FUTURE SYSTEM LEADERSHIP:
A QUANTITATIVE INVESTIGATION OF
THE ROLE OF THE NEW YORK STATE PRINCIPAL
AS THE STRATEGIC PATHWAY TO THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENCY

A Doctoral Research Project
Presented to
Associate Professor Daniel Alemu
Doctoral Research Committee Chair
School of Education
Sage Graduate School

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Education in Educational Leadership

Stanley W. Maziejka

July 2009

We represent to Sage Graduate School that this thesis/dissertation and abstract are the original work of the author(s) and do not infringe on the copyright or other rights of others.

_____
Stanley W. Maziejka   Date of Signature

_____
Dr. Daniel S. Alemu   Date of Signature
Assistant Professor of Education
Doctoral Research Committee Chair

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Abstract

This quantitative study sought to identify specific factors that influence New York State principals to aspire to the school superintendency. A survey of 120 principals investigated the role demographics (age, gender, experience, school type, certification as a school superintendent, and participation in a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program), job satisfaction, expected job satisfaction as a superintendent, knowledge of the superintendency, and the role the principal's current superintendent might play in encouraging a principal to seek the school superintendency within the next five years. The results indicate that 72% of principals are not interested in seeking the superintendency. Principals report that although they would expect to enjoy high levels of job satisfaction as a school superintendent, few plan to apply for such a position in the next five years. This study found that the Principals' knowledge of school board relations is a significant deterrent to seeking the superintendency. Encouragement from their current school superintendent was also found to have a positive impact on the principals' decision to seek system leadership.

Suggested Keywords: Superintendent Shortage, Job Satisfaction, Leadership Capacity, Pathways to Leadership, Knowledge of Superintendency, Mentoring.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER I

Introduction

School superintendents of the 21st century will need to develop a far different skill set

than their predecessors of the past decades. Globalization has changed the world in which we

live. The growing integration of economies and societies around the world will place unique

pressures on educational systems and challenge their norms. Thomas Friedman the Pulitzer

Prize winning author of The World is Flat, argued convincingly that our educational systems

must challenge our best in brightest if the United States is to effectively compete at a global level

(Friedman, 2005). The monumental task of preparing our students for this new world will be

fraught with a myriad of challenges at the federal, state, and local level. These challenges will

require exceptional levels of leadership if we are to successfully adapt to them and be successful.

Heifetz (2004) has pointed out that leaders have always enjoyed built-in mechanisms to

address technical tasks they have already encountered and solved. These new challenges inherent

in the 21st century will require an adaptive leadership style which engages the organization to

seek and develop new responses to the challenges as Heifetz refers to as "mobilizing adaptive

work" (Heifetz, 2004, p.99).

Rogers et al (2006) describe the role of the school superintendent as a tenuous one in

which they report to elected boards of education, oversee the hiring of teachers and other staff,

are accountable to the New York State Education Department and Federal Government, and

must submit their annual school district budgets to local taxpayers for a public vote.

Superintendents must be experts at leading and creating meaningful change, must effectively

communicate with a plethora of diverse stakeholder groups, must work with elected officials,

must run multi- million dollar organizations, must feed, transport, and keep safe thousands of children, and are held accountable for a myriad of educational results. There are few leadership positions that encompass the breadth and rigor of responsibility, public scrutiny, and the accountability for results that characterize the diverse role of the school superintendency.

How will we find future system leaders who have the passion, wisdom, work ethic, intuitiveness, and perseverance to act as courageous champions for our students insuring they achieve at high levels and can compete in the ever changing 21st century world? Numerous studies(Glass & Bjork, 2003; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000; Houston, 2006; Rogers et al, 2006; Sutton & Jobe, 2008) have provided coherent evidence that many superintendents from the baby boom generation will soon be exiting their leadership roles and moving into retirement within the next five years.. While there still remains a large number of an individual who have attained New York State certification as a school superintendent and are currently working in the role as a principal, there still remains considerable reluctance for most of them to aspire to the superintendency.

There have been a myriad of studies (Gates, Ringel, & Santibenez, 2003; Howley, Pendarvist, & Gibbs, 2002; O'Connell, Brown, & Williams, 2005; Winter, Rinehart, Keedy, & Bjork, 2007) completed looking specifically at the principalship and the superintendency. Many of these studies have focused directly on the principal's and superintendent's role within that particular vocation. The studies have provided insight as to demographic trends, job satisfaction within the position, and even principal interest in career advancement (Gates et al., 2003; Hawley et al., 2002; O'Connell et al., 2005; Winter et al., 2007). There is little research exploring what specific role the school superintendent may have in developing leadership

capacity among principals which may encourage them to consider becoming a school superintendent.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to investigate the relationships that might exist between a principal's intent to apply for a school superintendent's position within the next five years with current building level principal demographics (age, gender, experience, school type, certification as a school superintendent, and participation in a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program), job satisfaction as a principal, expected job satisfaction as a superintendent, knowledge of system leadership, and ways in which the principal's current superintendent might encourage their interest in becoming a system leader. The need for such a study is demonstrated by the anticipated historic rates of retirement for system leaders in New York State and the necessity to find qualified replacements. By the year 2011, 60% of current system leaders are expected to retire (Rogers et al., 2006). If the trend forecast by Rogers et al., occurs, it would seem prudent to examine the pool of principals as potential future leaders, since the position of building principal in itself seems strategically situated to be the most logical pathway to system leadership.

Significance of the Study

This study has significance in the State of New York where school districts statewide face the potential crisis of not having enough qualified candidates to assume anticipated vacancies resulting from the high number of superintendent retirements that will occur within the next five years. There is a vast untapped pool of leadership talent already in existence within our

school principals. By investigating the more proactive role the current superintendents could assume in developing and nurturing future leaders, it may be possible to implement more effective measures to address the foreseen leadership crisis.

Research Questions

Do New York State principals who have attained certification to become school superintendents intend to apply for such a position within the next five years?

1. Do New York State Principals who have attained certification to become school superintendents intend to apply for such a position within the next five years?

2. Is there a relationship between a principal's current job satisfaction and his/her intent to apply for a school superintendent's position within the next five years?

3. Is there a relationship between a principal's perceived job satisfaction as a school superintendent and the principal's intent to apply for a school superintendent's position within the next five years?

4. Are principals who have experienced a professional and collegial relationship with their current school superintendent more inclined to consider applying for a school superintendent's position within the next five years than those principals who have not experienced such a relationship?

5. Are principals who perceive they have greater knowledge of system leadership more inclined to consider applying for a school superintendent's position within the next five years than those who perceive they have less knowledge?

Limitations of the Study

The researcher chose to limit his research study to a sample of principals within New York State which was the only delimitation placed upon the study. The limitations of this research study were:

1) The use of an email survey via SurveyMonkey where the researcher has provided written assurances to voluntary participants regarding their privacy and anonymity may not assure each participant of such. In this instance participants may not respond truthfully to all questions which could lead to invalid responses, or they may choose to be unresponsive.

2) The survey responses from Survey Monkey resulted in eleven emails being returned to the researcher as undeliverable. The email addresses of potential participants provided by the New York State Education Department may have been inaccurate based upon principal retirements or changes in employment.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The Superintendent Shortage

The current state of system level leadership within New York State is undergoing a major demographic shift due to an extraordinary rate of turnover among school superintendents (Rogers et al, 2006). Such a significant trend demands attention as the consequence will result in less experience and expertise among those available and willing to assume this very important leadership role. It is anticipated that by the year 2011 one third of all current school superintendents will retire (Rogers et al., 2006). The potential quandary of an inadequate supply of school leaders prepared and available to assume the superintendency in the advent of this crisis is also echoed by school superintendents across the United States. The 2007 American Association of School Superintendents Mini-Survey found that 85% of current school superintendents believe there are an inadequate number of qualified educational leaders available to assume the large number of vacancies that will arise over the next five years (Sutton & Jobe, 2008).

The escalating number of vacancies seem to have overwhelmed the traditional pathway to the superintendency as applicant pools have diminished (O'Connell, 2000) and those ready to assume the role are less prepared to do so (Volp et al., 2004).

There is a great deal of research available related to the school superintendency. A vast number of studies, (Bjork, Keedy, & Gurley, 2003; Glass & Bjork, 2003; Howley et al., 2002; Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2002; Sutton et al., 2008; Winter et al., 2007) have focused on the challenges inherent in the position, a shortage of qualified applicants for impending retirements, and questions as to who will be available to assume the anticipated vacancies of the future.

Data from other studies on the superintendency indicate that there are considerable challenges present in recruiting new superintendents as candidate pools have diminished significantly from 1996-1999 (from an average of 43 applicants down to only 26 per vacancy O'Connell, 2000) and is comprised of fewer qualified applicants (Brockett, 1996).

According to Orr (2006), there are a number of specific conditions blamed for the eminent superintendent shortage which reflects both the nature of the current labor market and the challenges embodied within this leadership position. The challenges include the ever-changing burdens and responsibilities placed upon the superintendency "resulting from increased decentralization within the district and increased centralization from the state and federal government, the lack of understanding of the position, time demands, stress, compensation and the general demunization of potential aspirations throughout the leadership pipeline" (p. 1363).

Houston (2001) asserts that there are an excessive number of reasons why individuals are not seriously inclined to consider becoming school superintendents. Potential leadership candidates view the "lightning rod" aspect of the superintendency and they make a conscious decision not to consider it. They perceive the role of the superintendency as a job inundated with excessive public criticism intertwined with minimal moments of public triumph (Houston, 2001).

7

They are cognizant of the fact that superintendents are sometimes ill-treated or viewed as the scapegoat and seldom do they receive public commendation for a job well done. All this inclusive with global expectations that are often too high and unrealistic.

Cooper, Fusarelli, and Carell (2000), also foresee a bleak future for the anticipated school executive shortage through a similar lens as Houston in that they espouse the popular perception of the school superintendency being an impossible job. There are few who choose to assume a role in which "the best and brightest confront escalating and competing demands, find themselves besieged by confusing and conflicting interest groups, and enjoy little or no job security" (Cooper et al., 2000, p.6).

Brocket (1996) suggests that if superintendent positions are being emptied at a much more frenetic pace than they are being filled with permanent replacements, then how will school districts contend and plan for this inevitable leadership vacuum. This grave inability to attract qualified candidates for an increasingly large number of administrative position vacancies, particularly the superintendency, represents a significant leadership crisis (McCormick, 1987).

Lankford and Wyckoff (2003) contend that much has been made of the impending shortage of our school leaders. Their analysis cites the substantial increase in leadership demand due to the perpetual retirements of the baby boom generation. It is expected that as many as fifty percent of current superintendents may retire within the next six years (Rogers, 2006).

