Kansas New Superintendents' Perceptions of the Helpfulness and Usefulness of

Stakeholder Support During Their Transitions

Joshua Neil Snyder

BS, Kansas State University, 2011

MS, MidAmerica Nazarene University, 2014

MASL, Benedictine College, 2015

MAT, Kansas State University, 2017

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of

Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Susan K. Rogers
Susan K. Rogers, PhD
Major Advisor

Verneda Edwards
Verneda Edwards, EdD

Volora Hanzlicek
Volora Hanzlicek, EdD

Date Defended: October 31, 2024

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of new superintendents'

perceptions of the previous superintendent's helpfulness during the transition to the role,

how these perceptions were influenced by district enrollment, and the reasons for the

previous superintendents' departures. Additionally, the purpose of the study was to

evaluate the perceived usefulness of the support from various stakeholders (i.e.,

administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendents, board

members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other

stakeholders) and to assess how the perceived usefulness varied among these groups as

well as the usefulness was affected by district enrollment. The researcher investigated the

perceptions of new superintendents during their first three years in their roles in Kansas

districts. Results showed that new superintendents perceived previous superintendents as

moderately helpful during the transition. District enrollment did not affect the perceived

helpfulness of previous superintendents; the reasons (retirement from the

superintendency, nonrenewal or termination of contract, accepted another

superintendency, accepted another position, or other) for the previous superintendent's

departure did. Results also showed that new superintendents found the support from

fellow superintendents and administrative assistants very to extremely useful. In contrast,

the support from district administrators and other stakeholders was perceived as

moderately to very useful. Teachers, previous superintendents, and board members were

considered slightly to moderately useful, and business leaders were perceived as no more

than slightly useful. There were significant differences in the perceived usefulness of

support from various stakeholders, with administrative assistants and fellow

superintendents rated as most useful. District enrollment influenced the perceived

usefulness of support; in smaller districts (0-500 students), administrative assistants and

district administrators were more helpful than business leaders. In medium-sized districts

(500-5,000 students), support from administrative assistants and district administrators

was perceived more useful than from business leaders. In large districts (over 5,000

students), the previous superintendent's support was perceived as more useful than that of

other stakeholders. The results of this study inform future new superintendents, boards of

education, preparation programs, state departments of education, mentoring programs,

and professional organizations on the potential support a new superintendent may need

during their transition. Recommendations for future research include studying the

usefulness and helpfulness of support to new superintendents at the national level,

updating the survey, conducting a study using qualitative interviews, and using the same

survey for a mixed-method study.

Dedication

This dissertation is, first and foremost, dedicated to my wife, Breanne Snyder. From the moment we met, I knew my life would be forever changed. Your unwavering support and love have made all the difference. Thank you for making my life extraordinary; I could not have done this without you.

To my beautiful children, Ash, Baylor, Cecilia, and Louisa—you are my inspiration. I completed this work to show you that dreams can become reality when you work hard and have a plan. You each have the power to make this world a better place, and I am so proud of you.

To my parents, Joseph and Rhonda Snyder, thank you for always believing in me, even when I did not believe in myself. This moment is a testament to your encouragement and unwavering faith in my abilities. Thank you for being my greatest champions. To my brother, Kyle Snyder, thank you for always pushing me to strive for more. Your encouragement has been instrumental in making this moment possible. To grandma, Patricia Snyder, thank you for always believing in me and for telling me I could achieve anything to which I set my mind.

I also dedicate this dissertation to all the children I have taught, influenced, and loved over the years. This achievement would not be possible without each of you. Finally, I dedicate this work to my family members who were educators: Grandpa Frank Myer, science teacher, and Great-Grandmother Clara Mae Page, who taught in a one-room schoolhouse. I know how proud you both would be; it is our legacy that will continue to live on in those we taught.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Susan Rogers. Your dedication, care, availability, and kindness have been invaluable in making this process a success. I am deeply grateful for all your feedback and comments that have helped me grow. Secondly, I would like to thank my research advisor, Dr. Margaret Waterman. Peg, you are truly one in a million. Your positivity and light make this world a better place. To my committee members, Dr. Verneda Edwards and Dr. Volora Hanzlicek, thank you for being essential to my successful completion of this dissertation.

