

SUPERINTENDENT PERCEPTIONS OF MOTIVATORS AND INHIBITORS FOR THE SUPERINTENDENCY

While there is much written today about the superintendent shortage (Cooper, 2000; Glass, Björk, & Brunner, 2000; Lowery & Harris, 2003; Hoyle, 2002; Rawls & Wolverton, 2000; Rohn, 2001), there is not complete agreement that a superintendent shortage exists. After completing a major study of the superintendency in 2000, Glass and colleagues concluded that the problem is more a perception “that fewer men and women want to be superintendents” than that an actual shortage exists (Dunne, 2000, p. 2). However, that same year, Cooper released a major study of the superintendency, sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators and the National Center for Education Statistics, that concluded the shortage of individuals to fill the superintendent role is already imminent if not a reality in the United States. In fact, he reported that 88% of practicing superintendents believe the shortage of applicants for these vacancies to be at crisis levels. Exacerbating this situation, about 35% of superintendents responding to Cooper’s survey indicated that they would not recommend that other educators even consider becoming superintendents.

Clearly, the perception that the superintendency is a difficult role to assume is reflective of the general feeling that the job of the school superintendent is filled with external pressures often played out in the arena of public criticism. As the demands for accountability are heightened, and the expectations are more and more unrealistic, some suggest that people may be less interested in becoming superintendents or staying in this role if they already have it (Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Houston, 2001). Whether or not this is an “era of superintendent shortages,” as Sternberg (2002, p. 6) wrote, both of the major studies by Glass et al. (2000) and Cooper (2000) agree that there are issues which make the superintendent job difficult, as well as rewarding. Thus, understanding the role of motivators and inhibitors in the superintendency becomes an important consideration. The present study examined practicing superintendents’ perceptions of the importance of motivators and inhibitors that contribute to their decision to stay in the superintendency.

Literature Review

The superintendent of the twenty-first century must face conflict over values and interests, increased political activism, challenges to the purposes and goals of education, and many other issues (Keedy & Björk, 2001). At the same time, superintendents have many tremendous opportunities to

change children's lives, alter organizations, and influence entire communities (Houston, 2001). In fact, U.S. Education Secretary, Rod Paige, asserted that "there is no more important job than that of leading effective public schools" ("Snapshot of a leader," p. 26). Issues such as the changing role of the superintendency, retirements from the job, minority representation, tenure and turnover, administrator preparation programs, previously identified inhibitors, as well as motivators, all should be considered in an effort to deal with the candidate pool, whether or not we agree it is shrinking. Filling vacancies with the most qualified candidate is a challenge for school districts, even those that hire experienced consultants to conduct the search (Harris, Marshall, Lowery, & Buck, 2002; Tallerico, 2000).

The Changing Role

The role of the superintendent has undergone significant change in recent years, and today there is more emphasis on curriculum and instruction, planning for the future, involving others in decision making, improving student achievement (Short & Scribner, 2000), managing fiscal resources (Thompson, Wood & Honeyman, 1994), and building cultural leadership (Schwahn & Spady, 1998). In fact, Houston (2001) wrote that the superintendent must provide the "final answer" (p. 429) while being responsible for all aspects of the organization. Glass et al. (2000) found that nearly 60% of superintendents reported that community pressure groups operate in their district. Certainly, superintendents are not strangers to controversy (Dennis, 1997), especially as the superintendency has become more and more a political job which must respond to diverse community needs (Keedy & Björk, 2001).

Superintendent Retirements

According to Glass and colleagues (2000), the overall median age of public school superintendents is 52.5 years. However, Cooper (2000) reported that 79% of superintendents are over 50 years of age and that 80% were eligible for retirement. For example, the Illinois State Board of Education reported that in the next three years 47% of current school administrators would become eligible for retirement (Rohn, 2001). Another Illinois report predicted that at least 40% of current superintendents would retire in the next five years (Pierson & Hall, 2001). Relatedly, Patterson (2000) interviewed 14 superintendents and two years later, 10 of them had left the superintendency altogether. Data such as these led Hoyle (2002) to assert that many superintendents who are "tired of the pressures and politics that come with public service choose to take early retirement" (p. 8). Thus, as the current slate of

practicing school superintendents retires, it raises the question of who will fill the positions they vacate.