Meanwhile, there is increasing evidence that schools across the United States are evolving into a much more demanding place to work with pervasive challenges for those who choose to lead. The demands of increased bureaucracy, public scrutiny, visibility, diminished

revenues, and school accountability all make the role of school leaders increasingly more difficult and tenuous. This supports the empirical evidence that the supply of potential leaders may very well be reduced. The anecdotal reports of small applicant pools for school leadership openings also provides tangible evidence that the shortage might very well result from increased demand and a reduced supply of credible and qualified school leaders (Volp et al., 2004; Rogers et al., 2006).

Houston (2006) asserts that the history of the system leader has gone through a metamorphosis from manager to leader where the role has evolved from responding to local management needs to leading a very complicated school community enterprise. The evolution of the superintendency has lead to a position that is both broadly influential but greatly misunderstood. "The superintendent has become a job with lots of accountability but limited authority and one that many have called the most complex job in America. Little wonder there is a shortage in those willing to tackle it" (p.54).

Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) as part of their national superintendent survey found that although school superintendents consider themselves to be quite effective in their role as school leaders there are a myriad of issues and challenges in the areas of administration and management which inhibit both performance and satisfaction with the job itself. Superintendents within the survey cited the following as areas of great personal and professional concern: school finances; assessment and testing of student outcomes; school accountability; demands for new ways of teaching; changing curriculum priorities; relationships with school boards; compliance with state and federal mandates; teacher recruitment; lack of time for important decision making; change in societal values and norms; lack of parental support, and personal time management.

These issues and challenges have made the job of being a school leader more difficult for those who have chosen to lead our schools. Glass et al., (2000) have also reported that there are very clear reasons why many school leaders are deciding to leave their jobs as school superintendents. Superintendents have always viewed their jobs as challenging and fulfilling but in the survey they cited some very specific factors which merit strong consideration to contemplate leaving their current position as school leader: inadequate financing at the federal, state, and local level, too many insignificant demands placed upon them, state reform mandates; collective bargaining agreements; racial and ethnic problems; too many added responsibilities; insufficient administrative support and staffing; difficult relations with school boards; ineffective staff members; lack of community support; board micromanagement and; board elections and new board expectations (Glass et al., 2000).

Superintendent perceptions reinforce the notion that a very difficult and tenuous school leadership position continues to evolve into one with immense challenges and responsibilities that few are aspiring to undertake.

According to Short and Scribner (2002), the role of the school superintendent has clearly evolved into one of the more complex leadership positions which exist in the education world today. The leaders of school districts have the unenviable task of responding to ever-increasing political pressures as well as a governance board that has complete control over the length of employment a superintendent will enjoy.

It cannot be understated that leadership be viewed as an integral component in creating an environment where schools flourish with effective teaching and high levels of student

achievement (Marzano, Waters, and McNulty, 2005). Shen, Cooley, and Wegenke (2004) assert that a shortage of qualified educational leaders will continue to detrimentally impact the educational quality we currently enjoy and threaten many of the educational gains we have attained during the past decade.

Houston (2006) is uncompromising in his belief that preserving the good we have done for our children requires leadership. It is this leadership component that is most the critical condition for such success. He contends that there is strong research evidence emerging that when one attempts to find the critical variable in positive school reform, it is the school superintendent. While the educational journey travels between the classroom and in the school, the navigation of the journey and the energy and resources required are commanded by the school leader. Without such leadership the journey would not enjoy success.

What creates some contradiction and cause for concern and further investigation is the fact that the majority of school superintendents continue to find their current roles very satisfying yet many are choosing to leave the profession (Glass, Bjork, and Brunner, 2000; Rogers et al., 2006; Volp et al., 2004;Winter et al., (2007). There is empirical evidence that the overwhelming majority of superintendents continue to enjoy high levels of job satisfaction (Glass et al., 2000; Rogers et al., 2006; Volp et al., 2004). The last two state-wide surveys completed by the New York State Council of School Superintendents indicated that current superintendents enjoy a high level of job satisfaction in their position as school leader. This high level of job satisfaction was also evident in the most recent survey completed nationally by the American Association of School Superintendents (Glass et al., 2000). The surveys completed by the New York State Council of School Superintendents showed that the majority (68.6%) of school superintendents

would encourage their own sons and daughters to enter this important profession (Rogers et al., 2006). Superintendents also stated unequivocally that if they had to make a career choice over again, the majority would once again aspire to the superintendency.

Finally, the surveys demonstrated that school superintendents openly share their satisfaction as a school leader with other educational professionals with whom they interact. In fact, most superintendents would highly recommend the position of school superintendent to their subordinates (Glass et al., 2000; Rogers et al., 2006; Volp et al., 2004). However, the question arises as to why other potential leaders in direct pathway to the superintendency do not share in the favorable perceptions embodied within the position or genuinely consider it as a career.

Pathways to the Superintendency

As the roles and responsibilities of school leaders become more and more complex it will become paramount that we identify strategies to recruit and train effective school leaders of tomorrow. One of the most logical pathways to the superintendency is the principalship. Currently within New York State, approximately 50% of new school district superintendents come directly from a school principalship (O'Connell, Brown, and Williams, 2005). The majority of other superintendent hires come from central office positions which often times has direct organizational roots to the principalship. It bears attention that not only does it appear there are fewer individuals who are seeking the superintendency, those who choose system leadership are doing so much later in their careers and thus will conceivably serve fewer years in the role and need to be replaced at a much higher rate (Glass et al., 2000; Volp et al., 2004).

When viewing the principalship demographics within New York State, a few significant items bear significant attention. First, it is important to note that the mean age at which the typical principal attained his or her initial principalship was 41 (O'Connell et al., 2005) as opposed to the national mean of 36 (Doud and Keller, 1998). This provides important information that individuals are entering the principalship at later stages of their careers. Also, it is noted that 78% of all principals have garnered certification as a school superintendent (O'Connell et al., 2005). Alarmingly, only 21 % of all principals throughout the State of New York have expressed any interest in aspiring to the superintendency. This has created a dilemma of having a plethora of school leaders certified as superintendents with no sincere interest in the position. This perceived problem is accentuated by the research of (Gates, Ringel, and Santibenez, 2003) who assert that the evidence from recent studies suggest that there may be more individuals certified to be school administrators than could be required to meet the increased demand. Their research shows that there will be an ample number of individuals who are credentialed and certified to become system leaders who could potentially abate the leadership crisis which is foreseen if they had intentions to actively seek a system leader position.

Without question, there are far more individuals who have attained certification for the superintendency in New York State who could ultimately become our next system leaders. However, it is clear that few of these qualified and certified individuals have any interest in becoming a school superintendent (O'Connell et al., 2005; Rogers et al., 2006). If this is the case, the question must be contemplated as to why so few building level principals aspire to be school superintendents and what can be done to influence their decision to consider pursuing the

superintendency in the future. Lankford and Wyckoff (2003) believe that the likelihood of transition from a lower level administrative position increases as time since becoming certified increases. This is consistent with individuals gaining experience in lower level administrative positions, ultimately preparing them for higher level administrative positions.

This belief is supported in the 2006 New York State School Superintendent Snapshot which shows both males and females are entering their initial superintendency at the mean age of 45.9 (Rogers et al, 2006).The mean age has decreased somewhat in that the two previous snapshots of 2001 (Volp et al., 2001), and 2004 (Volp et al., 2004) indicating the mean age of new superintendents was 48.3 and 48.4 respectively. However, while we may enjoy a large number of individuals certified as superintendents, even with increased experience over time, few seem willing to ascend into the system level leadership role.

Howley et al., (2004) in their study of Ohio principal attraction to the superintendency reported a number of conditions which principals found both appealing and unappealing regarding the prospects of seeking the superintendency. Principals reported the following conditions as appealing factors in seeking the superintendency: chance to make a difference, anticipated satisfaction associated with making a difference, opportunity to implement creative personal ideas, anticipated satisfaction associated with ability to provide support to school and district staff, high levels of board support, improved annual salary, improved benefit package, greater control over work schedule, increased opportunities for professional growth, and higher status (Howley et al., 2004).

Principals reported the following conditions unappealing factors in seeking the superintendency; increased burden of responsibility for local, state, and federal mandates; need to be accountable for outcomes that are beyond an educator's control; low levels of board support; excessive pressures to perform; stress associated with anticipated conflict with teacher unions; increased work load; lack of clarity about job descriptions; need for greater amounts of technical knowledge; and the field being dominated by males (Howley et al., 2004).

With the added experience and expanded role, few principals are making the decision to become school superintendents. Instead, they may seek central office positions or continue their work as building level principals until retirement (Howley et al., 2004; O'Connell et al., 2005: Winters et al., 2007).

Building Leadership Capacity

Daresh (2004) laments the fact that school districts have overtly acknowledged that a myriad of practicing administrators are leaving the profession with fewer educators, predominately teachers, showing any interest in aspiring to careers as administrators. This leadership crisis has created a true sense of urgency and a compelling argument to investigate varied approaches to nurture and develop future educational leaders. A major component to this new approach of developing capacity for new school leaders might be the practice of mentoring. Wasden (1988) when referring to mentoring for educational leaders defined the mentor in the following terms:

The mentor is a master at providing opportunities for the growth of others. By identifying situations and events which contribute knowledge and experience to the life of the steward.

15

Opportunities are not by happenstance; they must be thoughtfully designed and organized into logical sequence. Sometimes hazards are attached to opportunity. The mentor takes great pains to help the steward recognize and negotiate dangerous situations. In doing all this, the mentor has an opportunity for growth through service, which is the highest form of leadership (Wasden, 1988, p. 17).

It is asserted by Lankford, O'Connell, and Wyckoff (2003) that administrators report it is the encouragement of a fellow administrator which profoundly influenced their decision to seek administrative certification and become a school leader. The research of others (Glass et al., 2000; Rogers et al., 2006; Sutton & Jobe, 2008; Volp et al., 2004) who listed the mentoring from fellow professionals and encouragement from colleagues as strong confidence builders which create strong motivation to encourage an individual to actively seek their initial superintendency. Glass et al., (2000) reported that almost 60% of superintendents say they were assisted by a mentor in their career development and that mentors and mentoring are important aspects of any profession. A great deal of meaningful professional knowledge is best transferred through a mentoring relationship rather than through a university preparation class or in-service workshop (Daresh, 2004). This mentoring contributes greatly in providing a practical application for encouraging, nurturing, and developing future leaders. This extremely important evidence leads to the logical question of what role can a superintendent play in supporting and influencing a principal's interest and decision to seek a school superintendent's position (Glass et al, 2000; Rogers et al 2006; Volp et al, 2004; Winter et al, 2007).