To Dr. Danira Fernandez-Flores, I cannot express enough gratitude for how much you have helped me become a better educator. Thank you for always being one of my marbles. Dr. Laura Lyons, thank you for your encouragement, for listening, and for guiding me through every challenge during this journey. To my accountability partner, Adelyn Soellner, our conversations were the driving force that pushed me to the finish line.

To my mentors over the years—Laura Batson, Dr. Karen Brack, Lisa Brookover, Ryan Bradbury, Dr. Judith Campbell, Rita Eckert, Jan Frickey, Jennifer Gigstad, Victoria Hegarty, Melissa Kennedy, Dr. Rebecca Kramer, Mandi McMillan, Marcia Munsell, Brenda Royer, Erica Tenpenny, Steve Wiseman, and Kim Zielsdorf—thank you for showing me the difference that an excellent educator can make through your leadership and example.

To my dear friends—Jenny Beaver, Laura Burchett, Dr. Megan Cook, Christa Crowder, Gail Hudson, Kelly Hanes, Charlotte Michel, Blaine and Sandee Minner, Chris Meier, Anna Salas, Annie Thompson, Dr. Amy Washington, Steffenee Watkins, and Kelly Whittaker—thank you for loving me even when I was not always able to return your calls

or texts. I appreciate you listening to my updates about my dissertation. My life would not be as rich without each of you.

  To Mrs. Debbie Schneider for being the first teacher that made me feel really seen as a student; I would not be here without you. Finally, to my family members thank you for believing in me and providing unwavering support over the years. I am deeply grateful for your constant encouragement and love throughout this process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Change is inevitable, and the rate at which the change is experienced has been increasing in school communities. School superintendents do not stay in the same school district for their entire careers (Schwanenberger et al., 2020). According to Rosenberg (2022), the 100 largest school districts in the nation have seen an increase in superintendent turnover since 2018. The superintendent turnover trends have been noted in Kansas as well (United School Administrators of Kansas [USA-KS], 2022).

Superintendents are the executive leaders of PK-12 school districts, and the transition from predecessors to successors is critical to the success of the students they serve (Wildman, 2020). Ensuring the success of the transition is important as the new-to-the-position superintendent can influence the culture, climate, policy, budget, strategic plan, and overall operations of the district (Davidson et al., 2021). This study was designed and conducted to identify the usefulness of the stakeholder support provided to new-to-the-position superintendents during their transition.

Background

Public education has been facing a shortage in recruiting and retaining staff members (Mullen & Mullikin, 2023). Specifically, superintendents across the country have been retiring at higher rates, leaving school districts seeking replacements with a smaller number of applicants (Mullen & Mullikin, 2023). According to In the Life of (ILO) Group's (2022) Superintendent Research Project, the nation's largest school districts have had an increase in turnover of 49% between 2020 and 2022. ILO Group (2022) indicated that "Half of the nation's largest school districts, which collectively

represent 12.5 million students, have had a disruption or change in leadership since March 2020 (ILO Group, 2022, para. 1)." Between March 1, 2020, and September 1, 2022, 246 (49%) of the 500 largest school districts in the country underwent or were currently changing superintendents, and 40 of those districts have changed leaders two times since March 2020. Seven have changed leaders three or more times since March 2020. As of September 1, 2022, 27 school districts employed an interim or acting superintendent in place. The 246 districts that have had a change in leadership educate nearly 12.5 million students out of the total 21.5 million in the top 500 school districts (ILO Group, 2022). In an updated report, ILO (2024) found that from July 1, 2023, to July 1, 2024, 100 districts had at least one leadership transition, with three of the districts having two or more transitions. The 100 districts represent 20% of the 500 largest districts, which is a higher turnover rate than historical percentages of 14% to 15%.