Minority Representation

The possible shortage in the pool of superintendent candidates is more certain when one considers the number of minority individuals who enter the superintendency. Nationwide, 88-90% of all school superintendents in the United States are men (Glass, 1992; Hodgkinson & Montenegro, 1999; Skrla, 2001). While the number of women superintendents has increased from only one percent in 1967 to 13.6% in 2000 (AASA, 2000), this is still low considering that 75% of teaching positions are held by women (Skrla, 2001).

Several factors appear to contribute to the shortage of women superintendents including career path trends. For example, women tend to spend more years in the classroom before they enter administration (Zemlicka, 2001), often in their late 40s (Shakeshaft, 1989), while the majority of male superintendents enter administration as young as 25 (Glass, 1992). Allen (1996) reported that family concerns often serve as a barrier and Ramsey (1997) asserted that family support is necessary for women to succeed as a superintendent. Additionally, Brunner (1999) reported that access to the superintendency for women is often denied by board members and/or discouraged by search consultants. Politics are also seen as a barrier because women seem to be less tolerant of the politics so prevalent in today's superintendency.

At the same time, men and women of color are also seriously underrepresented in the superintendency with only 5% of these positions held by minority individuals (AASA, 2000; Glass et al., 2000). Over 20 years ago it was noted that most minority superintendents served in districts where persons of the same race are represented in significant numbers (AASA, 1983). All too often this is still the case; in fact, Marshall and Kasten (1994) argued that many school personnel hold unstated understandings that "minority administrators should administer schools... with large minority populations and concerns" (p. 5). Another barrier to minority representation is that minority superintendents held more educational positions prior to the superintendency, thus taking longer to achieve the position of superintendent (Zemlicka, 2001).

Tenure and Turnover

In the 1950s superintendent tenure averaged as high as 13 to 14 years, but it reached its lowest point in 1990 (Natkin, Cooper, Fusarelli, Alborano, Padilla, & Ghosh, 2002). Since then, the average tenure of a superintendent in the United States has varied from five to six years according to Glass (1992)

and Hodgkinson and Montenegro (1999), as long as 7.25 years according to Cooper (2000), and as short as only eighteen months in some large, urban districts, according to Cummings (1994).

Chance and Capps (1990) studied the high turnover rates for superintendents within rural areas of Oklahoma and found that 41 rural school districts had three or more superintendents in the last five years. Forty-three percent of the 63 superintendents who left rural districts were either terminated or forced to resign, while 23% resigned to accept positions in larger districts. The current annual turnover rate in Texas is between 20 and 25% (Moses, 2000). Even more disconcerting, Deary (1989) reported that in Connecticut nearly one third of the turnover was involuntary, although 15% is more in line with the national average. However, Natkin et al. (2002) reported that turnover has not increased markedly since 1975, when median turnover was 7.5 years, and since 1990-1994, when it was 6.5 years.

Administrator Preparation Programs

Data indicate that there is no decline in the number of individuals receiving school administration certificates, yet fewer people are actually seeking the job (Rawls & Wolverton, 2000), and this is especially true of women. For example, in Texas in 1996-97, the State Board of Educator Certification reported that 40% of certified women were not employed as school administrators (DeFelice & Schroth, 2000). Additionally, Grady (2000) found that 65% of the 196 women surveyed in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas who held administrative certificates were unwilling or unable to pursue these positions. DeFelice and Schroth (2000) found that women in Texas who held administrator certification but chose not to pursue this role identified internal barriers, such as family and the love of teaching, and external barriers, such as politics, lack of mentors, and lack of encouragement as primary reasons for this.

However, according to Grady (2000), the demographics of administrator preparation programs are changing. Today, 52% of enrollment in graduate education programs are women, more than in any other previous period in history. In the mid-1900s less than 20% of doctoral recipients were women; today 37% are women. In fact, in 1987, women with doctorates in education outnumbered men by more than two to one (Thurgood & Clarke, 1995). Grady (2000) also noted that non-traditional populations are increasingly enrolled in graduate school programs and these populations include ethnic minorities as well. This advances the notion of Irby and Brown (2000) that educational administrative programs should address the unique needs and challenges of women and other minority groups in their leadership program design.