Normore (2006) contends that many school principals today believe that they spend far too much of their time and effort on administrative and managerial tasks rather than on those

important issues that directly affect instructional leadership, including curriculum and instruction. If we are to create a pool of qualified system leaders to alleviate the intense demand placed on the superintendent labor pool as fewer administrators seek the superintendency (O'Connell, 2000), it is imperative that superintendents play an active role in developing and nurturing a principal's capacity to do so.

The 2006 Triennial Study of the Superintendency in New York provided great insight as to what factors were confidence builders, motivators, and incentives to apply for their initial superintendency and what factors were potential barriers to applying. The five highest confidences builders were associated with their previous job experience, mentoring activities, encouragement from colleagues, academic preparation, and encouragement from family. The five highest incentives to apply for superintendency were a desire to take on greater challenges, having greater influence on children, a new experience, increased compensation, and increased status. Superintendents also viewed significant barriers which provided some sense of caution with their initial interest in applying for superintendency. The school superintendents cited the large scope of the position, lack of job security, having school aged children, spousal considerations, quality of life factors, and cost of living considerations as potential barriers to their interest in becoming a school superintendent (Rogers et al., 2006; Volp et al., 2004).

There is much that we know about the factors that can positively influence a principal's decision to aspire to the superintendency. A number of these factors can only be influenced by policy makers at the federal, state, and board level. However, there are those factors that can be most effectively influenced by the relationship a principal has with his or her own superintendent.

Spanneut and Ford (2008) believe that by design or by chance, school superintendents communicate their beliefs about what is educationally important and the roles they expect principals to fulfill. Superintendents through their spoken words and actions foster the development of their principal's leadership capacity by establishing a common and clear understanding about why the role of effective instructional leaders is necessary and critical for school success. Superintendents reinforce this by actively providing support for their principals to develop and refine their effectiveness as instructional leaders. These stewards of leaders also take personal pride and satisfaction by investing in the growth of these future district-wide instructional leaders. They accept the great responsibility that it is their role to develop capacity for future school leadership (Spanneut and Ford, 2008).

Senge (1994) contends that learning organizations are present when people continually expend their capacity to create results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of knowledge and truth are nurtured, where collective aspirations are set free, where people are continually learning how to learn together. It is the school superintendent who has the formal authority, power, and influence to bring such leadership capacity development to fruition in our principals.

Davis (2000) asserts that it is the school superintendent who is uniquely positioned to establish an environment where system level learning can flourish, facilitating powerful on the job learning experiences for future aspiring school superintendents. As the leader of leaders, superintendents have an obligation to stimulate and support the professional goals of everyone in the organization. It seems clear that sitting school superintendents have a great deal to offer in terms of abating the current leadership crisis in New York State. It is the superintendent who is

uniquely positioned to provide guidance, support, knowledge, and a nurturing environment by which principals will be encouraged to seek the superintendency (Glass et al, 2000; Rogers et al, 2006; Volp et al, 2004; Winter et al, 2007).

The 2005 New York State Council of School Superintendent survey devoted great detail to the premise of mentoring and the value in the practice in cultivating future school leaders. In fact, 96.4 % of superintendents who responded felt that mentoring was an excellent mechanism to encourage individuals in becoming interested in the superintendency. The national survey done by the American Association of School Superintendents reports that 76% of superintendents realized great value in the mentoring process (Glass et al, 2000).

The New York survey also emphasized that mentors had made a sizeable contribution to a superintendent's decision to apply for their initial superintendency and many of these superintendents could identify with a former superintendent who had provided this meaningful mentoring experience. It was also clear that many sitting superintendents believed that there were not sufficient mentoring opportunities available to nurture and encourage others to consider the superintendency as a career goal.

Marzano et al., (2005) refer to this superintendent leadership style as servant leadership. The fundamental application of this leadership style is to nurture and support others within the organization. This would include developing and encouraging the leadership skills of potential leaders within the school organization, in this instance, building principals.

Maxwell (1995) contends that it is the effective leader who creates the environment that attracts other potential leaders to the organization. He states that doing so "is the job of leaders.

They must be active; they must generate activity that is productive; and they must encourage, create, and command changes in the organization. They must create a climate where potential leaders will thrive" (Maxwell, 1995, p.17). Maxwell believes that once you have identified potential leaders within your organization it is imperative that you commence the important work of building leadership capacity within them. He refers to this as his BEST strategy; Believe in them; Encourage them; Share with them; and Trust them. This concerted nurturing and support creates a strong emotional and professional foundation from which they can reach their potential as a future leader. The most critical aspect of this relationship and a responsibility of leadership is modeling. It is imperative that superintendents model what Maxwell viewed as critical components to nurturing these aspiring leaders "leadership, a strong work ethic, responsibility, character, openness, consistency, communication, and a belief in people" (Maxwell, 1995, p. 62). While this seems a daunting task in light of the immense responsibilities innate within the superintendent position, as Maxwell states great leaders know the difficulties associated with choosing to lead but choose to carry on anyway. "The growth and development of people is the highest calling of leadership" (Maxwell, 1995, p.111).

Bennis (1989) also speaks to this leadership imperative to mentoring and nurturing future leaders when he asserts that "leadership opportunities should be offered to all would-be leaders early in their careers, because they build, drive, and trigger a can-do spirit, and inspire self-confidence (Bennis, 1989, p.177).

Tallerico (2000) when discussing career mobility within organizations focused specifically on building level administration positions and the potential for providing structures within the organization which would encourage access to the superintendency. Clearly the main

focus of this organizational model would be mentoring facilitated by the superintendent to develop the competencies needed for administrators to become system leaders.

Summary of the Literature Review

The literature provides compelling evidence that, indeed, the state of the superintendency across our nation and particularly, in New York, demands considerable attention. There is strong evidence that increased numbers of school superintendents will be retiring in the next few years with fewer qualified individuals applying for the anticipated vacancies. While the research provides evidence that there are large numbers of individuals who have attained the necessary certification to become a superintendent, few are aspiring to do so. It appears that the current pathway to superintendency is most commonly through the principalship. A concerted effort must be made to encourage, nurture, and influence principals statewide to aspire to the superintendency. The most logical means to do so is through our current school superintendents. It is vital that sitting superintendents make a concerted effort to inspire others to lead. There is great potential for this realization to materialize if current school superintendents build capacity for their current principals to become system leaders. We are cognizant of what motivates individuals to apply for the superintendency as well as the inherent barriers which deter one's consideration to assume leadership positions within our school districts. By providing leadership and building capacity among our principals we may be able to assuage the current superintendent crisis and preserve the necessary leadership to move our schools effectively into the 21st century.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This chapter provides an explanation of the proposed research project methodology including; the research design, the research participants of the study, research procedures, the instrument that will be utilized, the variables of the study, methods of analysis, and how the results will be analyzed and interpreted.

Design of the Study

The study which has been completed is a quantitative study. Creswell (2009) defines quantitative research as:

A means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. These variables in turn, can be measures, typically on instruments, so that numbered data can be analyzed using statistical procedures. The final written report has a set structure consisting of an introduction, literature and theory, methods, results, and discussion (Creswell, 2009, p.4).

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the relationships that might exist between a principal's interest in applying for a school superintendency within the next five years with principal demographics (age, gender, number of years in the principalship, school type, participation in a leadership academy, and certification as a system leader), issues of job satisfaction (both current level within the principalship and expected level as a superintendent), perceived knowledge of the superintendency, the principal's relationship with their current

school superintendent in terms of developing leadership capacity. These research questions were investigated in this quantitative study:

1. Do New York State principals who have attained certification to become school superintendents intend to apply for such a position within the next five years?
2. Is there a relationship between a principal's current job satisfaction and his/her intent to apply for a superintendent's position within the next five years?
3. Is there a relationship between a principal's perceived job satisfaction as a school superintendent and the principal's intent to apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years?
4. Are principals who have experienced a professional and collegial relationship with their current school superintendent more inclined to consider applying for a superintendent position within the next five years than those who have not experienced such a relationship?
5. Are principals who perceive they have greater knowledge of system leadership more inclined to consider applying for a school superintendent's position within the next five years than those who perceive they have less knowledge?

Population and Sample

Principals from across New York State were chosen as the population to be studied because they are in direct organizational line to the superintendency and are the logical pipeline to assume the position of superintendent. Fifty per cent of all superintendent vacancies in New York State are filled with candidates who are currently principals (Rogers et al., 2006). The

position of principal is also one of the traditional avenues for developing the necessary leadership capacity to assume the superintendency. It is the principalship that seems the most logical pathway to the superintendency.

A research sample of 120 principals was chosen from the statewide population of 3008 school principals. According to Alreck & Settle (1995) this sample size is within the ideal range to provide adequate confidence in the sample. The research sample was chosen using a systematic random method utilizing 25th name sampling. Alreck et al., (1995) contend that when the sample frame consists of a list of sample units the most common method of selecting a random sample from the list is to select every nth name. This systematic random sampling method which was selected utilized the nth name sampling method. In this instance every 25th principal was selected from a master list provided by the New York State Education Department. This selection process created a pool of 120 school principals who could become voluntary participants in this study. The chosen sample size will permit the research to generalize results to the entire population of New York State principals with a reasonable degree of confidence in those generalizations.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

Data for this research was collected utilizing a survey. The New York State Education Department provided to the researcher with the email addresses for all principals statewide via an Excel file. By utilizing a systematic random sampling method and an nth name sampling method 120 principals were selected to participate in an electronic survey which was distributed through SurveyMonkey. SurveyMonkey is a web based tool which allows for the creation, distribution,

and analysis of online surveys. The researcher was responsible for the creation of the survey, all costs associated with the survey, and dissemination and collection of the data contained within the survey. The survey was designed by this researcher and is composed of five separate sections. Part one of the survey contained eight questions related to principal demographics and attitudes such as age, gender, years of experience as a principal, school type, certification as a school superintendent, participation in a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program, and their intent to apply for a superintendent's position within the next five years. Part two of the survey focused on the principals' personal job satisfaction in their current position. A five point likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (extremely satisfied) was utilized to focus on the following work related characteristics: salary and benefits, job security, prestige of the position, relationship with staff, relationship with community, impacting instructional decisions, hiring qualified staff, amount of time devoted to the job, autonomy in decision making, ability to influence others, impact on family life, being recognized for efforts, and creating meaningful change. Part three of the survey focused on the expected job satisfaction a principal would enjoy if he/she were to become a superintendent. In this instance the principals were asked to respond to the identical job characteristics utilized in the previous survey section. The same five point likert-type scaled was also used in this part of the survey. Part four of the survey focused on the principal's knowledge and understanding of the role of the superintendency. The principals were asked to respond to six questions related to their personal knowledge of the superintendency: political advocacy, personnel, board relations, business and finance, labor relations, and curriculum and instruction. A five point likert-type scale was used for these five questions with a range of 1 (minimal knowledge) to 5 (a high degree of

knowledge). The final part of the survey focused on to what degree the principal's relationship with their own school superintendent had influenced their leadership development practices. The principals responded to five questions related to leadership capacity development by their superintendent: has encouraged me to aspire to the superintendency, has acted as an informal mentor, has provided opportunities to engage in district-wide leadership responsibilities, has provided meaningful feedback on leadership performance, and has provided meaningful professional development related to leadership ranging from 1 (to a low degree) to 5 (to a high degree).