The current study was conducted in Kansas, which had 286 school districts serving 478,858 students during the 2023-2024 school year (Kansas State Department of Education [KSDE], 2024). The school population in the state of Kansas is diverse in its demographics, with urban, suburban, and rural students from various racial, ethnic, and socioemotional backgrounds (see Table 1). According to USA-KS (2024), there were 125 new superintendent transitions during the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 school years. While superintendents leaving has not been associated with one reason, board relations and the political nature of the position have had an impact on retention (Peetz, 2023).

Table 1

Kansas Student Demographic Percentage Data 2022-2023 School Year

Demographic	% of Students
Gender	
Male	51.3
Female	48.7
Race/Ethnicity	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.7
Asian	2.9
African American	6.8
Hispanic	21.6
Multiracial	6.1
White	61.6
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.2
Socioeconomic Status	
Economically Disadvantaged	48.3
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	51.7
Disability Status	
Students with Disabilities	16.5
Students without Disabilities	83.5
ELL Status	
ELL Students	9.3
Non-ELL Students	90.7
Migrant Status	
Migrant Students	0.8
Non-Migrant Students	99.2

Note. Adapted from *Kansas Report Card 2022-2023,* by KSDE, 2023

(https://ksreportcard.ksde.org/demographics.aspx?org_no=State&rptType=3).

Superintendent turnover may not have a large impact on student achievement (Peetz, 2023). Chingos et al. (2014) determined that the superintendent's direct impact on student achievement is less than one-half of a percentage point. The superintendent's leadership actions indirectly impact the classroom experience and student outcomes, which makes the correlation more challenging to demonstrate (Chingos et al., 2014). "Moreover, even though the U.S. includes around fourteen thousand school districts, the geographic dispersal means that state- or local-level studies of the superintendency tend to draw on small sample sizes that are difficult to generalize" (Schwartz et al., 2023, p. 2). Superintendents do lead the school districts in developing the overall atmosphere; when changes occur, district initiatives and the advancement of the district might be impacted (Peetz, 2023). When turnover occurs, personalities and priorities adjust, which impacts the overall culture of the district (Peetz, 2023).

Statement of the Problem

Kansas school districts have been facing a sizable turnover in the superintendency. USA-KS (2022, 2024) reported there were 64 new superintendent transitions for the 2022-2023 school year and 61 in 2023-2024. These transitions might impact the assistance received by newly hired superintendents and how successful they are in the position. This impact is even more evident in rural school districts than in urban school districts. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2023), 197 of the 290 school districts in the state of Kansas are considered rural. "Assistance with the transition to a superintendency may be a more critical need in rural districts than those located in or near metropolitan areas" (Davidson et al., 2021, p. 28). Rural school districts make up most of the districts in the state of Kansas. All school districts could

benefit from knowing whether newly-hired superintendents are receiving useful transition support and who is providing the support to them, as there is not enough known about the support to new superintendents during transitions.

Purpose of the Study

The focus of this study was the investigation of the perceptions of new superintendents during their first three years in their role in Kansas districts. The first purpose of this study was to determine the extent of new superintendents' perceptions of how previous superintendents were helpful in the transition to the position. The second purpose of this study was to determine the extent of new superintendents' perceptions of how the helpfulness of previous superintendents in assisting with the transition was affected by district enrollment and the reason for the previous superintendents' departures. The third purpose of this study was to determine the extent the new superintendents perceived the support was useful from the administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders. The fourth purpose was to determine the extent of difference in the perceived usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders. The fifth purpose was to determine the extent of the perceived usefulness of the support from administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders is affected by the district enrollment.

Significance of the Study

Identifying the perceived helpfulness and usefulness of the support during

transitions for new-to-the-position superintendents is thought to be significant to the

success of new superintendents who have recently transitioned. The results of this study

could also support individuals who plan to transition into the superintendency, board

members who support superintendents, and organizations who mentor new

superintendents in Kansas. It is important to determine whether the superintendents who

have transitioned in the past three years have received the support needed to be

successful.

