different ways (CV1 and CV2) which then served as the criterion variables in two separate stepwise logistic regression analyses. Stayers were superintendents who had been in their current position more than six years, while Leavers were superintendents who had six years or fewer in their current position. CV1 included data from superintendents who were in their first superintendency and from superintendents who had more than one superintendency and CV2 included only data from superintendents who had two or more superintendencies.

There were six research questions posed in this study. All of these questions were addressed simultaneously using stepwise logistic regression analyses. An alpha

level of 0.10 was used to determine statistical significance of the findings. The width of this confidence interval is wider than the standard 0.05 interval used in most educational research. A higher type I error rate is justifiable in this exploratory study to decrease the possibility of making a type II error by potentially missing a possible risk or protective factor. The predictor variables were divided into three groups: (1) Superintendent Factors, (2) School District Factors, and (3) School Board Factors, but for purposes of analysis all of the factors were included in the stepwise logistic analysis.

A variable was considered a protective factor if it was shown to increase the probability that a superintendent would stay in a position for more than six years. The variable was considered a risk factor if it was shown to decrease the probability that a superintendent would stay in a position for more than six years.

### Logistic Analysis 1

Using CV1 as the criterion variable, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(7, N=121)=51.6673$ ,  $p < .0001$ . There were four superintendent factors that were significant at the .10 level and classified as protective. They were: age, additional retirement benefits in the salary package, the length of time the superintendent has lived within a 25 mile radius of his/her current position, and the outcome of the last evaluation. Table 48 presents a summary of the stepwise logistic analysis along with the odds ratio (OR) for each of the significant predictor variables. The odds ratio for retirement benefits (OR=2.907)

Table 48

## Protective Factors for Longevity, Criterion Variable 1

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Wald Chi-Square	P Value	Odds Ratio	90% Confidence Limits
Age	1	0.0883	3.0724	0.0796	1.092	1.0054 1.1867
Retire Ben.	1	1.0672	4.1098	0.0426	2.907	1.2230 6.9101
Live	1	0.0854	13.2598	0.0003	1.089	1.0479 1.1320
Last Eval	1	1.3943	5.4364	0.0197	4.032	1.5077 10.7833

indicates that when holding all other variables constant, respondents with additional retirement benefits in a salary package were almost three times more likely to be a stayer than a leaver. The odds ratio for a superintendents' last evaluation ( $OR = 4.032$ ) indicates that when holding all other variables constant, respondents with a higher rating in their last evaluation were over four times more likely to be a stayer than a leaver. Although age was a significant predictor variable in this analysis ( $p=.0796$ ), the odds ratio for age ( $OR = 1.092$ ) indicates that older superintendents were only slightly more likely to be in the stayers group than in the leavers group. Superintendents who lived within 25 miles of their position were more likely to be a stayer than a leaver ( $P = .0003$ ), but holding other variables constant the odds ratio ( $OR = 1.089$ ) indicates that the difference between stayers and leavers was not as great as with additional retirement benefits and the level of the last evaluation.

Presented in Table 49 are the statistically significant risk factors related to longevity for CV1. Two predictors were significant at the 0.10. They were Board Micromanagement and Quality of the Relationship between the Superintendent and the School Board. Superintendents were asked to choose which factor(s) most

Table 49

## Risk Factors for Longevity, Criterion Variable 1

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Chi-Square	P Value	Odds Ratio	90% Confidence Limits	Wald
Board Micro-management	1	-2.2556	5.1426	0.0233	0.105	0.0204	0.5382
Quality	1	-2.3351	10.9775	0.0009	0.097	0.0304	0.3086

inhibited their effectiveness in their position. Those who chose “Board Micromanagement” were more likely to be among the leavers group, (OR=.105) indicating that when holding all other variables constant, leavers were more likely to choose board micromanagement as a factor inhibiting their effectiveness and contributing to their leaving. The other statistically significant risk factor was the quality of relationship between the superintendent and the school board. Those perceiving a higher quality in their relationship were more likely to be a superintendent who has six years or less in their current position (see Table 49).

Criterion Variable 2

Using CV2 as the criterion variable, a test of the full model versus a model with intercept only was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(3, N=67)=52.2092$ ,  $p<.0001$ . Two superintendent factors and one school district factor were found to be significant at the .10 level. These factors were all found to be protective for longevity (see Table 50). The factors were: the longest time a superintendent had served in one district, whether the superintendent had left for family reasons, and moving from suburban to

Table 50

## Protective Factors for Longevity, Criterion Variable 2

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Chi-Square</b>	<b>P Value</b>	<b>Odds Ratio</b>	<b>90% Confidence Limits</b>	<b>Wald</b>
<b>Longest time</b>	1	1.2252	11.6569	0.0006	3.405	1.8870	6.1435
<b>Left for Family</b>	1	3.1147	5.8413	0.0157	22.527	2.7041	79.9499
<b>Suburb to Sub.</b>	1	5.0888	8.6683	0.0032	162.199	9.4461	2784.9912

suburban districts. The time a superintendent served in a previous district (OR=3.405) indicates that when holding other variables constant, superintendents who had served a longer time in a previous position were more than 3 times more likely to be a stayer. If the superintendent left his/her last position for family reasons (OR=22.527), holding other variables constant, he/she would be over 20 times more likely to be a stayer. A superintendent who is moving from suburban district to suburban district is 162 times more likely to be a stayer, holding other variables constant (OR =162.199). These last two statistically significant protective factors must be interpreted with caution, however. As can be seen from Table 50, the OR estimates for leaving for family reasons and moving from suburban district to suburban district are very large. This is likely due to small sample sizes and uneven distributions in these variables. Thus the lower limit of the 90% CI may represent a more plausible OR, i.e. 2.7041 and 9.4461, respectively. There were no risk factors for Criterion Variable 2

## Summary

Six research questions were posed for this study. Each question was addressed using the stepwise logistic regression analysis. An alpha level of .10 was used as the criterion for determining the statistical significance of the findings. The factors are listed according to their level of significance with the most discriminating factor listed first.

Research question 1. What are the superintendent factors that are protective for longevity?

1. The length of time the superintendent lived within 25 miles of his/her position.
2. The length of time the superintendent spent in a previous position.
3. Leaving the past position for family considerations
4. The outcome of the last evaluation
5. The existence of additional retirement benefits in the salary package.
6. The age of the superintendent

Research question 2. What are the superintendent factors that are risk for longevity?

The micromanagement of the board as a factor that inhibits the superintendent's effectiveness.

Research question 3. What are the school district factors that are protective for longevity?