Other Inhibitors for the Superintendency

Clearly, the opportunities to do the important job of the superintendency are fraught with difficulty that includes rapidly changing community demographics (Houston, 2001), increased community political activism (Keedy & Björk, 2001), and increased accountability measures (Mathews, 2001). Callahan's vulnerability theory (1962) focused primarily on school board difficulty, while Lutz (1990) extended this to include dissatisfaction reasons within the community. Greyser (1999) suggested that the role of the superintendent often leads to isolation as administrators move up the leadership ladder, while at the same time leaders tend to put unrealistic demands on themselves that they have all the right answers (1999).

The term "stress" is often associated with the superintendency. In fact, a survey of retired school superintendents in New York cited stress as the most common reason for their decision to retire (Goldstein, 1992). Districts with difficult political situations, little money, poor staff morale, and poor student achievement make for especially stressful positions. Brubaker and Coble (1995) suggested that conflicting expectations of the role are inherently stressors in the job. On the other hand, Milstein (1992) reported that while educational administrators believe their work is stressful, research suggests that most cope with it quite well.

Moore and Ditzhazy (1999) reported that students enrolled in university administrative programs indicate that factors inhibiting their choice to become administrators (principals, as well as superintendents) include the increased time commitment, such as more consultation with outside stakeholders, and too much paperwork. They also pointed out that the nationwide challenge for states to mandate higher-stakes performance assessment of students, and the decentralizing of decision-making are also seen as inhibitors for education students to consider entering administration. Simply put, even though within the last 25 years efforts have been made to improve schools, superintendents still face situations for which there are no easy answers (Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000).

Motivators for the Superintendency

Nearly twenty years ago, Gunn and Holdaway (1986) identified that job satisfaction itself was a motivator when administrators perceived that they were effective and influential within their organization. This was evidenced by Houston (2001) who reported that most superintendents found the job "exhilarating and challenging" (p. 429). In fact, many who left actually come back to "change the trajectory of children's lives, alter the behavior of organi-

zations, and expand the possibilities of whole communities” (p. 429). Students in a university administrator preparation program who participated in a study by Moore and Ditzhazy (1999) identified similar intrinsic reasons, such as the desire to make a difference, the personal and professional challenge, and the ability to initiate change as primary motivators to becoming administrators.

Patterson (2000) noted that the superintendency is not just a job, but a lifestyle filled with important professional and personal accomplishments with an opportunity to overcome challenges and do “difficult but valuable work” (p. 23). Through professional reflection, many long-time superintendents have asked hard questions and faced the answers, thus contributing to their decision to stay on the job for the long haul (Kearns & Harvey, 2001).

Methodology

Sample. Using systematic sampling, researchers surveyed 25% of the 1,036 superintendents in Texas school districts, which is a representative sample (McMillan, 2000). Of the 259 superintendents receiving questionnaires in the mail, 231 responded which was a response rate of almost 90%. All respondents were assured of confidentiality.

Data collection. The survey consisted of four parts (see Appendix). Part I asked for general biographical and school district demographic information. This section also included questions about retirement plans for the superintendent. Part II asked participants to identify factors that motivated them to remain as superintendents. Part III asked respondents to identify factors for not remaining in this position. Subjects responded on a Likert-type scale ranking each item from 1 (not very important) to 4 (very important). Part IV of the study included one open-ended question which asked superintendents to share whatever they would like with the researchers. The survey was adapted from a list of administrator motivators and inhibitors by Moore and Ditzhazy (1999) and then pilot tested with students enrolled in university superintendent certification programs. Results were discussed in doctoral level superintendent courses and further revisions were made, increasing the validity of the instrument (McMillan, 2000).

Data analysis. Utilizing the statistical package, SPSS, all responses were tallied and frequencies generated. Means were created and independent samples *t*-tests conducted to test for significance at $p < .05$.

Findings

Demographics

Biographical demographics. While only 30% of the superintendents responding were less than 50 years old, over 43% were between the ages of 50 and 55. Eighty-six percent were men, 13% were women. Fairly consistent with the state of Texas as a whole, 91% were Anglo, 5.2% were Hispanic and 2% were African American. Thirty percent of superintendents held earned doctoral degrees. Eleven percent of the superintendents were in their first year on the job, 32% had served from two to five years, and the remaining 57% had been a superintendent at least six years.