Delimitations

According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), delimitations are aspects that narrow

the scope and create the confines of the study. The research sample was limited to Kansas

superintendents who transitioned to new positions in their current school district or a new

district during the school years from 2021-2022 to 2023-2024. The data were collected

electronically using a Google Form during the spring and early summer of 2024.

Assumptions

"Assumptions include the nature, analysis, and interpretation of the data"

(Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 135). This study was based on the following assumptions:

(a) the superintendent participants understood the survey items and the purpose of the

study; (b) the superintendent participants completed the survey accurately and honestly

without the help of others; and (c) the survey accurately assessed the superintendent's

transition experiences.

Research Questions

The following research questions were created to determine the usefulness of the support received during the transition to the superintendency. The following five research questions were developed to address the purpose of the study.

RQ1

To what extent did the new superintendents perceive the previous superintendents were helpful in assisting new superintendents with the transition to the position?

RQ2

To what extent is the perceived helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the new superintendents affected by district enrollment and the reason for the previous superintendents' departures?

RQ3

To what extent did the new superintendents perceive the support from the administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders was useful?

RQ4

To what extent is there a difference in the perceived usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders?

RQ5

To what extent is the difference in the perceived usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders affected by the district enrollment?

Definition of Terms

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) state that "you should define all key terms central to your study and used throughout your dissertation" (p. 118). The following terms used in this study are defined below.

New Superintendent

In this study, a new superintendent is defined as new to their current position within the past three school years (2021-2022, 2022-2023, 2023-2024).

Previous Superintendent

In this study, a previous superintendent is an administrator who is no longer in their former superintendent position but was in the same school district as the participant is currently working.

Superintendent

According to *Collins* (n.d.), a school superintendent is "an official whose job is to oversee school administration within a district" (n.p.).

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 included the background, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, the definition of terms, and the study's organization.

Presented in Chapter 2 is a comprehensive literature review that addresses superintendent transitions. Chapter 3 includes the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and the limitations. In Chapter 4, the descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis testing are presented. Finally, a study summary, findings related to the literature, and the conclusions are included in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter 2 is to provide background on the empirical research related to superintendent turnover and its impact, superintendent transition planning, and superintendent succession planning. Reviewing this literature developed the foundation for addressing the research questions of the present study. The literature review supports the research questions to determine the influence of stakeholders.

Superintendent Turnover

Superintendent turnover is not limited to one part of the country and affects all school districts. The position of school superintendent is one of the more difficult, complicated jobs in the educational profession (Shields, 2002, p. 5). This difficulty arises because most decisions and meetings are conducted publicly, which exposes superintendents to public scrutiny and potential ridicule, particularly during periods of taxpayer discontent (Shields, 2002). Goddard (1977, as cited in Bryant & Grady, 1989) analyzed superintendent turnover in rural districts, identifying factors such as financial problems, superintendents' upward mobility, position instability, and inadequate school board members.

To determine the extent of superintendent turnover in rural states, Bryant and Grady (1989) selected Nebraska, which met the conditions of the study with 327 school districts in the state. During the seven years covered in the study, there were 268 superintendent turnovers out of the 327 K-12 school districts included in this study (Bryant & Grady, 1989). Participants included 25 superintendents who took part in telephone interviews. The average population in districts with high superintendent

turnover was around 600 residents, typically in agricultural communities far from population centers. These towns were characterized by declining business vitality and steady outmigration. These causes were categorized into four groups: personal reasons, job or district characteristics, problems with the board of education, and career ascendency (Bryant & Grady, 1989). The findings provided evidence that personal reasons led 10 out of 24 superintendents to leave, often to move closer to home, reduce family stress, or address the educational needs of children (Bryant & Grady, 1989). Job or district conditions, including declining enrollment, poor financial health, and board interference, were the primary causes for eight superintendents. In some cases, they were ousted by locals reclaiming jobs or exerting excessive power over district decisions (Bryant & Grady, 1989). Five superintendents left due to problematic board relations, where they were expected to act as the board's puppet or scapegoat. Finally, four superintendents left for career advancement, seeking higher salaries or more prestigious districts.