Moving from suburban district to suburban district

**Research question 4.** What are the school district factors that are risk for longevity?

There were no school district factors that are significant at the .10 confidence level.

**Research question 5.** What are the school board factors that are protective for longevity?

There were no school board factors that are significant at the .10 confidence level.

**Research question 6.** What are the school board factors that are risk for longevity?

The quality of the relationship between the superintendent and the board.

Conclusions based on these findings along with a discussion as to how these findings relate to the current literature, can be found in Chapter V. Also included in Chapter V are the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into six sections. The first section consists of a summary of the study, including the purpose of the study, description of the population, and the treatment of the data. The second section includes a summary of the findings listed according to criterion variables (CVI and CVII). The third section consists of a discussion of the results relating to the findings. The fourth section examines the conclusions based on the findings and the literature. The fifth section presents limitations of the study and the final section suggests recommendations for further research.

#### Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine potential risk and protective factors for longevity of superintendents in Michigan. Longevity was defined by two criterion variables: (1) CV1, and (2) CV2. Criterion Variable 1 (CV1) divided the superintendents into two groups: Superintendents who had more than one superintendency and had six years or less in their current position (Leavers), and superintendents who had more than six years in their current position regardless of the number of superintendencies they had in their career (Stayers). Criterion Variable 2 (CV2) looked at only those superintendents who had more than one superintendency. The two groups



consisted of those having six years or less in their current position (Leavers) and those with more than six years in their current position (Stayers). The predictor variables consisted of factors measured by the survey and divided into Superintendent Factors, School District Factors and School Board Factors. The data were collected by means of a mail out survey instrument sent to all the superintendents in Michigan (N=524). There was a 64.5% return rate (n=338). The survey instrument contained 41 questions. Superintendents who were in their first superintendency answered the first 32 questions, while those having more than one superintendency answered the entire survey. Additionally, the wealth of the school district was measured by the per pupil expenditures. This information was obtained directly from the Michigan Department of Education ([www.mde.state.mi.us](http://www.mde.state.mi.us)), and analyzed with the rest of the data collected using the stepwise logistic regression procedure.

### Summary of the Findings

#### Criterion Variable 1

The following predictor variables were found significant at the .10 confidence level as they relate to longevity defined by Criterion Variable I. There were four superintendent factors that were protective for longevity, and one superintendent factor that was risk for longevity. There were no school board factors that were protective for longevity and one school board factor that was risk for longevity. There were no school district factors that were either risk or protective for longevity.

**Superintendent Factors protective for longevity as defined by CV1:**

1. Superintendents with more than six years in their current position indicated they had lived within 25 miles of their current position for a longer period of time.
2. Superintendents with more than six years in their current position were older than those having six years or less in their current position.
3. There was a relationship between superintendents who have more than six years in their current position and whether the district offered retirement benefits as part of their compensation package. Odds ratio data indicate that the odds of a person with retirement benefits to be a stayer is almost three times more than to be a leaver.
4. Superintendents who had been in their position longer than six years had a higher score on their last evaluation.

**Superintendent Factors that are risk for longevity as defined by CV1:**

1. Superintendents with six years or less in their current position find micro-management by the board a factor that most inhibits their effectiveness.

**School Board Factors that are risk for longevity as defined by CV1:**

1. Superintendents with six years or less in their current position perceive a higher quality in their relationship with the school board than those with more than six years in their current position.

**Criterion Variable 2**

**The following predictor variables were found significant at the .10 confidence**

level as they relate to longevity defined by Criterion Variable 2. There were two superintendent factors that were protective for longevity, and no superintendent factors that were risk for longevity. There were no school board factors that were either protective or risk for longevity and one school district factor that was protective for longevity. There were no school district factors that were risk for longevity.

**Superintendent Factors that were protective for longevity as defined by CV2:**

1. The longer a superintendent had served in a previous position, the more likely the superintendent would be to serve in the current position longer than six years. Odds ratio data indicate that superintendents who had served a longer time in a previous position were more than 3 times more likely to be a stayer when holding other variables constant.

2. Leaving a former position as superintendent for family reasons was characteristic of superintendents who had been in their current position longer than six years. Odds ratio data indicate that the odds of a person who left the last position for family reasons, to be a stayer is at least 2.7 times more than to be a leaver, holding other variables constant.

**School District Factors that were protective for longevity as defined by CV2:**

1. Superintendents who move from suburban to suburban districts are more likely to be superintendents who stay in their position longer than six years. Odds ratio data indicate that the odds of a person who moves from suburban district to suburban district, to be a stayer is at least 9.4 times more than to be a leaver, holding other variables constant.

## Discussion of the Results

Each of the significant factors are discussed in this section. They are introduced in order from most significant to least significant. These findings are enhanced by additional demographic information gathered from the results of other questions on the survey.

The factor that was most significant in the logistic stepwise selection method was the length of time a superintendent had lived within 25 miles of his/her current position. The longer a superintendent had lived in the area, the more likely the superintendent will stay longer than 6 years. A large number of the responding superintendents (N=59) had lived in their current district 30 years or longer. This is for most people their entire career life. Several of the respondents were born in the community in which they are a superintendent (N=31). This is strong evidence for a school board to consider hiring a local person if it is important for them to have a superintendent who stays longer than the reported average tenure.

For the superintendents who have had more than one superintendency, they will be more likely to stay longer than six years in their current position if they stayed longer in their previous position. In other words, hiring superintendents who have moved from one district to another after a short period of time will most likely result in a superintendent who continues to move on. Carlson (1962) used the concept of career-bound and place-bound to differentiate between superintendents who ascended to the superintendency from a different position within the district and those who

came in from outside the district to assume the superintendency. Fenske (1971) noted that the career-bound superintendent values opportunity over ties to a single community and is one who is more open to new positions in other locales.

Surprisingly, the perceived quality of the relationship between the superintendent and the board had a reverse effect on longevity. The higher the superintendent scored the quality of their relationship with the board, the more likely the superintendent would be a superintendent with six years or less in his/her current position. This finding is not consistent with most of the literature and bears a closer look. Hentges (1985) looked at the politics of superintendents and school boards. Pertinent in his study are the findings that conflict levels in general proved higher than had been indicated in earlier research. Some argue that the board becomes too engrossed in the day to day affairs of the school district. One wonders if the data from this study indicate a "honeymoon phase" that could occur during the first few years as a superintendent settles in to his/her new position. This could account for the perception by the short term (six years or less in their current position) superintendents seeing their relationship with the board as "Excellent" more often than those seasoned superintendents who have been there longer. Another thought is that members of the board who hire a superintendent may be mostly or totally gone after a six year period. Those superintendents with more longevity may be working with a board whose philosophy is quite different than that of the board who hired them.