The purpose of the survey was to gather data so that generalizations can be made from the sample that might provide some inferential information regarding principal interest in becoming school superintendents. Prior to dissemination of the survey it was informally piloted with five retired principals. The researcher chose five retired principals who represented different school types (urban, suburban, and rural) and who were diverse in terms of gender and ethnicity. The retired principals were presented with a cover letter which outlined the purpose of the research study, a draft of the survey instrument which had been developed, and a questionnaire composed of nine questions which they were asked to complete.

The purpose of the pilot was to ascertain whether the survey questions were relevant and made sense, measure what they purport to measure, were clear and concise, and that there were no questions which the researcher was remiss in asking. All retired principals were provided self addressed postage paid envelopes which could be sent back to the researcher. All five retired principals returned the questionnaire and their feedback was integrated within the instrument prior to finalizing the New York State Principal Survey.

On November 11, 2009, the survey was distributed to 120 New York State Principals through Survey Monkey. Nine of the surveys were returned as undeliverable to the researcher via Survey Monkey as erroneous email addresses. In this instance the researcher believes that individuals had either retired or had changed employment to a different school district. The researcher sent out a follow-up survey on December 8, 2009 to thank those participants who had returned their surveys and to encourage those who had not to do the same. It was impressed on all principals that their response to the survey would greatly enhance the validity and reliability of the research study so that generalizations could be made about the statewide population of New York State Principals. The researcher's goal was to obtain a minimum survey return rate of 60%. Of the 111 principals who had received the survey 71 individuals had started the survey (63.96%) but only 64 individuals had completed each question within the survey (57.65%). However, the researcher points out that this is misleading in that some questions would require no response based upon a previously asked question. When analyzing the survey results the researcher found that there were 71 survey responses that were of value in this research study. For practical purposes the researcher's reported return rate is 63.96%. Since the return rate exceeded the threshold goal of 60 % the researcher is confident the sample data are reasonably representative of the population.

Variables of the Study

The dependent dichotomous variable is the principal's interest in applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years. The independent variables within the research study are principal demographics (age, gender, and number of years in the principalship, school type, certification as a school superintendent, and participation in a leadership academy or

27

superintendent's preparation program), job satisfaction as a principal, and expected job satisfaction as a school superintendent, knowledge of the superintendency, and the principal's relationship with their current superintendent in terms of developing leadership capacity.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Thomas (2004) states that when using a likert-type scale it is vital to consider evaluating the scale interval consistency or how well the items are measuring the same construct. Since this calculation is extremely complex it is recommended that statistical analysis be done utilizing the SPSS software package 17.0.

First a descriptive analysis was conducted using SPSS version 17 that focused on the demographic background of the research participants. The descriptive statistics allowed the researcher to profile the sample. Accordingly, frequencies, means, and standard deviations were reported for the following group characteristics: age, gender, experience in the principalship, school type, certification as a school superintendent, and participation in a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program, all descriptive analysis data will be reported within tables.

Second, Cronbach's alpha was analyzed using SPSS, to evaluate the reliability of the likert-type survey questions to measure the intended constructs. This analysis will tell the researcher if there is internal consistency within the scaled items and that the individual items within a scale positively correlate with the sum of the remaining items. The researcher is using a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher as an acceptable measure for each construct.

SPSS was utilized to perform inferential statistics using independent t-tests to explore the relationships that exist between the dependent dichotomous variable, a principal's interest in

applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years with the independent variable, a principal's knowledge of the superintendency. The t-tests will allow the researcher to compare the mean scores of two independent groups (those principals who will apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years and those that have no intention to apply), as it relates to their knowledge of the superintendency. The researcher will utilize $p=.05$ to determine whether variables are statistically significant.

SPPS was used to perform inferential statistics utilizing Pearson Chi Square to explore what relationships may exist between the dependent dichotomous variable, a principal's interest in applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years with the independent variables; principal demographics (age, gender, experience, school type, certification as a school superintendent, and participation in a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program), principal job satisfaction, expected job satisfaction as a school superintendent, and ways in which the principal's current superintendent has developed leadership capacity within the principal. Chi Square will allow the researcher to view the frequency distribution of expected response counts and actual response counts from the two independent groups (those principals who will apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years and those who have no intention to apply).

CHAPTER IV

Summary of Results

This chapter describes the results of this quantitative study. The results and findings of the study are presented for each of the five research questions which were outlined in Chapter I. The results were presented utilizing a descriptive statistical analysis of selected demographic items, as well as inferential statistics using both independent t-tests and Chi Square. Cronbach's Alpha was used to analyze reliability of the instrument's subscales. All frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations used within the following analysis were rounded to the nearest one-hundredth decimal place value.

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the relationships that might exist between a principal's interest in applying for a school superintendency within the next five years with principal demographics (age, gender, experience, school type, certification as a school superintendent, participation in a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program), issues of job satisfaction (both current level within the principalship and expected level as a superintendent), perceived knowledge of the superintendency, the principal's relationship with their current school superintendent in terms of developing leadership capacity

This section summarizes the results from the various statistical procedures utilized within this quantitative study. The first component of this section will focus on the descriptive analysis of the participants sampled in this study along with group statistics (means and standard deviations) for each subscale within the study. The remaining components will present and interpret the statistical outputs (t-tests, Chi Square, and Cronbach's Alpha).

Analysis of Findings

When examining the demographic characteristics of the principals who took part in this study Table 1 presents a frequency and percentage distribution gender, age range, experience, school type, certification as a school superintendent, and attendance at a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program.

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Principals by Gender, Age Range, Experience, School Type, Certification as a school superintendent, and Participation in a Leadership Academy

Demographic Characteristics	Number	Percent
Gender		
Female	31	44.3
Male	39	55.7
Age Range		
30 or under	0	0
31 – 40	16	22.8
41 – 50	24	34.3
50 or more	30	42.8
Experience		
5 or less	29	41.4
6 – 10	21	30.0
11 – 15	7	10.0
15 or more	13	18.6
School Type		
Rural	19	27.5
Suburban	41	59.5
Urban	9	13.0
Certification		
Yes	61	87.1
No	9	12.9
Attended Leadership Academy		
Yes	12	17.6
No	56	82.4

The sample for this study was comprised of 55.7% males (39) and 44.3% females (31). Of these participants 22.9% (16) were between the ages of 31-40, 34.3% (24) between the ages of 41-50, and 42.9% (30) were 50 or older. No participants within the sample were 30 years of age or younger. When looking at experience within the principalship 41.4% (29) had five or less years of experience, 30% (21) had six to ten years of experience, 10% (7) had eleven to twenty years of experience, and 18.6% (13) had fifteen or more years of experience as a principal. When looking at school type 27.5% (19) worked in a rural school, 59.5% (41) worked in a suburban school, and 13% (9) worked in an urban school district. There were 87.1% (61) of principals who had attained certification to become a school superintendent, while 12.9% (9) had not. Finally, the sample showed that 82.4% (56) of the principals had not attended a leadership academy, while 17.6% (12) had.

Research Question I

Do New York State principals who have attained certification to become school superintendents intend to apply for such a position within the next five years?

Survey question eight asked principals about their intent to apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years. The researcher found that 72.1% (49) said they would not apply for superintendency, while 27.9% (19) stated they were intent on seeking the superintendency. When looking at the group demographic statistics age, gender, number of years in the principalship, and attendance at a leadership academy, none of these characteristics indicated a significant relationship with a principal's decision to aspire to the superintendency

within the next five years. When looking at the demographics characteristics this researcher found that for the characteristic of age, 25% of the principals (4) in the age range of 31-40 were intent on applying for a superintendent's position while 75% (12) were not. For the age group of 41-50, the researcher found that 43.47% of principals (10) were intent on applying and 56.53% (13) were not. For the final age group of 50 and older, the researcher found that 17.24% of principals (5) were intent on applying for the superintendency and 82.76% of principals (24) were not. When looking at the demographic characteristic of gender, the research indicated that 34.21% of males (13) were intent on applying for a superintendent position and that 65.79% of males (25) were not. In the case of female principals, 20% of females (6) intend to apply for the superintendency, while 80% of females (24) were not. The demographic characteristic of experience showed that for principals with 5 or less years of experience 32.14% of principals (9) would be applying for superintendency while 67.86% principals (19) would not. For those principals who had been working for 6-10 years, the researcher reported that 36.84% of principals (7) were intent on applying while 63.14% of principals (12) were not. For those principals with 11-15 years of experience the researcher found that 28.57%) of principals (2) would apply for the superintendency while 71.43% of principals (12) would not. Finally, when looking at the most experienced principals those who had served for 15 or more years the research indicated that 7.69% of principals (7) were intent on applying for the superintendency while 12 (92.31%) principals (12) report that they would not apply. Finally when investigating those principals who had attended a leadership academy 18.18% of principals (2) report that they will apply for superintendency while 81.82% of principals (9) will not. For those principals who had not attended a leadership academy the researcher reports that 29% of principals (16) are

intent on applying for superintendency while 71% of principals (39) are not. When investigating

the final demographic characteristic of superintendent certification the researcher notes that

32.20% of principals (19) who had participated in a leadership academy would apply for

superintendency while 77.80% of principals (40) would not. For those principals (9) who had

never participated in a leadership academy, none had any intention to apply for superintendency.

Looking at table 2, we find the results for the Chi Square analysis performed on all of the

demographic characteristics previously described. The Chi Square results reported the following

values and significance levels between each of the demographic characteristic and the dependent

dichotomous variable of whether the principals would apply for a superintendent' position within

the next five years: gender (.376), age, (.200), experience (.130), school type (1.61), attendance

at a leadership academy (.466) , and certification (.046). Only the demographic characteristic of

certification provided a significant relationship ($p<.05$).

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics

	N	Value	Pearson Chi Square Significance (2-tailed)
Gender	68	4.475	.195
Age	68	1.681	.107
Experience	67	3.603	.308
School Type	67	2.020	.364
Certification	59	4.022	.045*
Attended Leadership Academy	66	.550	.458

*   Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Research Question II

Is there a relationship between a principal's current job satisfaction and his or her intent to apply for a superintendent's position within the next five years?