Sharp (1994) found that superintendents often leave districts for several reasons. Those pursuing promotions, higher pay, or moving for geographic preferences often find positions in financially stable districts that can offer better salaries. Additionally, superintendents who leave due to strained relationships with the school board frequently experience conflicts with teachers' unions and legal issues. These challenges are related, as union disputes can lead to legal problems, particularly when the school board sides with the union. Financial difficulties in a district can also cause legal and union-related issues, especially when salary increases are unattainable, leading to further conflicts. The purpose of Sharp's (1994) study was to determine if superintendents on the Illinois

Watch List, districts that met the criteria for financial instability, left their positions due to their identification on the Illinois Watch List. Sharp found that the Illinois Watch List districts experienced higher superintendent turnover than non-Watch List districts. However, superintendents surveyed indicated that predecessors primarily left due to retirement, not financial issues. Despite Illinois' early retirement incentives, many superintendents see the role as their final career step before retiring (Sharp, 1994). The findings indicated that there was no significant difference between the reasons for leaving between the Watch List superintendents and those who were superintendents not on the Watch List.

According to Shields (2002), as resources diminish and demands for better educational outcomes increase, the relationship between school boards and superintendents has become more strained. Giles and Giles (1990, as cited in Shields, 2002) reported that over six years in California, 75% of superintendent turnover resulted from conflicts with the school board. Sharp's (1994) findings indicated that the relationship between the superintendent and the board is critical, not just for educating the students in the district but also for the superintendent's job security. In addition to board/superintendent relations, there are several other reasons superintendents leave their positions. Dlugosh (1994) found that superintendents often seek better positions offering higher pay or status or prefer to move to larger districts or communities. Other reasons for departure include family pressures, stress, working conditions, and school board relations. While conducting a literature review, Shields (2002) realized that the most frequently cited reason for superintendent turnover was the negative relationship between the board of education and the superintendent. These strained relationships were

attributed to various factors, including actions by the board, the superintendent, and external influences (Shields, 2002).

Grissom and Mitani (2016) found that superintendents often leave their positions for roles in other districts, different positions within the same district, roles in higher education or related fields, or retirement. However, many are also forced out involuntarily due to the dissatisfaction of school boards or political issues. The superintendency is notably transitory, with around 20% of superintendents leaving their roles each year and over half of them exiting the profession entirely.

In a study of rural school districts in 48 states, Tekniepe (2015) realized that school boards may offer shorter contracts as they have concerns and reservations. Due to the high superintendent turnover in rural districts, sometimes school boards turn to shorter contracts due to reservations and concerns. Tekniepe (2015) also found that single-year contracts often indicate a board's uncertainty about a superintendent, skepticism of their vision, and possibly a lack of commitment to their leadership. This dynamic can result in increased board control over the superintendent, potentially hindering the superintendent's ability to implement innovative changes to improve academic achievement within the district.

Pascopella (2011) purported that the involuntary turnover of a superintendent should be reviewed to determine what leads to the decision. Voluntary turnover among superintendents occurs for various reasons, including personal factors, retirement, and the pursuit of higher-paying opportunities (Pascopella, 2011). Additionally, difficult relationships with the school board, especially with the board president, can also prompt superintendents to leave their positions voluntarily. Metzger (1997) conducted research

involving 39 superintendents who experienced involuntary turnover and identified
several contributing factors to their departure, including:

1. Political agendas**:** 85% of superintendents cited political issues among board
   members, such as frequent board turnover, power struggles, and
   disagreements over roles and responsibilities. Board members often used their
   positions for personal or political gains, leading to a lack of trust and respect
   for the superintendent's professional expertise.

2. Personnel issues: 66% of superintendents faced conflicts over employment,
   termination, transfer, or evaluation of staff. District staff sometimes
   undermined superintendents by playing politics with the board.