Superintendents who had more than one superintendency were asked, "When you last changed districts as a superintendent, what type of district did you move

from?" Of the nine choices, one of those choices, Suburban to Suburban, was protective for longevity. The odds ratio for suburban to suburban indicates that when holding other variables constant, a superintendent is at least 9 times more likely to be a stayer than to be a leaver when he/she moves between suburban districts. These data are a strong affirmation of the literature. Most superintendents prefer to work in the type of district in which they currently work, and overall they were most attracted to suburban districts (Cooper et al., 2000).

The outcome of the last evaluation proved to be a significant protective factor for longevity. In response to "What was your last evaluation?", the respondents could choose from a list of four options: (1) Poor, (2) Fair, (3) Good, and (4) Excellent. The category most often chosen was "Excellent" with a rather high number choosing not to answer the question (n=21). This study indicates that those who have been in their current position longer than six years were more likely to choose "Excellent" than those who were in their position six years or less. This stands to reason since in many positions, the excellent evaluation is withheld for a few years to see how the new superintendent does in his/her new position. The superintendency is also a challenging position. It may take a few years for someone to actually do work deserving of an excellent evaluation. If a superintendent has been in a district for a long time and is not being evaluated with high marks, many would see that as an indicator to begin looking for a new position.

Family is an important factor when it comes to superintendent mobility. The responding population of superintendents in Michigan are white (n=324 or 95%),

men (n=302 or 88%). They are married with children (n=285 or 84%). This question asked superintendents to choose from a list of 15 choices, what were the circumstances under which they left their last position. They could check all that apply. Significant as a protective factor for longevity was Family Considerations. Paired with this question, but not found to be significant is question 37: "Has your family status had any effect (positive or negative) on your willingness to move to another superintendency?" This survey question is mentioned here because the respondents had an opportunity to explain in their own words how their family has influenced their decisions (see Appendix E). Overwhelmingly, the responses indicated that the superintendents saw themselves as part of a family and a move was a family decision, not just the decision of the superintendent. Among considerations mentioned were spouses career, children in school, and moving to be with extended family.

Micromanagement by the board is considered a risk factor for longevity. Some feel that board members become too involved in the day to day affairs of running a school district, and that they challenge the superintendent for power and control over the district. This is often seen as a deterrent to the educational program (Bradley, 1990).

Salary was an expected protective factor for longevity (Anderson, 1989; Newell, 1997). The survey asks the superintendents to fill in their salary. It also asks them to check from among nine choices any additional benefits they might have. One benefit was shown to be a protective factor for longevity: additional retirement benefits. The average age of the respondents was 50.84. This statistic mirrors the national

statistics (Glass, 2000) and is the main reason why retirement benefits are an important focus for many of the superintendents. This study showed that those who have more than six years in their current position are characterized as having additional retirement benefits as one of their salary perks. This benefit was found to be protective for longevity, while salary alone was not found to be protective.

Age is a protective factor for longevity. This data show that superintendents who have been in their positions longer than six years are older than those who have been in their positions six years or less. The average age of the responding population is 50.8. Those having more than six years in their current position have a mean age of 54.5 with a standard deviation of 4.41. Although there was one superintendent who was 32 years old, the majority of superintendents are in their fifties.

### **Conclusions and Implications**

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions and implications can be drawn.

1. Salary was not found to be a major determiner of superintendent longevity in a given position, however additional retirement benefits were a significant factor. School boards need to carefully analyze superintendent compensation packages and be sure that they are meeting the needs of their superintendent. Being competitive in the marketplace means not only a fair salary, but a benefits package that is attractive as well.

2. When a board wants to hire a superintendent who will stay longer than the



average, look to the talent already in the district. Hiring someone from the outside may bring in new ideas, but it also heightens the chance that the superintendent will serve the district less than the average tenure.

3. A superintendent is part of a family. Superintendents who left their previous position for family reasons were 4.6 times more likely to be a stayer than a leaver, holding other variables constant. When asked in this survey if the family had any bearing on a superintendent's decision to leave, the response was overwhelmingly yes (see remarks in Appendix E). Superintendents have children in schools and spouses with careers. When recruiting a new superintendent, school boards need to be aware that the position itself is only part of what will affect the decision made by the candidate. Also retaining a superintendent may have more to do with the age of the children, the career aspirations of the spouse and the presence of extended family in the area than it has to do with factors more closely tied to the position.

4. Superintendents who stay longer are those with excellent evaluations. The superintendency can be a difficult and complex job, therefore taking a new superintendent several years to do excellent work and be recognized for that in his/her evaluation. School boards do not always take the opportunity to look carefully at a superintendent's work and give recognition for the work that is well done. Many times the board members are not trained to evaluate a superintendent's work. Evaluation can be an opportunity to let a superintendent know in a meaningful way that he/she is doing a fine job. If their good work is acknowledged, they may stay longer.

5. Many superintendents who have been in a district more than six years do

not feel they have an excellent relationship with their board. Superintendents in Michigan spend an average of 4.5 hours per week in direct communication with the board. This needs to be increased in order to ensure that this vital relationship is kept in tact. Superintendents need to make a concerted effort to telephone, email or meet informally with their board members each week.

6. Boards need to curtail their efforts to try to micromanage the school district. If superintendents have a clear job description, and many of them do not, school boards need to let them do the job they were hired to do. A good place to begin is to make sure the superintendent has a clear job description and knows when and how he/she will be evaluated. If necessary, the board needs to bring someone in to provide leadership in this area.

### Limitations of the Study

1. Superintendents were asked to categorize their districts into Suburban, Rural, or Urban. They were asked to do this with no guidelines. As a result, the category chosen by the superintendent may not be the category chosen by the researcher. A better way would have been to measure the size of the district by the number of students served, or to provide guidelines within the survey itself. This would have brought more accuracy to the statistic.

2. On reflection, there were other, better ways to ask some of the questions. For example, the respondent was asked to circle Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree, to this question: "Moving my spouse/significant other and family

would be a strong incentive if I were to consider a different superintendent position.”

In most cases, this is a disincentive. Dealing with a “double negative” is often confusing.

In another question, the superintendent was asked: “How do you perceive the stress associated with your position of superintendent?” The choice of answers were: No stress, Little stress, Moderate stress, Very great stress. One answer, on reflection seems to be missing: Great stress.