When looking at the group statistics of principal job satisfaction there is no significant difference within the mean scores reported for each job satisfaction characteristic. The mean scores are reflective of a range of 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (extremely satisfied).This researcher also noted no statistically significant variances when reviewing the standard deviation of the mean scores reported for each job satisfaction characteristic. Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard deviation for each characteristic reported for those principals who intend to apply for superintendency and for those who will not apply. The job satisfaction characteristics are delineated in sequential order (low to high) of those who would apply for school superintendency within the next five years and those who would not. The researcher found little variation within the distribution of the scaled scores for principal job satisfaction characteristics. There were no significant variances within the responses among those individuals who were intent on applying for school superintendency within the next five years and with those who report no interest in applying for the superintendency.

Table 3

Group Statistics – Principal Job Satisfaction

	Applying for Superintendency	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Salary and Benefits	Yes	19	3.58	1.216
	No	47	3.87	.769
Job Security	Yes	18	4.11	.758
	No	47	4.21	.858
Prestige of Position	Yes	18	4.06	.725
	No	47	3.83	.789
Relationship with Staff	Yes	18	4.11	.900
	No	47	4.30	.749
Relationship with Community	Yes	18	4.22	.647
	No	46	4.21	.634
Impacting Instructional Decisions	Yes	19	3.89	.737
	No	46	4.15	.698
Impacting Policy Decisions	Yes	18	3.67	.840
	No	46	3.63	.878
Hiring Qualified Staff	Yes	18	4.22	.647
	No	47	4.21	.883
Amount of Time Devoted to Job	Yes	19	3.26	1.327
	No	46	3.54	.912
Autonomy in Decision Making	Yes	18	3.78	.808
	No	46	3.65	.875
Ability to Influence Others	Yes	18	3.78	.808
	No	46	4.02	.577
Impact on Family Life	Yes	18	3.06	.725
	No	47	3.15	1.000
Being Recognized for Efforts	Yes	18	3.22	1.116
	No	46	3.39	.856
Creating Meaningful Change	Yes	19	3.79	.855
	No	47	3.83	.789

Pearson Chi Square analysis was completed for the principal's job satisfaction characteristics and the dependent variable, the principal's intent to apply for a superintendent position within the next five years. Table 4 indicates that none of the principal's job satisfaction items had a statistically significant value in determining the relationship between a principal's job satisfaction and his or her intent to apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years.

To measure the reliability coefficient of these principal job satisfaction questions a reliability analysis was conducted. Accordingly, the Cronbach's Alpha indicated a coefficient of .864.

Table 4

Principal Job Satisfaction Characteristics

	N	Value	Pearson Chi Square Significance (2-tasked)
Salary and Benefits	66	6.556	.161
Job Security	65	1.814	.612
Prestige of Position	65	1.374	.712
Relationship with Staff	65	1.025	.795
Relationship with Community	64	.368	.832
Impacting Instructional Decisions	65	4.457	.216
Impacting Policy Decisions	64	2.929	.570
Hiring Qualified Staff	65	3.125	.373
Amount of Time Devoted to Job	65	6.947	.139
Autonomy in Decision Making	64	2.576	.462
Ability to Influence Others	64	4.274	.233
Impact on Family Life	65	3.234	.519
Being Recognized for Effort	64	5.651	.227
Creating Meaningful Change	66	.262	.967

Research Question III

Is there a relationship between a principal's expected job satisfaction as a superintendent and his/her intent to apply for a superintendent's position within the next five years?

Table 5 provides the group statistics for the characteristics related to a principals expected job satisfaction if he/she were to become a school superintendent. Using independent t-tests the researcher found no significant differences among the mean scores for each job satisfaction characteristic. The mean scores reported by the researcher reflected a range of 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (extremely satisfied). The expected job satisfaction characteristics found in table 5 are delineated in sequential order (low to high) of those who would apply for superintendency and those who would not. The researcher reported in Table 5 that there was little variation in the means scores for each job satisfaction characteristic as reported by principals who were either intent on applying for a superintendent position within the next five years or had no interest or intent in applying.

Table 5

Group Statistics – Expected Job Satisfaction as a Superintendent

	Applying for Superintendency	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Salary and Benefits	Yes	17	4.47	.514
	No	45	4.29	.695
Job Security	Yes	17	3.00	.866
	No	45	2.96	1.205
Prestige of Position	Yes	17	4.47	.624
	No	45	4.07	.809
Relationship with Staff	Yes	17	3.71	.686
	No	43	3.42	.852
Relationship with Community	Yes	17	4.00	.707
	No	45	3.62	.777
Impacting Instructional Decisions	Yes	17	4.29	.772
	No	45	3.96	.999
Impacting Policy Decisions	Yes	17	4.35	.702
	No	45	4.36	.712
Hiring Qualified Staff	Yes	17	4.35	.606
	No	45	4.22	.850
Amount of Time Devoted to Job	Yes	17	3.53	1.125
	No	45	3.11	1.191
Autonomy in Decision Making	Yes	17	3.88	.857
	No	45	3.76	.908
Ability to Influence Others	Yes	18	4.18	.728
	No	45	4.02	.783
Impact on Family Life	Yes	17	2.94	1.110
	No	45	2.71	1.290
Being Recognized for Efforts	Yes	17	3.71	.849
	No	45	3.24	1.048
Creating Meaningful Change	Yes	18	4.17	.707
	No	45	3.82	.912

The researcher also performed an Independent T-Test on the expected job satisfaction characteristics. Table 6 demonstrates that the researcher found no significant differences among standard deviation values for each job satisfaction characteristic as there was a relatively normal distribution of mean scores.

Table 6

Expected Job Satisfaction Characteristics as a Superintendent

	N	Independent T-Test for Equality of Means Significance (2 tailed)
Salary and Benefits	62	.331
Job Security	62	.890
Prestige of Position	62	.068
Relationship with Staff	60	.220
Relationship with Community	62	.086
Impacting Instructional Decisions	62	.213
Impacting Policy Decisions	62	.990
Hiring Qualified Staff	62	.564
Amount of Time Devoted to Job	62	.216
Autonomy in Decision Making	62	.621
Ability to Influence Others	62	.484
Impact on Family Life	63	.503
Being Recognized for Effort	62	.110
Creating Meaningful Change	63	.156

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The researcher completed Pearson Chi Square analysis for the characteristics of expected job satisfaction as a school superintendent and the dependent variable, the principal's intent on applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years. The researcher found that there was no statistically significant relationship between the categorical variables (expected job satisfaction as a superintendent characteristics) and the dependent variable. The researcher reports that these categorical variables do not have a relationship with a principal's interest in applying for superintendency. In summation, Table 7 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant relationship between the expected job satisfaction characteristics and a principal's intent to apply for superintendency.

To measure the reliability coefficient of the survey questions related expected job satisfaction as a superintendent, a reliability analysis was completed. Accordingly, the Cronbach's Alpha indicated a coefficient of .862.

Table 7

Expected Job Satisfaction Characteristics as a Superintendent

	N	Value	Pearson Chi Square Significance (2-tasked)
Salary and Benefits	62	1.666	.645
Job Security	62	6.551	.164
Prestige of Position	62	3.403	.326
Relationship with Staff	60	2.756	.432
Relationship with Community	62	3.098	.377
Impacting Instructional Decisions	62	1.822	.769
Impacting Policy Decisions	62	.069	.966
Hiring Qualified Staff	62	3.570	.312
Amount of Time Devoted to Job	62	2.834	.586
Autonomy in Decision Making	62	.652	.957
Ability to Influence Others	62	.667	.881
Impact on Family Life	63	5.050	.282
Being Recognized for Effort	62	2.985	.560
Creating Meaningful Change	63	2.471	.650

Research Question IV

Are principals who have experienced a professional and collegial relationship with their own superintendent more inclined to consider applying for superintendency than those who are not?

Table 8 illustrates the group statistics for leadership capacity, those five relationship characteristics a principal could experience with his or her own school superintendent that might inspire a principal to apply for a system leadership position. This survey component provided a response scale range of 1 (to a low degree) to 5 (to a high degree) to ascertain the relationship the principal enjoyed with their own superintendent in developing and encouraging leadership capacity. The researcher found no statistically significant differences for the mean scores related to following leadership capacity characteristics: has acted as a formal mentor, has provided meaningful opportunities to engage in district wide leadership responsibilities, has provided meaningful feedback on my leadership performance, and has provided opportunities for meaningful professional development related to leadership. The researcher did report a significant variation in the mean scores for the final leadership capacity characteristic, has encouraged me to aspire to the superintendency. In this instance the researcher reported that there was a significant relationship between a superintendent encouraging a principal to aspire to the superintendency and the principal's intent on applying for superintendency within the next five years.

Table 8

Group Statistics – Leadership Capacity

	Applying for Superintendency	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Has encouraged me to aspire to the Superintendency	Yes	19	3.41	1.460
	No	49	2.57	1.469
Has acted as an informal mentor	Yes	17	3.67	1.534
	No	44	3.11	1.466
Has provided meaningful opportunities to engage in district-wide leadership responsibilities	Yes	18	4.22	1.116
	No	44	4.00	1.078
Has provided meaningful feedback on my leadership performance	Yes	18	3.67	1.609
	No	44	3.75	1.278
Has provided opportunities for meaningful professional development related to leadership	Yes	18	3.89	1.231
	No	44	3.68	1.253

An independent t-test for equality of means significance was completed for all of the leadership capacity characteristics. The independent t-tests provided only one significant relationship among the five scaled items analyzed. Table 9 provides the results of the independent t-tests and the correlation significance for five leadership capacity characteristics within this study. The researcher reported no statistically significant variation among the distribution of mean scores for the following leadership capacity characteristics: has acted as an informal mentor, has provided meaningful opportunities to engage in district wide leadership responsibilities, has provided meaningful feedback on my leadership performance, and has provided opportunities for meaningful professional development related to leadership. The researcher did report significant variation of mean scores for the leadership capacity variable, has

encouraged me to aspire to the superintendency. The researcher reports that this leadership

capacity variable's t-test significance of (.049) enjoyed a positive correlation at the .05 level (two

tailed).

To measure the reliability coefficient of the leadership capacity questions a reliability

analysis was performed. Accordingly, the Cronbach's Alpha indicated a coefficient of .860.

Table 9

Leadership Capacity

	N	Independent T-Test for Equality of Means Significance (2 tailed)
Has encouraged me to aspire to the Superintendency	61	.049*
Has acted as an informal mentor	62	.188
Has provided meaningful opportunities to engage in district-wide leadership responsibilities	62	.475
Has provided meaningful feedback on my leadership performance	62	.830
Has provided opportunities for meaningful professional development related to leadership	62	.555

*   Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Research Question V

Are principals who perceive they have greater knowledge of system leadership more inclined to consider applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years than those who perceive they have less knowledge?