3. Financial problems: One-third of the superintendents faced financial
   difficulties within their districts, which contributed to their departure.

4. Union and collective bargaining issues: About one-fourth of the cases
   involved union problems and issues related to collective bargaining.

5. Racial/ethnic issues: A few superintendents felt that conflicts arose due to
   racial or ethnic differences between board members and superintendents.

6. Student achievement: Only one superintendent cited concerns over student
   achievement as a reason for leaving.

These factors combined to create an environment where superintendents were often
pressured to leave before they desired, were terminated, or felt compelled to resign
(Metzger, 1997).

Meyer (2013) studied five Arizona school superintendents who left their positions
between 2008 and 2013. To gather insights into the reasons behind their departure, the

researcher conducted interviews with each superintendent as well as with a board member, a district staff member, and a community member from each of their former districts. Meyer identified school board relations and politics as the primary reasons for superintendent turnover in Arizona school districts. Specifically, 80% of the superintendents interviewed cited their interactions with the school board and associated political issues as the most significant factors influencing their decision to leave. Conversely, 20% of the superintendents did not consider these factors as major reasons for their departure (Meyer, 2013). Additionally, retirement was reported as another key factor by 80% of the superintendents. Role clarity between the school board and the superintendent was also a prominent issue, with 60% of the superintendents identifying it as a factor in their decision to leave. Problems such as micromanagement, a lack of trust, and the board's involvement in daily operations were highlighted as contributing to the lack of role clarity (Meyer, 2013). The average age of the superintendents was 61, with ages ranging from 54 to 74 years. Other factors mentioned by the superintendents included community relations and politics, as well as health concerns, which were identified by 40% of the superintendents as influencing their departure. Financial issues, staff relations and politics, demographics, and geography were noted by only 20% of the superintendents as factors in their turnover (Meyer, 2013).

In 2024, Zalaznick reported that out of 300 positions, 49.8% of superintendents reported retirement was the main reason they left their positions. The next most common reason for departure was accepting another position. Resignation/leave contributed to 15.7% of the main reason for leaving. Termination and contract nonrenewal amounted to only 6.1% for an exiting reason.

Superintendent Turnover Impact

Across the United States, the position of superintendent has been characterized by high turnover. Metzger (1997) indicated that the financial impact of involuntary turnover of superintendents can be detrimental to a school district. According to Price (1977, as cited in Kasper, 1997), research on the concept of turnover in a variety of fields researchers found that effectiveness, formalization, satisfaction, administrative staff, innovation, and centralization impacted the decision to leave. Price was unable to find evidence in the literature that examined the impact of the turnover on the organization.

Early termination of a superintendent's contract by a board can lead to significant legal costs for the district. Natkin et al. (2002) noted that effective systemic school reforms require a superintendent's consistent focus for five or more years, implying that frequent turnover can have prolonged negative effects. Natkin et al. (2002) led a team of researchers to investigate the "revolving door theory" of the superintendency. The team took the stance that to ensure school districts' success, there needs to be stable and predictable leadership over a sustained period. Various researchers have explored common leadership-related reasons for superintendents leaving their positions. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) wrote that it is estimated that successful reforms require five years or more of a superintendent's attention. "Thus, if tenures of two or three years are as widespread as commonly believed, comprehensive school reform might be an elusive goal" (Natkin et al., 2002, p. 1). In "The Study of the American School Superintendency 2000," a 10-year research project sponsored by AASA, The School Superintendents Association, Glass et al. (2000) found that the tenure of 2,232 superintendents averaged between five and six years. Natkin et al. (2002) stated that the idea of superintendents not

staying long in districts might have created a negative impact on the idea of becoming a superintendent.