3. Some of the respondents questioned the confidentiality of the survey because there was a number on the back of it. This number was used for tracking purposes so that this researcher could send a reminder postcard to those who had not returned the survey. If this would have been explained in the cover letter, some superintendents would perhaps have felt more at ease in giving some of the more personal information. There were several surveys with questions left blank.

4. Although the response rate to this survey was good (65%), the timing of sending the superintendent a survey was questionable. This survey was sent in the summer. Of those not returning the survey, when asked for the reason why, they responded that either they or their secretaries were on vacation. Sending the survey during the school year is also questionable since superintendents are on a tighter schedule.

5. This study reflected the perceptions of the superintendent. Different answers may have been given by others regarding the superintendent’s relationship with the school board and the attitudes of school board members, community

members and staff toward standardized testing. The outcome of the last evaluation was also self-reported. A survey sent to board members could yield different information for some of the questions.

6. Superintendents who had recently left or retired were not surveyed. This survey was filled out only by those currently holding the position. The study would have been enhanced by information from superintendents who had left the position. Sometimes those who have left can give a more objective viewpoint of the job and the conditions contributing to their leaving.

7. Interim superintendents are sometimes hired by districts when a superintendent search is taking longer than expected, or when a superintendent leaves with no warning. Interim superintendents run the day to day operations of the district until a board can find a person who meets their requirements. There was no question on the survey asking whether a superintendent was interim or permanent. A person hired as an interim would know at the onset of his/her position that it would be for a short time, therefore the information he or she would give on the survey would be invalid.

8. Leavers and stayers could have been defined differently. In this study, a person who had worked for 10 years in a previous district and had recently moved to their current district would be classified as a leaver. Leavers could have been defined as those superintendents who have never served in a district longer than 6 years and stayers would be those having been in their current position or any position longer than six years.

### Recommendations for Further Research

There needs to be more research in the area of compensation packages for superintendents. Most often, the only part of a superintendent's package that is reported is the salary figure. This information is difficult to obtain because of its personal nature, yet as superintendents negotiate for better pay and benefits, they need to have better information as well.

The definition of longevity with superintendents needs to be standardized. This research chose to define it as taking the number of years a superintendent has in his/her current position, with six years as a cut-off point for stayers and leavers. This was taken from the most current research that says that superintendents have an average tenure of 5-6 years nationally (Glass, 2000). In the recent study done by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), tenure data were analyzed by dividing the total number of years in the superintendency by the number of superintendencies held. Other studies have defined it differently and the result has been conflicting information in the research as to whether the turnover rate in this field represents a crises.

Stress in the position of superintendent is an area where more research needs to be done. Of the responding superintendents, more than 35% of them said they experienced "Very great stress" associated with their position. What effect does this amount of stress have on the work of superintendents? What are the causes of this stress, and how does it affect job performance? What are some systems that can be in

place to help a superintendent combat this level of stress on the job?

Cultural change in a school district takes a minimum of three to five years (Fullan, 2001). With superintendents' longevity averaging five to six years, more research needs to be done on the effect of high turnover of superintendents on cultural change. An in-depth study of the effect of change in superintendents on principals, teachers, parents and students would help uncover the real effects that superintendents' longevity has on the culture for learning .

Leadership is a complex art. Effective leaders are energy creators. They set high standards and bring with them a spirit of hope and optimism. Students are the real losers in the shuffle of changes in the superintendency. Our nation's children deserve better. Until this country prioritizes education, not just with rhetoric, our schools will not be able to attract the best and the brightest that are so desperately needed as our superintendents.

**Appendix A**  
**Survey on Factors Concerning Superintendent Tenure**

**SURVEY ON FACTORS CONCERNING SUPERINTENDENT TENURE**

The purpose of this survey is to identify factors which affect superintendent tenure in a given district. Data will be reported by general categories and not by individual school districts.

1. Is this your first superintendency? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

If No, have you had two or more positions in the past six years? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

2. How many years have you served as a superintendent? \_\_\_\_\_

3. How many years have you served in your current position? \_\_\_\_\_

4. What is the highest degree you have earned?

\_\_\_\_\_ Bachelors  
\_\_\_\_\_ Masters  
\_\_\_\_\_ Specialists  
\_\_\_\_\_ Doctorate

5. To what ethnic group do you belong?

\_\_\_\_\_ Caucasian  
\_\_\_\_\_ African American  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic  
\_\_\_\_\_ Asian  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other

6. How old are you?

7. Gender?    Male                      Female

8. What is your present family status?

\_\_\_\_\_ Single  
\_\_\_\_\_ Married without children  
\_\_\_\_\_ Married with children  
\_\_\_\_\_ Divorced



9. What is your present yearly salary? \_\_\_\_\_

10. In addition to your current salary, circle the additional financial benefits of your position? (Check all that apply)

- \_\_\_\_\_ district leased vehicle or vehicle allowance
- \_\_\_\_\_ annuities
- \_\_\_\_\_ additional life insurance
- \_\_\_\_\_ paid board positions
- \_\_\_\_\_ additional retirement contributions
- \_\_\_\_\_ additional social security contributions
- \_\_\_\_\_ expense account
- \_\_\_\_\_ country club membership
- \_\_\_\_\_ opportunity for to attend national conferences

11. How much of a feeling of satisfaction does the position of superintendent provide for you?

- \_\_\_\_\_ None
- \_\_\_\_\_ Little
- \_\_\_\_\_ Moderate
- \_\_\_\_\_ Considerable

12. Are there any issues that would cause you to leave your current position of superintendent?

\_\_\_\_\_ No      \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, check all that apply.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Lack of financing to adequately fund the operations of the district
- \_\_\_\_\_ Lack of community support
- \_\_\_\_\_ Lack of board member support
- \_\_\_\_\_ Media attacks on school district
- \_\_\_\_\_ Increased family responsibilities
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other

13. How long have you lived within a radius of 25 miles of your current position?

\_\_\_\_\_

14. What are the factors that inhibit your effectiveness in your current superintendency? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Inadequate financing
- ☐ Too many insignificant demands
- ☐ State reform mandates
- ☐ Collective bargaining agreements
- ☐ Racial/ethnic problems
- ☐ Too much added responsibility
- ☐ Insufficient administrative support
- ☐ Difficulty with relations with board members
- ☐ Ineffective staff members
- ☐ Size of district
- ☐ Lack of community support
- ☐ Board micromanagement
- ☐ Board elections - changed expectations
- ☐ Other

15. What is the average number of hours per week you spend in direct communications with board members?

16. How do you perceive the quality of your relationship with your current board?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Poor

17. How important to you is the quality of the relationship with your board ?

- ☐ Crucial
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Not Important

18. How important are your district's MEAP scores as a factor of the support you feel from: (circle your response)

4 = crucial 3 = very important 2 = important 1 = not important

The community      4      3      2      1

The school board      4      3      2      1

The staff      4      3      2      1

19. Solidarity means a oneness of purpose between a superintendent and the board. How would you rate the solidarity between you and your current board?