Table 10 provides the group statistics for the six characteristics related to superintendent job role. The superintendent job role characteristics were: political advocacy, personnel, board relations, business/finance, labor relations, and curriculum and instruction. The mean scores for each characteristic ranged from 1 (a low degree of knowledge) to 5 (a high degree of knowledge). The researcher reports that there was a fairly normal distribution of means scores for all variables related to school superintendent job roles when compared to the dependent variable, the principal's intent to apply for superintendency within the next five years.

Table 10

Group Statistics – Knowledge of Superintendency

	Applying for Superintendency	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Political Advocacy	Yes	18	3.89	.758
	No	45	3.78	1.146
Personnel	Yes	18	4.39	.850
	No	44	4.05	.776
Board Relations	Yes	17	4.18	.529
	No	43	4.14	.915
Business/Finance	Yes	18	3.22	1.116
	No	45	3.47	1.036
Labor Relations	Yes	71	3.76	.903
	No	45	3.64	1.026
Curriculum and Instruction	Yes	18	3.89	.963
	No	45	4.11	.859

The researcher completed a Pearson Chi Square analysis for the six superintendent job role characteristics and their relationship with the dependent variable, the principals interest in applying for a superintendency within the next five years, Table 11 reports the superintendent job role characteristics of political advocacy, personnel, board relations, business/finance, labor relations, and curriculum and instruction. The researcher reports that only one variable, the board relations characteristic enjoyed a significant relationship with a principal's intent to apply for superintendency within the next five years. The researcher noted a statistically significant result with the superintendent job role characteristic of board relations and a principal's intent to apply for a school superintendent position (.036).

To measure the reliability coefficient of the scaled questions related to superintendent job role characteristics, a reliability analysis was completed. Accordingly, the Cronbach's Alpha indicated a coefficient of .729.

Table 11

Relationship Between Dependent Variable and Knowledge of the Superintendency

	N	Value	Pearson Chi Square Significance (2-tasked)
Political Advocacy	63	4.073	.396
Personnel	62	5.122	.163
Board Relations	60	8.564	.036*
Business/Finance	63	2.914	.700
Labor Relations	62	2.050	.562
Curriculum and Instruction	63	.806	.566

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER V

Summary of Findings and Conclusions, Recommendations,

and Considerations for Further Study

This chapter serves to set forth major findings of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to investigate what relationships may exist between a New York State principal's intent to apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years with principal demographics (age, gender, experience, school type, certification as a school superintendent, and participation in a leadership academy or superintendent preparation program), job satisfaction as a principal, expected job satisfaction as a superintendent, knowledge of system leadership, and ways in which the principal's current superintendent might encourage a principal's interest in becoming a system leader.

Five research questions were designed to accomplish the aforementioned purpose and correspond with the five individual questionnaire components outlined in the survey. The research questions are as follows:

1. Do New York State principals who have attained certification to become school superintendents intend to apply for such a position within the next five years?

2. Is there a relationship between a principal's current job satisfaction and his/her intent to apply for a school superintendent's position within the next five years?

3. Is there a relationship between a principal's expected job satisfaction as a school superintendent and the principal's intent to apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years?

4. Are principals who have experienced a professional and collegial relationship with their current superintendent more inclined to consider applying for a school superintendent's position within the next five years than those who have not experienced such a relationship?

5. Are principals who perceive they have greater knowledge of system leadership more inclined to consider applying for a school superintendent's position within the next five years than those who perceive they have less knowledge?

   The sample of principals was chosen using a New York State Education Department database which provided email addresses for all principals statewide. The researcher used the nth method selecting every 25th principal to voluntarily participate in this study. The researcher chose a sample size of 120 principals, of which nine were found to have inaccurate emails which were bounced back and excluded from the study. The researcher found that 71 of the 111 surveys that were returned were of value to the study.

   This study utilized a quantitative research strategy to obtain research data. The quantitative aspect of the study utilized an electronic survey via SurveyMonkey to obtain research data. The survey questionnaire was composed of five sections. Section one contained nine questions related to principal demographics (age, gender, experience, school type, certification as a superintendent, and participation in a leadership academy or superintendent

preparation program) and whether the principal would apply for a superintendent position within the next five years. The remaining four sections contained 38 likert-type questions with a five point scale focusing on principal job satisfaction (salary and benefits, job security, prestige of position, relationship with staff, relationship with community, impacting instructional decisions, hiring qualified staff, amount of time devoted to job, autonomy in decision making, impact on family life, being recognized for efforts, and creating meaningful change), expected job satisfaction (salary and benefits, job security, prestige of position, relationship with staff, relationship with community, impacting instructional decisions, hiring qualified staff, amount of time devoted to job, autonomy in decision making, impact on family life, being recognized for efforts, and creating meaningful change) characteristic as a superintendent, knowledge of system leadership (political advocacy, personnel, board relations, business/finance, labor relations, and curriculum and instruction), and ways in which a principal's current superintendent might encourage and influence a principal's intent to become a school superintendent (has encouraged me to aspire to the superintendency, has acted as an informed mentor, has provided opportunities to engage in district-wide leadership responsibilities, has provided meaningful feedback on my leadership performance, and has provided opportunities for meaningful professional development related to leadership).

Findings and Conclusions

Within the framework of the research questions the following describes the findings and conclusions as noted by this researcher.

The initial findings and conclusions are being reported based upon statistically significant relationships discovered by this researcher through his analysis of research data.

The researcher found that the majority of New York State principals are certified to be school superintendents (87.10%) yet fewer than 30% of principals are interested in applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years. This leads the researcher to conclude that while the majority of principals have interest in becoming certified as a school superintendent and subsequently follow through on attaining their certification, the majority of principals are not intent on actively seeking a school superintendent's position within the next five years.

The researcher found that New York State Principals who are intent on applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years report that their current superintendent has encouraged them to aspire to the superintendency to a much higher degree than those principals who are not intent on applying. This significant relationship leads the researcher to conclude that many current school superintendents are provided great capacity in influencing, mentoring, and nurturing a principal in the hope that they will ultimately come to a decision in which they aspire to system leadership position. This act of providing the ultimate level of professional development to principals, by itself, has unyielding potential to positively impact the leadership crisis that currently exists in New York.

The researcher found that the New York State principal's knowledge of a superintendent's role as it relates specifically to school board of education relations appears to significantly impact their decision to consider applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years. One must conclude that the principal's personal experiences related to

the knowledge and understanding of this school governance role creates a perception that may influence their career aspirations. These perceptions lead to an understanding and acknowledgement that a school board is empowered to impact the day to day activities of the school superintendent, particularly as it relates to working conditions, salary and benefits, and length of employment. This perception becomes a driving force in the mind of the principal and becomes a significant factor in the principal's decision to consider aspiring to the superintendency.

While the following findings and conclusions being reported did not enjoy a statistically significant relationship, in the mind of this researcher, they did have practical significance and are worthy of being reported.

The researcher found that the majority of New York State principals surveyed (72.10%) are not intending to apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years. This finding leads one to conclude that the leadership crisis within New York State is still problematic if those who are in the most strategic position to assume the role of system leadership are not inclined to do so.

The researcher found that the majority of New York State principals are male (55.70%) and almost half are 51 years of age or older. This finding is alarming in that the current pool of principals in New York State is an aging population that is nearing retirement with most not having any interest in becoming school superintendent. Those principals that have interest in the superintendency will be assuming system leadership already near retirement age. One must conclude that this factor will continue to exascerbate the leadership crisis at the state level where a shortage of qualified candidates is unavailable. One must also question as to how the current

retirement system might have had some effect perpetuating retirements. The majority of current retirements are within a tiered system whose current tier (Tier one or two) which provides significant benefits.

The researcher found that the majority of New York State principals are relatively inexperienced as approximately 42% have served in the principalship for five or less years. This finding coupled with the fact that most principals are an aging population with limited experience in the role of principal leads one to conclude that the principalship is presently not in a state in which it can readily create a pipeline of potential system leaders. This adds to the current crisis of far too few qualified candidates available for system leadership. It also raises the question as to whether consideration should be given to seeking qualified educational leaders outside of the traditional educational system.

The researcher found that a New York State principal's participation in a Leadership Academy or superintendent preparation program does not have a significant relationship with their interest in applying for a school superintendent's position within the next five years. The researcher concludes that the efforts of many state organizations, like the New York State Council of School Superintendents and other collegiately associated programs, have been ineffective in developing and encouraging future system leaders and must be compelled to develop a new paradigm of school superintendent preparatory programs whose primary goal is create a pipeline of future system leaders. To not do so will perpetuate the current cycle where programming has thus far lacked any tangible effectiveness in reaching this extremely important goal. It is evident that the program while well intended has not been a viable tool at attracting or inspiring principals to apply for and attain system leadership positions.

The researcher found that most New York State principals enjoy high levels of job satisfaction in their current role. The majority of principals also believe they would enjoy equally high levels of job satisfaction for the majority of leadership roles embodied in the position of a school superintendent. One must conclude that a principal's perceptions of expected job satisfaction as a school superintendent does not translate to greater interest in aspiring to the school superintendency as one would expect much higher numbers of these principals to actively seek positions of system leadership. Perceived job satisfaction, by itself, will not encourage principals to aspire to system leadership. It is important to determine why positive job satisfaction is not more of a predictor for principal interest in system leadership.

The researcher found that New York State principals did report lower levels of expected job satisfaction as a school superintendent in the areas of impact on family life and job security. This leads the researcher to conclude that many principals acknowledge and look unfavorably on the role of school superintendent, as it could potentially result in longer work hours and heightened expectations of visibility, which can impact time spent with family. One must also conclude that principals may be far more comfortable working within a tenure system which provides greater job security than the contract system within New York State. Consequently, many principals may not consider system leadership diminishing the potential for a larger and more qualified pool of candidates for this important leadership position.

The researcher found that New York State principals report that they enjoy a high degree of understanding of the diverse and expansive role of a school superintendent.

However, while principals report they have a fairly coherent understanding of the role of a school superintendent, one must conclude that enjoying such an understanding of the position does not necessarily appear to translate into a principal making the decision to consider the superintendency as a career.

The researcher found no significant relationship with the demographic characteristic of gender and a New York State principal's interest in applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years. Of those New York State principals surveyed, 80% of females and 66% of males are not intent on applying for a school superintendent position within the next five years. The researcher concludes that although there is no statistically significant relationship between the demographic characteristic of gender and a principal's intent to apply for a superintendent position, gender may very well be a practical factor in the current crisis where there is a lack of qualified candidates for superintendent vacancies. There must be tangible reasons why fewer females have expressed interest in applying for system level positions. The researcher concludes that females may perceive they are disadvantaged in our current system which is dominated by a male presence in the superintendency.