School demographic information. Nearly half of the responding superintendents served in school districts of fewer than one thousand students. Thirty-eight percent served in school districts that had a population of between 1000-5000 students. Seventy-four percent of the school districts were rural, 19% were suburban, and 5% were urban. Texas ranks each school district in the state from Low Performing to Exemplary based on the results of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills test (TAAS). Twenty percent of participating superintendents were in school districts ranked as Exemplary, 46% were in Recognized districts, and 33% were in districts ranked as Acceptable. Only two (.9%) were from Low Performing districts.

Retirement plans. Three (1.3%) superintendents indicated a desire to retire at the age of 50, while 35% indicated plans to retire at 55. Thirty-two percent reported they planned to retire at 60, with 29% planning to retire at 65 or older. Fifty-four percent indicated they planned to work after retiring from the superintendency, while 31% were undecided. Only 12.6% had no plans to work after retirement. Those who planned to work after retirement considered jobs as an education consultant (23.4%), college professor (14.7%), or private businessman (19.5%). Fifty respondents failed to answer this question at all.

Motivating Factors

As shown by Table 1, when identifying factors that superintendents considered as important reasons to remain in the job, superintendents indicated the desire to make a difference ($M = 3.74$), positively impact people ($M = 3.71$), the professional challenge ($M = 3.64$), the personal challenge ($M = 3.61$), and the ability to initiate change ($M = 3.58$).

Table 1

Motivating Factors for Superintendents Deciding to Remain in the Superintendency in Order of Importance

Motivating Factors	Mean	Std. deviation
Desire to make a difference	* 3.74	.47
Desire to positively impact people	3.71	.47
Professional challenge	3.64	.58
Personal challenge	3.61	.59
Ability to initiate change	3.58	.54
Increased salary and fringe benefits	** 3.21	.73
Support and encouragement from others	3.07	.80
Teacher of teachers	3.05	.67
Increased prestige and status	2.05	.82
Relocate to a desired location	1.85	.85

Note. $n = 231$

* $p < .05$ by ethnicity

** $p < .05$ by gender

Because there were so few minority participants (20) compared to majority participants (208), in order to analyze means by ethnicity, the initial categories of white, African American, Hispanic, and other were combined into two categories: majority and minority. When motivating factors were analyzed by ethnicity, only the category of desire to make a difference was significant, $F(2, 228) = 29.412, p = .001$, indicating that minority superintendents ($M = 3.95$) considered this category significantly more important than majority superintendents ($M = 3.72$) did.

When analyzed by gender ($M=199, F=30$), only the category increased salary and fringe benefits was statistically significant, $F(2, 227) = 5.243, p = .012$, indicating that male superintendents ($M = 3.26$) considered this a significantly more important motivator than female superintendents ($M = 2.90$) did. When data were further analyzed by age of superintendent, respondents were merged into two categories, those under 50 years of age and those over 50 years of age. There were no statistically significant findings.

On the survey's open-ended question, 170 participants wrote in a comment. Of these, 110 (60%) comments focused on the positive aspects of

the job of the superintendency. These statements resonated with three main motivating themes: 27% gave advice for others, 23% gave encouragement, and 55% commented on their love for the job despite the difficulties. Advice statements included such suggestions as, "Make sure it's the community's vision, not yours." Encouragement appeared to emerge from the job challenges, as one superintendent said, "after all, the only way to ride the horse is to stay in the saddle." Another encouraged by saying, "You can always defend a decision, if it's the best thing for kids." Several superintendents suggested, "If it were easy, everyone would want to do the job; consider your talents and hang in there!"

Over half of the respondents (55%) emphasized their love of the job in a variety of phrases. One superintendent said, "Sure, I've made mistakes, but most of my mistakes were on the behalf of the kids... I can live with that." Or, as one superintendent said, "School is all I know and, after twenty-five years in the business, I still love school!" Finally, the most common reason for loving the job of superintendent was stated by a thirty year veteran who said, "I just like knowing that after a long day at work, I've done something good for someone... even if no one else notices but me."