\_\_\_\_\_ Excellent

\_\_\_\_\_ Good

\_\_\_\_\_ Fair

\_\_\_\_\_ Poor

20. Have community pressure groups emerged in the past year to pressure the board?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

\_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know

21.. How do you perceive superintendent turnover in Michigan?

\_\_\_\_\_ Decreasing

\_\_\_\_\_ Increasing

\_\_\_\_\_ Remaining about the same

\_\_\_\_\_ Don't Know

22. Do you have a formal job description

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

If Yes, are you evaluated on the basis of that job description?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_\_ No

23. Are you evaluated:

- ☐ Annually?
- ☐ Every two years?
- ☐ Every three years?
- ☐ I am not evaluated at regular intervals

24. What was your last evaluation?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

25. In your career, where do you plan to be in five years?

- ☐ Continue in my current position
- ☐ In a superintendency in a larger district
- ☐ In a superintendency in a smaller district
- ☐ Working in a university
- ☐ In a profession outside education
- ☐ Retirement
- ☐ Working in an education- related position

26. How do you perceive the stress associated with your position of superintendent?

- ☐ No stress
- ☐ Little stress
- ☐ Moderate stress
- ☐ Very great stress

27. How would you describe your current community?

- Rural ☐
- Suburban ☐
- Urban ☐

Please circle your answer.

4 = Strongly agree 3 = agree 2 = disagree 1 = strongly disagree

28. Higher pay and better benefits would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position. 4 3 2 1

29. Moving to a larger district would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position. 4 3 2 1

30. Moving to a smaller district would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position. 4 3 2 1

31. Moving my spouse/significant other and family would be a strong incentive if I were to consider a different superintendent position. 4 3 2 1

32. Having a portable pension would give me would be a strong incentive for me to consider a different superintendent position. 4 3 2 1

**If this is your first superintendency, stop here. Thank you for your participation.**

33. If this is not your first superintendency, what were the circumstances under which you left your last position? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Community Pressure
- ☐ Left for a larger district.
- ☐ Conflict with Board Members
- ☐ Lack of Funding
- ☐ Board Elections
- ☐ Family Considerations
- ☐ Higher Education Opportunities
- ☐ Job in better financed district
- ☐ Conflict with the community
- ☐ Conflict with an employee
- ☐ I had been there "long enough"
- ☐ Left for a higher salary
- ☐ Voluntary
- ☐ Board vote of no confidence
- ☐ Dismissal
- ☐ Other, please explain

34. How many school districts have you worked for as a superintendent? \_\_\_\_\_

35. What was the longest time you spent in a district as superintendent?  
\_\_\_\_\_

36. What was the shortest time you spent in a district as superintendent? \_\_\_\_\_ -

37. Has your family status had any effect (positive or negative) on your willingness to move to another superintendency?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

If yes, please explain.

38. When you last changed districts as a superintendent, the type of district you moved from was:

\_\_\_\_\_ Rural to rural

\_\_\_\_\_ Rural to suburban

\_\_\_\_\_ Rural to urban

\_\_\_\_\_ Suburban to rural

\_\_\_\_\_ Suburban to suburban

\_\_\_\_\_ Suburban to urban

\_\_\_\_\_ Urban to rural

\_\_\_\_\_ Urban to suburban

\_\_\_\_\_ Urban to urban

39. Did the results of a bond/millage election have any influence on your leaving your last position?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

40. Solidarity means a oneness of purpose between a superintendent and the board. How would you rate the solidarity between you and your past board?

\_\_\_\_\_ Excellent

\_\_\_\_\_ Good

\_\_\_\_\_ Fair

\_\_\_\_\_ Poor

41. How important was "solidarity" as a factor for leaving your last position?

- ☐ Crucial
- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Somewhat important
- ☐ Not important

Check here if you would like to be sent a summary of the results of this study.

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your participation.

**Appendix B**  
**Human Subjects Institutional Review  
Board Approval Letter**



College of Education  
Department of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership



Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-5276  
616 387-3465

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
H. S. I. R. B.  
Approved for use for one year from this date:

MAY 30 2001

x *Michael J. Fitch*  
HSIRB Chair

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Factors Relating to Superintendent Tenure in Michigan." This project is designed to identify reasons superintendents leave their positions and is being conducted by Dr. Joseph Kretoivics and Sally Siebesma-Hipp from Western Michigan University, Department of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Sally Siebesma-Hipp.

The survey is comprised of 41 short answer type questions and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey or you may discard it. Returning the survey indicates your consent to use the answers you supply for this research. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Joseph Kretoivics at (616) 387-6867, Sally Siebesma-Hipp at (616) 676-0379, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293, or the Vice President for Research at (616) 387-8296.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature.

A summary of the results of this survey will be sent to all participants. Thank you for considering participation in this study.

**Appendix C**  
**Reminder Postcard**

Dear Superintendent,

Just a friendly reminder to turn in your survey regarding  
**Factors Affecting Superintendent's Tenure in Michigan.**

If you have already done so, thank you and please disregard

Send to

Sally Hipp

1801 Timber Canyon

Ada, MI 49301

Dear Superintendent,

Just a friendly reminder to turn in your survey regarding  
**Factors Affecting Superintendent's Tenure In Michigan.**

If you have done so, thank you and please disregard  
this message.

Send to:

Sally Hipp

1801 Timber Canyon

Ada, MI 49301

Dear Superintendent,

Just a friendly reminder to turn in your survey regarding  
**Factors Affecting Superintendent's Tenure in Michigan.**

If you have already done so, thank you and please disregard

Send to

Sally Hipp

1801 Timber Canyon

Ada, MI 49301

Dear Superintendent,

Just a friendly reminder to turn in your survey regarding  
**Factors Affecting Superintendent's Tenure In Michigan.**

If you have done so, thank you and please disregard  
this message

Send to:

Sally Hipp

1801 Timber Canyon

Ada, MI 49301

## **Appendix D**

### **Reasons Given for Not Sending Back the Survey**

### **Reasons Given for Not Sending Back the Survey**

The total population of all superintendents in Michigan is 524. All the superintendents were sent a survey. There were 342 surveys returned for a response rate of 65%. A random sample of six superintendents not responding were contacted as to the reasons they did not respond. The following reasons were mentioned:

My secretary was on vacation(when the survey came), and I can't remember seeing the survey.