The researcher found that not a single New York State principal sampled within the survey was thirty years of age or under. This leads the researcher to conclude that the issue of an aging population of principals will continue to persist within New York State and will continue to be problematic if efforts are not made to encourage younger teacher leaders to aspire to the principalship and ultimately the superintendency.

The researcher found no significant relationship with demographic characteristic of school type and a New York State principal's intent to apply for a school superintendent position within the next five years. In this instance only 38.9% of rural principals, 26.9% of suburban principals, and 14.28% of urban were expected to consider applying for school superintendency within the next five years. The researcher concludes that there may be a practical relationship with this demographic characteristic, particularly the low levels of urban principals who aspire to system leadership.

Recommendations

1. It is imperative that professional organizations such as the New York State School Boards Association (NYSSBA), New York State Council of School Superintendents (NYSCOSS), School Administrators Association of New York (SAANYS), and the New York State United Teacher's Association (NYSUT) work together to establish formal programming aimed at developing practicing principals as future system leaders. The majority of individuals entering the principalship are doing so at an older age in which they gain experience as a principal and then choose to retire from that position, seek a central office position, or aspire to the superintendency. This transition of principals, who are nearing retirement age then aspiring to the superintendency, ultimately creates an aging population at the superintendent level where retirement is imminent. This transition then exacerbates the issue of system leadership retention where these aging superintendents retire after only a few years in the position. It is imperative that these organizations collaborate to encourage younger educational professionals to seek the principalship who may later aspire to the superintendency at younger ages.

57

2. Although there was no significant relationship between a principal's participation in a Leadership Academy or superintendent preparation program and a principal's intent to apply for superintendency within the next five years, it was alarming as to how few principals had participated in such a school superintendent preparation program. There would be great value in investigating why there are so few principals making the decision to participate in these programs. The issue may be the cost of such programs which in these difficult economic times can be exorbitant and a deterrent when considering being a part of such programming. It may also be an issue of not being willing to devote the time necessary to participate, as many of these programs are in the evenings or weekends and often times require an individual to travel long distances to attend. If these superintendent development programs were to become viewed as an extremely important professional development opportunity for principals they might be scheduled at times more convenient for principals. It is also imperative that these superintendent development programs are supported both philosophically and financially by the principal's current superintendent. This type of professional environment may well serve to encourage more principals to participate in such an important leadership development exercise which ultimately encourages their interest in the position of school superintendent.

3. Principals acknowledge serious concerns about the job security aspect of the superintendency. Many choose not to enter system leadership because they do not wish to become at will employees whose providence is entrusted to ever changing elected school boards. Because the current political climate in New York State is an environment where

school leaders are under an incredible scrutiny, there are limitations as to how added protections to this vital leadership position might be considered. While the timing may be exceptionally challenging, it is imperative that the New York State Council of School Superintendents and the New York State School Boards Association work collaboratively in future advocacy efforts to reinvent the manner by which school boards of education employ school superintendents. The current model where superintendents work under a varied contract system of one to five years is driven by elected school board members whose membership changes at a frenetic pace. Such a contract system, at times, can be ineffective and fraught with politics and personal agendas. When not operating in a professional manner this system can be a deterrent in attracting new leaders to aspire to the superintendency. I would recommend minor revisions to the current paradigm where a statewide chief school officer contract system would be implemented. Under this system school superintendents would enjoy at a contract system that was never less than three years and never exceeds six. All superintendent contracts would contain common language which provides significant due process protection in the form of a stability clause. This would provide superintendents enhanced job security as they could not be terminated without just cause. This system would include an independent arbitrator that both the board of education and superintendent consent to. The cost of independent arbitration would be borne by the school board. Such a system, while not perfect, would seem more pragmatic in that a system leader's employment would enjoy greater likelihood of being based on performance rather than the political posturing of an ever changing elected school board. While the superintendent would still be required to

negotiate salary and benefits, the position would no longer engender itself as an at will employee. With the position enjoying a greater sense of job security it might become a position far more appealing for principals to consider, ultimately increasing to pool of available chief school officer candidates.

4. Principals who report they have high levels of knowledge relative to how a school board functions are much more likely to seek a position of system leadership. Consequently, it is imperative that efforts are made to establish a system where principals are provided opportunities for such meaningful experiences where they attain the requisite perspective on the role of effective school governance. To not do so might produce unintended consequences where the principal lacks perspective related to the superintendent and board of education roles and responsibilities and are less inclined to aspire to the superintendency. A recommended intervention would require the school superintendent to actively engage the principal in governance activities where he or she will gain the needed perspective to better understand this complex relationship. This might include mandatory attendance at board meetings, providing the opportunity to participate in school board executive sessions and board committee meetings, and finally, allowing the principal to actively observe annual board workshops/retreats, where roles, responsibilities, governance operating procedures, and board goals are discussed. One other potential perspective to consider are those instances where the principal may enjoy a narrow outlook of the school board/superintendent relationship and at times may perceive it to be a negative in nature. Such perceptions, although not necessarily justified, might create less likelihood that the principal may seek a system leadership

position. One would surmise that when a principal does truly observe or experience such negativity it could provide a less than favorable view of system leadership. While the issue of mitigating effective board/superintendent relations is a difficult one, there are some steps that should be taken which might ameliorate its current state. While new school board members are required to attend mandated training, there may be limited impact on an entire board's collective effectiveness as its focus is primarily on how the individual, where the primary focus is the board's fiduciary responsibilities along with roles and responsibilities. It is imperative that New York State Council of School Superintendents and the New York State School Boards Association establish a framework for mandated annual board workshops that focus on the collective well being of the entire organization. This would require legislation from the Senate, Assembly, and Governor's Office to create this mandate. At times difficult board relations result from school board members that become "renegades" who purposely abrogate their roles and responsibilities and involve themselves in the day to day administrative operations of the school district, thus creating conflict within the school board/superintendent relationship. While school boards are empowered to counsel individual members, they have no real authority to take effective steps to remedy the issues that evolve as a school board member acts outside his or her prescribed role. It is critical that the New York State Commissioner of Education, in collaboration with the New York State Council of School Superintendents and the New York State School Boards Association, establish stronger guidelines relative to school board member conduct. This would also include a clearer

and more expedient mechanism to censure or remove school board members who act outside their prescribed role.

5. Research reports that a principal's current school superintendent can effectively influence a principal's decision to aspire to the superintendency. It is paramount that superintendents become informal mentors to their building level principals in an effort to create this level of positive influence. Such a relationship would expose principals to the many facets of this important role which ultimately could impact their inclination to seek system leadership. If a school superintendent works assiduously to develop the essential leadership competencies within his or her principals a new cadre of potential system leaders might be established. I would strongly recommend that New York State Council of School Superintendents and the School Administrators Association of New York State establish a partnership to discuss what this model might look like and find tangible ways to promote this new mentoring paradigm throughout the state. I would also suggest that current school superintendents have a moral and ethical obligation to their profession to engage in this vital professional development activity and should be disposed to do so.

6. As previously stated in recommendation five, we know that an incumbent superintendent has significant influence to create system leaders within the framework of an informal mentoring relationship with principals. It would seem practical that if a SCHOOL superintendent has established such a relationship with a particular principal who embodies all those system leader competencies, that we institute a formal model of succession planning where that principal becomes the next superintendent. For a succession model to work it would need to be embraced by both superintendent and

school board. Consequently, it is imperative that New York State School Boards Association and the New York State Council of School Superintendents work cooperatively and create a common message that espouses the benefits of joint succession planning.

7. While the issue of gender within this research study did not provide any significant findings it is still a variable with great importance. While New York State has seen an increase in the number of females serving as school superintendents, it is clear they are an underserved population. It is paramount that sitting superintendents mentor female principals who have the leadership acumen to become system leaders. It is also important that superintendents have the courage to advocate for such female leaders when opportunities present themselves for superintendent succession planning where females leaders within the system are qualified to succeed the superintendent.

8. The New York State Council of School Superintendents does an incredible service to the field of leadership with information which is collected through the Superintendent Snapshot, a statewide survey of superintendents within New York State. I would recommend that The Council consider changes to the survey which might provide greater insight into issues that may have a relationship with the pending superintendent shortage. It is vital that more questions be asked about the relationship a sitting school superintendent has with both principals and other central office staff. The focus of such questions should be related to the superintendent's role with mentoring and encouraging others to aspire to the superintendency. It is also important to know why some

superintendents choose to engage in this important professional development activity and why others do not.

9. I would recommend that the New York State Council of School Superintendents and the New York State Association of School Administrators collaborate on the development of a survey that could be distributed every three years to principals who have attended leadership academies or superintendent development programs. It is paramount that we gather information about the principals' experiences and ascertain how these programs have contributed to their goal of becoming system leaders. This information could then be utilized to reshape these leadership programs in the goal of enhancing their effectiveness. The ultimate goal being to seeing principals and other administrators ascend to the superintendency.

Considerations for Further Study

The researcher believes that through his research there is clear evidence that the leadership crisis in New York State may continue to be problematic as those who are most strategically placed to assume the role of school superintendent, the principal, are not inclined to aspire to this leadership role as a career choice. While this research study has brought to light some very tangible reasons for a principal's lack of motivation to ascend to system leadership, there are still many questions needed to be answered which could provide even more insight into

this very serious issue. With that, this researcher sees great value in additional research being completed in the following areas:

1. Consider investigating more deeply the effectiveness of leadership academies and school superintendent development programs. An effort should be made across New York State to track each individual who has participated in such a program to gauge how their participation has influenced both their intent to apply and their success in attaining a system leadership position.

2. Consider investigating why so few principals choose to participate in leadership academies or school superintendent preparation programs. Is their perceived lack of interest related to issues of time, finances, or lack of professional support from their current school district?

3. Consider investigating the circumstances by which current school superintendents choose to act as informal mentors to their principals in developing the necessary leadership capacity for the superintendency and encouraging principals to aspire to system leadership.

4. Consider investigating more deeply why principals in New York State view the expected negative relationship between school superintendent and school board of education in such a light that discourages their possible ascension to system leadership. It is important to understand how principal perceptions of school superintendent/board relations evolve and their relationship with a principal's interest in becoming a superintendent.

5. Consider investigating the concept of succession planning and how this process might provide heightened opportunities for qualified principals to assume a position of system leader.