As is evidenced by Table 1, the two strongest motivators for remaining in the superintendency were intrinsic, specifically, the desire to make a difference and to have a positive influence on people. While increased salary and fringe benefits were obviously important, more so for males than females, and were a consideration in the decision to stay in the superintendency ($M = 3.21$), findings suggest that these superintendents remained in this important, challenging position more because of their commitment to helping others.

Inhibiting Factors

As shown in Table 2, inhibiting factors were not identified with as high a level of agreement as were the motivators. In fact, the highest mean was only 3.02 for the category identified as amount of paperwork/bureaucracy. Other strong inhibitors for the superintendency were community politics ($M = 2.94$), working with the school board ($M = 2.90$), increased commitment ($M = 2.80$), and isolation or alienation from the campus ($M = 2.69$).

When data were disaggregated by ethnicity, as well as age of the superintendent, there were no statistically significant differences. When analyzing for gender differences, only one category was significant at the $p < .05$ level and that was increased commitment, $F(2, 225) = 1.919$, $p = .047$, suggesting that females ($M = 3.13$) considered this a stronger inhibitor than males ($M = 2.75$) did.

Table 2

Inhibiting Factors for Superintendents Deciding Not to Stay in the Superintendency in Order of Importance

Inhibiting factors	Mean	Std. deviation
Amount of paperwork/bureaucracy	3.02	.90
Community politics	2.94	.97
Working with the school board	2.90	.92
Increased commitment	* 2.80	.98
Isolation/alienation from campus setting	2.69	.87
Increased emphasis on standardized tests	2.56	.95
Litigation surrounding education	2.55	.96
No tenure/lack of security	2.49	1.02
Salary too small	2.28	.91
Job opportunities outside superintendency	2.02	.92
Fear of failure	1.66	.78

Note. $n = 226$

* $p < .05$ by gender

When responding to the open-ended question, 60 (35%) comments centered on the inhibitors of the job and two themes emerged. Half of the comments (30) focused exclusively on the difficulty of relationships with the board and the other half identified the difficulty of unifying diverse communities. One superintendent said “If the board doesn’t trust me, I can’t be their superintendent.” Another pointed out that “Too often, the board has difficulty understanding its role.” The second theme reflected the challenge of the growing diversity within the community. A superintendent wrote, “There are just too many factions in our community to keep any one happy long enough to accomplish anything.” Another superintendent emphasized that a diverse community makes for a much more interesting school, “but also one that is more complex.” Another complained that “most of the time I feel like a conflict mediator, not a leader.”

While data suggested that negative factors for the superintendency were not as strongly felt as those issues that make the job of the superintendency one to be desired, there was consensus that the amount of paperwork and the bureaucratic nature of the job, the politicization of community in-

volvement, and difficulties with the school board were perceived as inhibitors. It is likely that each of these issues contributes to a need for increased commitment and a demand on superintendent time that create barriers to successfully negotiating the job of superintendent.

Recommendations

Clearly, these Texas superintendents chose to remain in this job because of their commitment to education and helping people. This serves to emphasize the importance of Schlechty's (2001) challenge to educators to remain focused on this important mission. However, despite findings by Glass et al. (2000) that 80% of school boards rate superintendent performance as excellent or good, open-ended comments in this survey suggested that too often superintendents spend much of their time engaged in averting conflict with board members and community members. This suggests the need for communities and their school boards to actively support and undergird superintendents in their challenging, complex job. One way to build community and board member support would be to "accentuate the positive" and provide superintendents with an avenue for sharing their successes with the larger community, such as writing an occasional column for the local newspaper, or being interviewed on a regular basis by the local news media (Lowery & Harris, 2003). Having an open avenue to vividly demonstrate their commitment will likely strengthen superintendent relationships with the school board and a diverse community.

When considering inhibiting factors to the superintendency, universities, communities, and school boards should dialogue with active superintendents, as well as aspiring superintendents, to improve understandings, and thus minimize the negative factors of the job. This dialogue and subsequent reflection emphasizing critical problem solving can lead to superintendents who are better prepared to overcome these obstacles. Relatedly, Patterson (2001) suggested encouraging superintendents to be resilient "in the face of adversity" (p. 18) by being positive in spite of the negative, by staying focused on what superintendents care about, by remaining flexible in strategy planning, by acting rather than reacting, and by applying conservation efforts during tough times.