I did not take the time to fill it out because of competing priorities.

I remember filling it out, but we were remodeling then and it could have gotten lost.

Long after the survey was filled out, I found it had slipped between the seats in my wife's car. When I found the survey, I figured it was too late to mail it.

I didn't have time.

I thought I mailed it. Are you sure you don't have it?

**Appendix E**  
**Comments on Question #37**

**Comments on Question #37****SURVEY # 3****37 a - To be near family****SURVEY 22****37 We moved closer to Family****Survey 27****Item 37 Didn't want to move while kids were in school****Survey 30****Item 37 Children are in school with many friends.****Survey 37****Item 37 Move closer to college age children.****Survey 49****Item 37 Children****Survey 51****item 37 - If I change jobs, my wife has to change jobs.****Survey 59****Item 37 Do not want to leave friends or home.****Survey 61****Item 37 We are happy here. My wife has excellent position. My son is a sophomore in the district and I look forward to giving him his diploma in 3 years.****Item 37 I waited until my youngest had graduated to move.****Survey 71****Survey 74****Item 37 Support of family.****Survey 78****Item 37 We wanted to stay in one district while our 2 boys were growing up. Our second son graduates in two years.**

**Survey 82**

**Item 37** I would not blame it on my family but I have not pursued other jobs that might upset my family.

**.Survey 91'**

**Item 37** My wife wants to be close to her 80 year old parents.

**Survey 98**

**Item 37** Age of children and family proximity.

**Survey 107**

**Item 37** I do not want to move my son now..

**Survey 122**

**Item 37** Spouse does not want to move do to her career.

**Survey 123**

**Item 37** Closer to wife's family.

**Survey 135**

**Item 37** My wife is currently disabled and moving closer to family was a prime consideration.

**Survey 136**

**Item 37** Quality of life.

**Survey 147**

**Item 37** Spouse's job.

**Survey # 147**

**Item 37 - Spouse's job**

**Survey # 152**

**Item 37 - Wife's career**

**Survey # 162**

**Item 37 - Unwilling to relocate to another area**

**Survey # 165**

**Item 37 - Divorced, moved, remarried**

**Survey 192**

**Item 37 - Divorced and wanted to get a fresh start.**



**Survey 212**

**Item 37 - I don't want to move school age children unless the new area offers the same opportunities as their present schools.**

**Survey 220**

**Item 37 - Impact on my spouse's career and commute are major factors.**

**Survey 227**

**Item 37 - Wife is also a public school administrator; that fact limits my mobility.**

**Survey 241**

**Item 37 - I waited until the children were in college.**

**Survey 250**

**Item 37 - Wanted to be closer to my wife's ailing mother.**

**Survey 252**

**Item 37 - Didn't move when kids were in high school and that was tough.**

**Survey 265**

**Item 37 - Family does not want to move again.**

**Survey 255**

**Item 37 - My wife is a teacher and it is difficult for her to change positions.**

**Survey 272**

**Item 37 - I am part of a family.**

**Survey 273**

**Item 37 - When children were in school, I didn't want to move them. I waited until they graduated from high school.**

**Survey 276**

**Item 37 - All of our decisions relative to location are family decisions.**

**Survey 285**

**Item 37 - Every move I have ever made was predicated on improving life for my family.**

**Survey 294**

**Item 37 - Ability to relocate spouse's career.**

**Survey 296**

**Item 37 - I waited to move to a larger district until my daughter graduated from high school.**

**Survey 298**

**Item 37 - I drive 75 miles one way so that I do not have to move my family.**

**Survey 313**

**Item 37 - School for children; wife's employment**

**Survey 314**

**Item 37 - Quality of life issues for children and spouse.**

**Survey 318**

**Item 37 - When my wife retired, we became more mobile.**

**Survey 328**

**Item 37 - My wife is a teacher in Gull Lake; I would like to join her.**

**Survey 340**

**Item 37 - Children still in school.**

**Survey 341**

**Item 37 - Kids needed to finish high school in one place.**

**Appendix F**  
**Definition of Criterion Variables**

### Definition of Criterion Variables

Questions 1 and 3 were used to define the dependent variable for longevity.

**Question #1 - Is this your first superintendency? If No, have you had two or more positions in the past six years?**

The majority of the superintendents returning this survey (66%) have been a superintendent in two or more districts.

**Question #3 - How many years have you served in your current position?**

Those having more than six years in their current position formed a slightly smaller group than those having six years or less in their current position. Most of the responding superintendents had six years or less in their current position (n=164)

From the information generated by these two questions, the following criterion variables were formed:

#### **Criterion Variable I (CVI)**

<b>Group 0 = Leavers</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percent</b>
▪ I have more than one superintendency	115	33.6%
▪ I have six years or less in my current position.	164	50.5%
▪ Combined	78	22.8%
<b>Group 1 = Stayers</b>		
▪ I am in my first superintendency	227	66.4%
▪ I have more than one superintendency	115	33.6%
▪ I have more than six years in my current position	161	49.5%
▪ Combined	107	31.3%

#### **Criterion Variable II (CVII)**

<b>Group 0 = Leavers</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percent</b>
▪ I have more than one superintendency	115	33.6%
▪ I have six years or less in my current position.	164	50.5%
▪ Combined	78	22.8%
<b>Group 1 = Stayers</b>		
▪ I have more than one superintendency	115	33.6%
▪ I have more than six years in my current position	181	49.5%
▪ Combined	35	10.2%

**Appendix G**  
**Number of Years Served as a Superintendent**

**Number of Years Served as a Superintendent**

**Question # 2 - How many years have you served as a superintendent?**

The average number of years a responding superintendent has served in that capacity is 7.62 years.