6. Consider replicating this study but doing so with a few changes to the survey instrument used to gather data from New York State principals. The first change would be the addition of a question in the demographics section of the instrument where principals would be asked at what level they serve within the principalship, elementary, middle, or secondary level. The other change to the survey instrument would be a revision to the dependent dichotomous variable seeking answers to whether principals were intent on applying for the superintendency within the next five years. The question would remain a simple yes or no question but would be left more open ended. The researcher would ask if principals would be applying for superintendency at some point in their career. The changes proposed to the survey instrument may uncover additional significant relationships that provide additional information as to why principals do or do not aspire to system leadership.

References

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1994). *Survey Research Handbook*. New York: McGraw-
Hill/Irwin.

Bennis, W. (2003). *On Becoming a Leader: The Leadership Classic*. New York: Basic Books.

Bjork, L., Keedy, J., & Gurley, K. (2003). Career Patterns of American Superintendents. *Journal
of School Leadership*, *13*(4), 406-427.

Brockett, D. (1996). School Boards Find Fewer Superintendent Candidates. *School Board News*,
16(10), 1-10.

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., & Carella, V. A. (2000). *Career Crisis in the School
Superintendency* (pp. 1-51, Rep.). Arlington, VA: AASA.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods
Approaches*. Minneapolis: SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Daresh, J. (2004). Mentoring school leaders; professional practice or predictable problems.
Educational Administration Quarterly, *40*(4), 495-517.

Davis, S. (2006). Influencing Transformative Learning for Leaders. *The School Administrator*,
63(8), 10-16.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (1998). Elementary/Middle School Principals: 1998 and Beyond. *The
Education Digest*, *November* (64), 3rd ser., 4-10.

Gates, S., Ringel, J., & Santibanez, L. (2003). *Who is Leading our Schools: An Overview of School Administrators and their Careers* (pp. 1-203, Rep.). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Glass, T., & Bjork, L. G. (2003). The Superintendent Shortage: Findings From Research on School Board Presidents. *Journal of School Leadership*, *13*(3), 264-287.

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000). *The Study of the American School Superintendent, 2000. A Look at the Superintendent of Education in the New Millenium* (pp. 1-188, Rep.). Arlington, VA: AASA.

Harris, S., Lowery, S., Hopson, M., & Marshall, R. (2004). Superintendent Perceptions of Motivators and Inhibitors for the Superintendency. *Planning and Changing*, *35*(1&2), 108-126.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap P of Harvard UP.

Houston, P. D. (May 2006). A critical position in critical condition. *The School Administrator*, *63*(5), 54-54.

Houston, P. (2001). Superintendents for the 21st Century. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *82*(6), 428-433.

Howley, A., Pendarvis, E., & Gibbs, T. (2002). Attracting Principals to the Superintendency: Conditions that Make a Difference to Principals. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, *10*(43), 1-18.

Jiangping, S., Cooley, V. E., & Wegenke, G. L. (2004). Perspectives on Factors Influencing Application for the Principalship: A Comparitive Study of Teachers, Principals, and Superintendents. *International Journal of Leadership In Education*, *7*(1), 57-69.

Keedy, J. L., Bjork, L. G., Winter, P. A., Rinehart, J. S., & Ricciardi, P. D. (2007). Is There a Crisis in the Superintendency? The Case of Kentucky. *Research in the Schools*, *14*(2), 49-63.

Lankford, H., & Wyckoff, J. (2003). *The Supply of School Leaders: A Multivariate Analysis of Administrative Certification and Transitions to Leadership Positions* (pp. 1-37, Rep.). Albany, NY: NYSED.

Lankford, H., Wyckoff, J. H., & O'Connell, R. W. (2003). *Our Next Generation: School Leadership in New York* (pp. 1-27, Rep.). Albany, NY: University at Albany.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Maxwell, J. C. (1995). *Developing the Leaders Around You*. Danbury: Thomas Nelson Incorporated.

McCormick, K. C. (1987). The Vaunted School Executive Shortage. *The Effective Executive*, *9*, 18-21.

Normore, A. H. (2006). Leadership Recruitmement and Selection in School Districts: Trends and Issues. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, *40*(1), 41-73.

O'Connell, R. W., Brown, C. E., & Williams, J. A. (2005). *2005 Profle of the New York State Principalship* (pp. 1-37, Rep.). Albany, NY: SAANYS.

O'Connell, R. W. (2000). *A Longitudinal Study of the Applicant Pool for the New York State Superintendency* (pp. 1-23, Rep.). Albany, NY: State University at Albany.

Orr, M. (2006). Learning the Superintendency: Socialization, Negotiation, and Determination. *Columbia Teacher's College Record*, *108*(7), 1362-1403.

Rogers, T. L., Terranova, M. C., Volp, F., Cattaro, G. M., Ike, R. R., Fale, E. M., et al. (2006). *The 6th Triennial Study of the Superintendency in New York* (pp. 1-80, Rep.). Albany, NY: NYSCOSS.

Senge, P. M. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Broadway Books.

Sharp, W. L., Malone, B. G., & Walter, J. K. (2002). *What Motivates Someone to Become a Superintendent* (pp. 1-17, Rep.). College Park, MD: ERIC Clearinghouse.

Shen, J., Cooley, V. E., & Wegenke, G. L. (2004). Perspectives on factors influencing application for the principalship: a comparitive study of teachers, principals, and superintendents. *International Journal of Leadership In Education*, *7*(March), 1st ser., 57-70.

Short, P. M., & Scribner, J. P. (2002). *Case Studies of Superintendency*. New York: Scarecrow P, Incorporated.

Spanneut, G., & Ford, M. (2008). Guiding Hand of the Superintendent Helps Principals Flourish.
Journal of Staff Development, *29*(2), 28-34.

Sutton, C. M., & Jobe, M. P. (2007). *2007 State of the Superintendency Mini-Survey: Aspiring to
the Superintendency* (pp. 1-17, Rep.). Arlington, VA: AASA.

Tallerico, M. (2000). Gaining access to the superintendency; headhunting, gender, and color.
Educational Administration Quarterly, *36*(1), 18-43.

Thomas, S. J. (2004). *Using Web and Paper Questionnaires for Data-Based Decision Making:
From Design to Interpretation of the Results*. New York: Corwin P.

Volp, F. D., Terranova, M. C., Rogers, T. L., Service, R., Fale, E. M., Archambault, P., et al.
(2004). *Snapshot V Study of the Superintendency in New York* (pp. 1-51, Rep.). Albany,
NY: NYSCOSS.

Volp, F. (2001). *Snapshot 2000 A Study of Superintendents in New York State* (pp. 1-30, Rep.).
Albany, NY: NYSCOSS.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. New York:
Cambridge UP.

Winter, P. A., Rinehart, J. A., Keedy, J. L., & Bjork, L. G. (2007). Superintendent Recruitment:
A Statewide Assessment of Principal Attraction To The Job. *Planning and Changing*,
38(1&2), 35-59.

October 31, 2008

Dear Retired Principal,

    I am currently in the dissertation phase of obtaining my doctorate in educational administration. Part of the process will be to pilot the instrument which I will utilize in surveying a sample of 120 principals statewide. The research design of my study will focus on the following questions:

1. Do New York State principals who have attained certification to become school superintendents intend to apply for such a position within the next five years?

2. Is there a relationship between a principal's personal job satisfaction and their intent to apply for a superintendent's position?

3. Is there a relationship between a principal's perceived job satisfaction as a school superintendent and the principal's intent to apply for a superintendent position?

4. Are principals who have experienced a professional and collegial relationship with their own superintendent inclined to consider applying for a superintendent position?

5. Are principals who perceive they have greater knowledge of system leadership more inclined to consider applying for a superintendent's position?

    I would greatly appreciate if you would take the time to actually complete the survey and respond to the following questions for me. Your participation will insure that the instrument I am using will be both valid and reliable.

    If you could respond to the above questions and return them to me in the postage paid return envelope, it would be of great help to me.

    Thank you for your consideration and help.

                  Respectfully,

                  Stanley Maziejka
                  Superintendent of Schools

<u>Survey Instrument Questions</u>
1. Do the questions appear to be clearly linked to the objectives stated in the research questions?

2. Are the directions clear?

3. Are the questions clear and concise?

4. Do the rating scales align with the questions asked?

5. Were there typos or grammar errors?

6. Was the instrument laid out in a manner where it was easy to read?

7. How long did it take you to complete the survey?

8. Are there any questions that I asked that I did not need to?

9. Are there any questions that were not asked that should have been?

New York State Principal Survey

<u>Demographics</u>

1. <u>Age</u>
      30 or under   31-40   41-50   51 or older

2. <u>Gender</u>
      Male   Female

3. <u># of Years in the Principalship</u>
      5 or less   6 – 10   11 – 15   15 or more

4. <u>School Type</u>
      Rural   Suburban   Urban

5. <u>Marital Status</u>
      Single   Married

6. <u>Do you presently have certification to be a School Superintendent?</u>
      Yes   No

7. <u>If no, are you intent on becoming certified?</u>
      Yes   No

8. <u>Have you participated in a leadership or Superintendent's Preparation Academy?</u>
      Yes   No

9. <u>In the next five years, do you believe you will apply for a Superintendent position?</u>
      Yes   No

Current Job Satisfaction as a Principal and
Anticipated Job Satisfaction as a Superintendent

There are two sets of rating scales for the job characteristics described below. The scales range from a low of 1 (not at all satisfied) to a high of 5 (extremely satisfied). The scale to the left relates to your current job as principal. The scale to the right relates to your expected job satisfaction as a Superintendent.

Job Characteristics	What you currently experience as Principal Not at all satisfied → Extremely satisfied					What you would expect to experience as a Superintendent Not at all satisfied → Extremely satisfied				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10) Salary & benefits										
11) Job security										
12) Prestige of position										
13) Relationship with staff										
14) Relationship with community										
15) Impacting instructional decisions										
16) Impacting policy decisions										
17) Hiring qualified staff										
18) Amount of time devoted to job										
19) Autonomy in decision making										
20) Ability to influence others										
21) Impact of job on my family life										
22) Being recognized for efforts										

23) Creating meaningful change										

Knowledge of the Superintendency

Please rate your knowledge of the following superintendent roles ranging from a low of 1 (little knowledge) to a high of 5 (high level of knowledge).

Job Role	Level of Knowledge				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
24) Political Advocacy					
25) Personnel					
26) Board Relations					
27) Business/Finance					
28) Labor Relations					
29) Curriculum & Instruction					

Leadership Capacity

Please rate to what degree your superintendent has played an active role in the following leadership capacity practices:
(The scale ranges from a low of 1 [to a low degree] to a 5 [to a high degree]).

	1	2	3	4	5
29) Has encouraged me to aspire to the superintendency					
30) Has acted as an informal mentor					
31) Has provided opportunities to engage in district-wide leadership responsibilities					
32) Has provided meaningful feedback of my leadership performance					
33) Has provided opportunities for meaningful professional development related to leadership					