Additionally, university training and staff development must emphasize reducing the impact of inhibiting factors by providing training in community building (Owen & Ovando, 2000), shared decision-making and empowerment (Lambert, 1998), as well as reducing the stress factor through time management strategies (Lowery & Harris, 2003). Additionally, universities must prepare superintendents as CEOs for education and provide experienced

mentors (Hoyle, 2002). In order to do this, university programs must also address these issues within the framework of the unique needs for women and other minorities. Integrating these concepts within the curriculum will encourage more strategic responses to negotiating the cultural barriers for under-represented groups.

Suggestions for future research include in-depth investigations of the role of the superintendent and the impact of external and internal micropolitical influences. Studies could also consider satisfaction levels using a qualitative study design for greater understanding. An examination of superintendent preparation and the influence of mentoring programs would also provide valuable insight into the retention of superintendents.

Conclusion

Goldberg (2001) interviewed individuals whom he argued were successful educational leaders. Based on these interviews he asserted that leaders have five major qualities: a bedrock belief in what they do, the courage to swim upstream in behalf of their beliefs, a social conscience committed to issues of racism and poverty, a seriousness of purpose with high standards and devotion to their causes, and situational mastery, high personal skills and feelings of accomplishment. Clearly, the characteristics that make for strong leadership are related to factors that this study identified as motivators for superintendents to stay in the job: a desire to make a difference, desire to positively impact people, the professional and personal challenge, and an ability to initiate change.

There is no doubt that the job of a school superintendent is shaped by broad social challenges, such as the changing demographics of the U.S. as reflected in the growing diversity of children in our schools. Because of the influence of superintendents as community and school leaders, it is imperative that every effort be made to reconfigure this role in such a way that inhibitors are de-emphasized and the motivating factors of the job are emphasized. Recruiting and retaining effective superintendents from a diverse population of qualified individuals is a critical component in building schools where success for all students is a realistic goal.

While the many pressures and responsibilities faced by superintendents increase each year, leaders who care about others, who can create shared visions to motivate and inspire, and who are tenacious in the face of adversity are desperately needed in these challenging times (Hoyle, 1999). Houston (2001) proclaimed that the superintendency is about "touching hearts," a job that is almost "sacred" (p. 433). Yet, Cooper (2000) argued that in this incredibly important leadership position "superintendents are rarely asked how they

view the career crises, job mobility, role satisfaction..." (Dunne, 2000, p. 2). This study contributes to filling this void by identifying superintendents' perceptions of motivators and inhibitors that influence their decision to stay on the job.

References

- Allen, E. (1996). Why women exit the superintendency in Texas (Doctoral dissertation, Baylor University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 10A, 4195.
- American Association of School Administrators. (1983). *Perspectives on racial minorities and women school administrators*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- American Association of School Administrators. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency 2000*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Brubaker, D., & Coble, L. (1995). The derailed superintendent. *The Executive Educator*, 17(10), 34-36.
- Brunner, C. (1999). *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chance, E., & Capps, J. (1990, October). *Administrator stability in small/rural schools: The school board perspective*. Paper presented at the 82nd annual meeting of the National Rural Education Association, Colorado Springs, CO.
- Cooper, B. (2000). Career crisis in the superintendency. In J. Natt (Ed.), *Superintendents see shortage of applicants for top spots as serious crisis*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. Retrieved January 27, 2000: <http://www.aasa.org/In/Misc/01/27-00supcrisis.htm>
- Cummings, J. (1994). Becoming the successful candidate. *The School Administrator*, 2(51), 28-35.
- Deary, J. (1989). Decision making and superintendent turnover: An empirical test of the Vroom and Yetton model with selected superintendents and board chairpersons in Connecticut (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bridgeport, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 08A.
- DeFelice, M., & Schroth, G. (2000). Women in Texas who are certified but not employed as administrators. In A. Pankake, G. Schroth, & C. Funk (Eds.), *Women as school executives: The complete picture* (pp. 169-175). Austin, TX: Texas Council of Women School Executives.