**Contrast of Number of Years Served as a Superintendent**

<b>Number of Years as Superintendent</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percent</b>
0	20	5.8
1	34	9.9
2	38	11.1
3	19	5.6
4	14	4.1
5	20	5.8
6	19	5.6
7	19	5.6
8-9	25	7.3
10-11	30	8.8
12-13	26	7.6
14-15	25	7.3
16-30	36	10.5

**Appendix H**  
**Variables Measured by Question Number**

### **Variables Measured by Question Number**

- Education of the Superintendent is measured by question 4.
- Ethnicity of the Superintendent is measured by question 5.
- Age of the Superintendent is measured by question 6.
- Gender of the Superintendent is measured by question 7.
- Family status of the Superintendent is measured by question 8.
- Salary of the Superintendent is measured by question 9.
- Benefits in addition to salary is measured by question 10.
- Perceived satisfaction of the Superintendent is measured by question 11.
- Issues that may cause a Superintendent to leave is measured by question 12.
- Length of time the Superintendent lives within 25 miles of current position is measured by question 13.
- Number and type of factors that inhibit effectiveness is measured by question 14.
- Average number of hours per week spent in direct contact with board members is measured by question 15.
- Perceived quality of relationship with the current board is measured by question 16.
- Importance of the quality of the relationship with the board is measured by question 17.
- Importance of district's MEAP scores to community, school board and staff is measured by question 18.
- Perceived solidarity with board by the Superintendent is measured by question 19.
- Prevalence of community pressure groups is measured by question 20.
- Perceived Superintendent turnover is measured by question 21.
- Presence of a formal job description is measured by question 22.
- Evaluation based on job description is measured by question 22A..
- Regularity of evaluation is measured by question 23.
- Outcome of last evaluation is measured by question 24.
- Five year plan of the Superintendent is measured by question 25.
- Perceived stress of the Superintendent is measured by question 26.
- Type of community - Rural, Suburban, or Urban is measured by question 27.
- Potential incentives to leave current position is measured by questions 28 - 32.



**Reasons for leaving prior position is measured by question 33.**

**Number of school districts worked for as a Superintendent is measured by question 34.**

**Longest time spent in a district as a Superintendent is measured by question 35.**

**Shortest time spent in a district as a Superintendent is measured by question 36.**

**Effect of family on willingness to move to another Superintendency is measured by question 37.**

**Type of district moved from as a Superintendent is measured by question 38.**

**Effect of the results of a bond election on decision to move is measured by question 39.**

**Perceived solidarity between Superintendent and past board is measured by question 40.**

**Importance of solidarity as a factor for leaving last position is measured by question 41**

**Appendix I**  
**Survey Code Book**

Sally Hipp

## Survey Code Book

Question	Code	Answer Code	Data Type
1	First	1 = Yes, 0= No	Nominal
1A	First0	1 = Yes, 0=No	Nominal
Note: Question 1A is skipped if question 1 is Yes or 1			
2	NOYS	# of Years as superintendent	Ratio
3.	NOYCP	# of Years in current position	Ratio
4.	HD	Highest Degree Bachelors - 1 Masters - 2 Specialist - 3 Doctorate - 4	Nominal
5	Ethnic	Caucasian - 1 African American - 2 Hispanic - 3 Asian - 4 Other - 5	Nominal
6	Age	Number reported - Left blank if not reported	Ratio
7	Gender0 - Male	1 - Female	Nominal
8.	Family 1 - Single	2 - Married without children 3. Married with children 4. Divorced	Nominal
9.	Salary	Reported as written Rounded to nearest hundred No commas Ex: 99659 = 99700	Ratio
10.	Benefits	1 = Yes 0 = No 9 cells	Nominal

11.	Satis	0=None 1=Little 2=Moderate 3= Considerate	Nominal
12.	Issues?	0=No 1=Yes	Nominal
12A	Issues	1-5 0=No, 1=Yes	Nominal
13.	Live	# of years reported 0 = Superintendent does not live within 25 miles of current position	Ratio
14.	Factors 1-14	0=No 1=Yes	Nominal
15.	Hours	Reported as written Took average if there was a span 6-8 Took lowest number if two numbers given Ex: 2-3	Ratio
16	Quality	4 = Excellent 3 = Good 2 = Average 1 = Poor	Nominal
17	Import	3 = crucial 2 = very important 1 = important 0 = not important	Nominal
18	MEAP	4 crucial, 3 very imp. 2 imp 1 not	
19.	Solid	4=Excellent, 3=Good, 2=Fair, 1=Poor	
20.	Groups	0=No, 1=Yes, 2=Don't Know	Nominal
21.	Turno	0=Decreasing 1=Increasing 2=Remaining about the same 3=Don't Know	Nominal

22.	jobdes	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
22A	jobdes1	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
23.	Eval	1 = Annually 2 = Every two years 3 = Every three years 4 = Not on regular intervals	Nominal
24	Leval	3=Excellent 2=Good 1=Fair 0=Poor	Nominal
25.	5years	7 cells Yes = 1 No = 0	Nominal
26.	Stress	0 = No stress 1 = Little stress 2 = Moderate stress 3 = Very great stress	Nominal
27.	Cummun	Rural = 1 Suburban = Urban = 3	Nominal
28.	Pay	4 - Strongly Agree 3 - Agree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree	Ordinal
29.	Big	Same as above.	Ordinal
30.	Small -	Same as above	Ordinal
31.	Spouse -	Same as above	Ordinal
Questions 30, 31 - (A 1 was changed to a 4; a 3 to a 2; a 2 to a 3)			

32. Pension -	4 - Strongly Agree 3 - Agree 2 - Disagree 1 - Strongly Disagree	Ordinal
---------------	--	---------

Respondents stopped here if this was their first superintendency.

33. Left 16 responses Yes = 1; No = 0		Nominal
34. Many	Recorded number as written	Ratio
35. Ltime	Recorded number as written	Ratio
35. Stime	Recorded number as written	Ratio
37. Fstatus	Yes = 1; No = 0	Nominal
37A If yes, please explain - remarks recorded on next page.		
38. Type	9 responses - Yes = 1; No = 0	Nominal
39. Results	Yes = 1 No = 0	Nominal
40. Pastbd	3 = excellent 2 = good 1 = fair 0 = poor	Nominal
41. Sfactor -	Crucial = 3 Very Important = 2 Somewhat Important = 1 Not Important = 0	Nominal

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, S. L. (1989). How to produce success in the superintendency. School Administrator, 46(7).

Auriemma, F. A., Cooper, B. S. & Smith, S. (1991). Graying teachers. Eugene, Or: ERIC Center for Education Management.

Bahgat, I. (1993). Inservice training needs of school board members and superintendents in Missouri. Dissertation Access no: OCIC:33339287.

Bennett, D. A. (1991). Big city blues. American School Board Journal, 178(4).

Blumberg, A. (1985). The school superintendent: Living with conflict. New York: Teachers College Press.

Botvin, G. J., Schinke, S., & Orlandi, M. A. (1995). Drug abuse prevention with multiethnic youth. Thousand Oaks California: Sage Publications.

Bradley, A. (1990, December). Rapid turnover in urban superintendents. Education Week.

Burstyn, D., & Tallerico, M. (1996). Retaining women in the superintendency: The location matters. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32.

Bushweller, K. (1997, June). Show us the money. The American School Board Journal, 184.

Candoli, I. C. (1986, February). Superintendent's evaluation process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, San Francisco.

Candoli, I. C. & Cullen, K., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1997). Superintendent performance evaluation: Current practice and directions for improvement. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Carlson, R. O. (1962). Executive succession and organizational change. University of Chicago. Danville, IL: Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Carson, A. M. (1999). Superintendent turnover in Montana: Case studies of small, rural schools. Montana State Univeristy. Accession No: AAG9927868.

Carter, D. & Glass, T., & Hord S. (1994). Selecting, preparing, developing the school district superintendent. New York: Falmer Press.

Carter, G. R., & Cunningham, W. (1997). The American school superintendent. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chance, E. W., & Capps, J. L. (1992). Superintendent instability in small/rural schools: The school board perspective. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: ED350121.

Chion-Kenny, L. (1994). Search consultants. The school administrator, 51(2).

Chion-Kenny, L. (1999, February). The perils of pension portability. School Administrator, 56(2).

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L., & Carella V. A. (2000). Career crisis in the school superintendency? Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Copeland, M., & Chance, E. W. (1996, Fall). Successful rural superintendents: A case study of four long term superintendents. Rural Educator, 18.

Czarnecki, E. H. (1996). Factors influencing voluntary superintendent exiting in New York. Accession No. AAG9525492.

Edelwich, J., & Brodsky, A. (1981). Burnout: Stages of disillusionment in the helping professionals. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Fenske, M. R. (1971). Career orientation and career mobility of Oregon school superintendents (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 3206A.

Fullan, M. (2001). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Freeman, J. L., Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J. C. (1991). What boards value. The American School Board Journal, 178(1).



Funk, D. F., & Funk, R. S. (1992). Baby boomers on board: What do today's school board members want? Show Me Education, 16-19.

Giles, D. E., & Giles, S. (1990). Where do all the superintendents go? ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 938.

Glass, T. E. (1992). The study of the American school superintendency. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000). The study of the American school superintendency. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Graf, L. W. (1996). Superintendent burnout in the public schools: A study of demographic and environmental variables and their effects on the school superintendent. University of La Verne: Accession No. AAG9700128.

Guthrie, J. W., & Sanders, T. (2001). Who will lead the public schools? New York Times, January 7.

Hall, G. E., & Diffort, G. A. (1992). State administrators association director's perception of the exiting superintendent phenomenon. San Francisco: American Educational Research Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 351 799).

Hawkins, D., Catalano, J., & Miller, R. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. Psychological bulletin 112 (1).

Hentges, J. T. (1985). The politics of superintendent school board linkages: a study of power, participation and control. ERIC No: ED256064.

Hinkle, D., & Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1994). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Houston, P. (1998). The ABC's of administrative shortages. Commentary, Education Week, 44, 32.

Hunter, R. C. (1997, February). The mayor versus the school superintendent: political incursions into metropolitan school politics. Education and Urban Society, 29.

Jackson, F., & Cibulka, E. (1991). The politics of urban education in the United States. Journal of Educational Policy, 6(5).

Johnson, K. M. (1997). The relationship of superintendent tenure to school performance in Arkansas. University of Arkansas Accession No.: AAG9805852.

Jones, E. (1994). The role of power, self-efficacy, and leadership styles in woman business executives and women entrepreneurs. George Washington University, Accession No: OCIC32411850.

Katz, M. (1993). Matching school board and superintendent styles. The School Administrator, 50(9).

Klenow, C. A. (1996). Perceptions of the superintendent's adherence to personnel standards in evaluating executive administrators in Michigan public school districts. Wayne State University Accession No: AAG9628911.

Koryl, M. N. (1996). The formal evaluation of Indiana school superintendents: Frequency, practices, and procedures. Ball State University: Accession No: AAG9709687.

Kowalski, T. J. (1995). Keeper of the flame: Contemporary urban superintendents. Thousand Oakes, CA: Corwin.

Kraemer, H. C. (1992). Evaluating medical tests: Objective and quantitative guidelines. Newberry Park, CA: Sage.

Loomis, F. J. (1995). An investigation of the relationship between turnover of incumbent board members and turnover of the district's superintendent. Portland State University. Accession No: AAI9530966.

MacPhail-Wilcox, B., & Forbes, R. (1990). Administrator evaluation handbook. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Metzger, C. (1997, January). Involuntary turnover of superintendents. Thrust for Educational Leadership, 26.

McCoy, C. B., Metsch, L. R., & Inciardi, J. A. (1996). Intervening with drug involved youth. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCurdy, D. (1992). Superintendent and school board relations. Arlington, VA: AASA.

McCurdy, J., & Hymes, D. L. (1992). Building better board-administrator relations. AASA Critical Issues Report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 609.

Moncher, M. S., Holden, G. W., & Tremble, J. E. (1990). Substance abuse among Native-American youth. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58(4).

Montgomery, R. (1991). Perceptions of state level policy elites and influential superintendents regarding changes in the superintendency. Accession No: AAG0570783.

Newell, M. B. (1997). Factors affecting superintendent tenure in Missouri. Dissertation: UMI number 9841356.

Ortiz, F., & Whisler, D. (1988). Superintendent's leadership in school reform. New York: Falmer Press.

Ravitch, D. (2000). Left back: A century of failed school reform. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Spring, J. (1998). Conflict of interests: The politics of American education. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Szeptycke, L. F., & Dodge, H. W. (1993). The legal cost of challenging the far right. The School Administrator, 50(9).

Tallerico, M. (2000). Accessing the superintendency: The unwritten rules. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tucker, H. J., & Zeigler, H. L. (1980). Professionals versus the public: An historical analysis. New York: Longman.

Traugh, R. M. (1997). A study of major internal and external constituents' influence over tenure in the urban superintendent. Accession no: AAG9721168.

United States Department of Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington DC: Author.

Walter, J. K. (1998, August). In shark-infested waters, it's wise to be wary. School Administrator, 55(7).

Winerip, M. (1993, December). As superintendents go out the revolving door, reform efforts may go with them: A case in point. The New York Times.

[www.mde.state.mi.us](http://www.mde.state.mi.us). (2002).

Yee, G., & Cuban, L. (1996). When is tenure long enough? Educational Administration Quarterly, Dec. 1996, 32.

York, C., Keough, K. E., Underwood, K. E., & Fortune, J.C. (1990). Happily ever after. The American School Board Journal, 177(1).