- Dennis, B. (1997). When zealots wage war. *The School Administrator*, 2(54), 26-33.
- Dunne, D. (2000, May 26). Is the superintendency in crisis? *Education World*. Retrieved on January 29, 2004 at http://www.education-world.com/a_admin/admin168.shtml
- Glass, T. (1992). *The 1992 study of the American school superintendency*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Glass, T. (2000, November 8). The shrinking applicant pool. *Education Week*, 20(10), 49-51.
- Glass, T., Björk, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). *The study of the American superintendency 2000: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Goldberg, M. (2001). Leadership in education: Five commonalities. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(10), 757-761.
- Goldstein, A. (1992). Stress in the superintendency. *The School Administrator*, 49(9), 8-13.
- Goodman, R., & Zimmerman, W. (2000). *Thinking differently: Recommendations for 21st century school board/superintendent leadership, governance, and teamwork for high student achievement*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Grady, M. (2000). Advising doctoral students: Women in transition. In A. Pankake, G. Schroth, & C. Funk (Eds.), *Women as school executives: The complete picture* (pp. 93-99). Austin, TX: Texas Council of Women School Executives.
- Greyser, L. (1999). Professional development helps counter lone ranger syndrome. *Leadership News*, 1(11).
- Gunn, J., & Holdaway, E. (1986). Perceptions of effectiveness, influence, and satisfaction of senior high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22(2), 43-62.
- Harris, S., Marshall, R., Lowery, S., & Buck, J. (2002). Community input into the selection of a superintendent. *Educational Leadership Review* 3(2), 22-27.
- Hodgkinson, H., & Montenegro, X. (1999). *The U.S. school superintendent: The invisible CEO*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Houston, P. (2001). Superintendents for the 21st century: It's not just a job, it's a calling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 428-433.
- Hoyle, J. (1999). The triumphant superintendent. *The School Administrator*, 6(56), 6-9.

- Hoyle, J. (2002). *Superintendents for Texas school districts: Solving the crisis in executive leadership*. Fort Worth, TX: Sid Richardson Foundation.
- Irby, B., & Brown, G. (2000). Advocacy at the university level for professional leadership development of women. In A. Pankake, G. Schroth, & C. Funk (Eds.), *Women as school executives: The complete picture* (pp. 108-118). Austin, TX: Texas Council of Women School Executives.
- Kearns, D., & Harvey, J. (2001). *A legacy of learning*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.
- Keedy, J., & Björk, L. (2001). The superintendent, local boards, and the political arena. *The AASA Professor*, 24(4), 2-5.
- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lowery, S., & Harris, S. (2003). Happily ever after. *American School Board Journal*, 190(3), 30-32.
- Lutz, F. (1990). Reforming education American style. In W. E. Eaton (Ed.), *History, politics and methodology in American education* (pp. 116-134). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Marshall, C., & Kasten, K. (1994). *The administrative career: A casebook on entry, equity, and endurance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Mathews, J. (2001). Nontraditional thinking in the central office. *The School Administrator*, 6(58), 12-17.
- McMillan, J. (2000). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Milstein, M. (1992). The overstated case of administrator stress. *The School Administrator*, 49(9), 12-13.
- Moore, D., & Ditzhazy, H. (1999, August). *Where have all the principals gone? Responses from graduate students currently in two educational leadership programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for Professors of Educational Administration, Jackson Hole, WY.
- Moses, M. (2000). Future school executives: Who will be our leaders? *Texas School Business*, 8, 12-13.
- Natkin, G., Cooper, B., Fusarelli, L., Alborano, J., Padilla, A., & Ghosh, S. (2002). Myth of the revolving-door superintendency. *The School Administrator*, 5(59), 28-31.
- Owen, J., & Ovando, M. (2000). *Superintendent's guide to creating community*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Patterson, J. (2000). *The anguish of leadership*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Patterson, J. (2001). Resilience in the face of adversity. *The School Administrator*, 6(58), 18-22.

- Pierson, M., & Hall, R. (2001, May). *Illinois School Superintendent Survey*. Illinois Association of School Administrators On-Line Publication. Retrieved January, 2001: <http://www.iasaedu.org/publications/survey00-01.htm>
- Ramsey, K. (1997). Domestic relationships of the superintendency. *The School Administrator*, 2(54), 34-40.
- Rawls, S., & Wolverton, M. (2000). The superintendency pipeline in Washington state: Aspirations, frustrations, and realities. In A. Pankake, G. Schroth, & C. Funk (Eds.), *Women as school executives: The complete picture* (pp. 157-165). Austin, TX: Texas Council of Women School Executives.
- Rohn, C. (2001, August). *Superintendent pool shallow? Perception or reality?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
- Schlechty, P. (2001). *Shaking up the schoolhouse: How to support and sustain educational innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwahn, C., & Spady, W. (1998). *Total leaders: Applying the best future-focuses change strategies to education*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Short, P., & Scribner, J. (2000). *Case studies of the superintendency*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Skrla, L. (2001, September 9). Textbook example of a gender gap. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, pp.1F, 6F.
- Snapshot of a leader: Texas 2001 NSOTY Winner Rod Paige. (2001). *Insight*, 15(1), 26-31.
- Sternberg, R. (2002). The new job: Tailored fit or misfit. *The School Administrator*, 5(59), 6-10.
- Tallerico, M. (2000). *Assessing the superintendency: The unwritten rules*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Thompson, D., Wood, R., & Honeyman, D. (1994). *Fiscal leadership for schools*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Thurgood, D. H., & Clarke, J.E. (1995). *Summary report 1993: Doctoral recipients from United States universities*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Zemlicka, B. (2001). *The career paths of Texas public school superintendents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Sam Houston State University: Huntsville, TX.

Sandra Harris is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Secondary Education and Educational Leadership at Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas.

Sandra Lowery is an Emeritus Professor in the Department of Secondary Education and Educational Leadership at Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas.

Michael Hopson is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Secondary Education and Educational Leadership at Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas.

Russell Marshall is Superintendent of Mabank Independent School District in Mabank, TX.

Appendix

Superintendency Survey

All information provided on this questionnaire will be confidential. Only summary data will be released in any report. Thank you.

I. Biographical Information.

1. Age: 30-39 40-49 50-55 56-60 61-65 65+
2. Gender: male female
3. Education: MA Ed.D Ph.D
4. Ethnicity: Anglo Hispanic African American Other
5. How many years have you been a superintendent?
first year 1-5 6-10 11-15 15+
6. What size is your school district?
less than 1000 1000-5000 5000+
7. Classify your school district as: rural suburban urban
8. What rating does your district have?
Unacceptable Low performing Acceptable Recognized
Exemplary
9. At what age do you plan to retire? 50 55 60 65 65+
10. Do your plans include other employment upon retirement?
yes no undecided
11. If you plan to work after retiring from the superintendency, in what type of job do you expect to be employed?
Education consultant College Professor Private Business
Other

II. Motivating Factors

Please rate each item based on its importance as a motivator for remaining in the superintendency.

1 = no importance 2 = of little importance 3 = important 4 = very important

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Increased salary and fringe benefits | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b) Desire to make a difference | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c) Ability to initiate change | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d) Desire to make a positive impact on people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e) Be a teacher of teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

f) Personal challenge	1	2	3	4
g) Professional challenge	1	2	3	4
h) Support/Encouraged from others	1	2	3	4
i) Relocate to a desirable location	1	2	3	4
j) Increased prestige/status	1	2	3	4

III. Inhibiting Factors

Please rate each item based on its importance as an inhibitor for remaining in the superintendency.

1 = no importance 2 = of little importance 3 = important 4 = very important

a) Salary is too small	1	2	3	4
b) No tenure (Lack of job security)	1	2	3	4
c) Increased commitment (meetings, longer day, etc.)	1	2	3	4
d) Isolation/Alienation from campus settings	1	2	3	4
e) Amount of paperwork/bureaucracy	1	2	3	4
f) Working with the school board	1	2	3	4
g) Increased emphasis on standardized tests	1	2	3	4
h) Community politics	1	2	3	4
i) Litigation surrounding education	1	2	3	4
j) Fear of failure	1	2	3	4
k) Job opportunities outside of the superintendency	1	2	3	4

IV. Please share with us any other comment that you would like to make about the superintendency.