Alsbury (2008) stated that turnover can negatively affect staff satisfaction and morale. For a school system to succeed, it is essential to foster a collaborative culture among stakeholders. High turnover can lead to a climate of low expectations among staff, resulting in decreased motivation and reluctance to embrace the mission and vision of the succeeding superintendent. Alsbury conducted a mixed methods study to determine the presence or absence of a significant relationship between superintendent and school board turnover and student achievement on the Washington Assessment of Student Learning. In school districts with an enrollment of 500 or fewer students, Alsbury determined that there was a statistically significant relationship between superintendent turnover rates and the number of districts with changing Washington Assessment of Student Learning scores. Alsbury's findings indicated that there was no connection between superintendent turnover and a change in student achievement scores in districts with enrollment over 500. Factors such as the stability of the teaching staff and building administration can affect the impact of a new superintendent due to their natural separation from the classroom's educational program (Alsbury, 2008). Consequently, the findings from many districts in this study showed no measurable effects from superintendent turnover, likely because these uncontrolled variables and differences in new superintendent effectiveness balanced each other out (Alsbury, 2008).

Meyers (2010) examined the length of a superintendent's tenure and the relationship to the academic achievement of students who scored "Proficient" or better on the 2008 third-grade Kansas Reading Assessment. Meyers found that 30% of

superintendent's turnover in the first year of a superintendency and 70% within five years. The length of a superintendent's tenure on third-grade scores had a significantly positive impact on student achievement.

Pascopella (2011) stated that having a stable and effective superintendent positively correlates with improved student achievement and community perception. Pascopella also stated that the effectiveness of a superintendent's leadership is significantly influenced by their ability to maintain a long-term, stable position. The tenure of public-school superintendents has consistently been a critical issue in the field of education. Superintendents, as key leaders within the educational system, must fulfill instructional, managerial, and political responsibilities. One of these responsibilities includes maintaining a strong relationship with the school board they serve. Successful superintendents possess the skills necessary to navigate these roles effectively. The way a superintendent addresses various issues and manages change can either support or undermine their tenure (Pascopella, 2011).

According to Grissom and Andersen (2012), superintendents turnover for a variety of reasons: school board relations, evaluation of performance, and community dissatisfaction. Community perception plays a central role in most exits. Equally important is that superintendent terminations are very rare; some exits are coded as resignations that were initiated by the dissatisfied school board. Grissom and Andersen (2012) stated,

> If board dysfunction drives this sort of voluntary turnover, or if board dysfunction creates dynamics that make them more likely to push out superintendents involuntarily, efforts to improve how well the school board works together and

with the superintendent via board training or professional development may pave

the way for greater leadership stability. (p. 1173)

Grissom and Andersen (2012) also asserted that superintendents leave rural

districts potentially viewing these experiences as stepping stones. These superintendents

leave their school districts to work in urban settings that may have more challenges but

could create prestige and increase pay. Acquiring new jobs that are considered

promotions plays a role in the superintendent's decision to leave their current position.

Finally, retirement is a frequent source of turnover. Grissom and Anderson also found

that rural superintendents across the United States are crucial for their districts' success

but encounter personal, professional, and cultural challenges in isolated areas that may

resist outsiders (Grissom & Anderson, 2012). These difficulties contribute to higher

turnover rates, which negatively impact student achievement and financially strain rural

communities (Grissom & Anderson, 2012).

In another study of rural superintendents, Parker-Chenaille (2012) established that

the average tenure was four years. The districts chosen for this study were part of the

Cooperative Educational Services in the state of New York. The selected region included

21 rural schools with varying student achievement scores. In the 12-year period

examined, 37 superintendent successions took place (Parker-Chenaille, 2012). When

evaluating the role of superintendents, two possibilities emerge: either they have little

influence on achievement or their impact is diluted within the system. Superintendents

promoted from within the district tend to increase student achievement by about five

percentage points more than those hired externally (Parker-Chenaille, 2012). In rural

areas, student achievement tends to improve more notably when a superintendent's tenure

reaches seven to 10 years, particularly if the superintendent was promoted internally. However, this finding is limited, as only one superintendent in the study met these criteria. Turnover has little impact in districts heavily reliant on state aid, with minimal changes in the percentage of students passing exams. In rural districts, turnover results in a slight increase in student achievement, with gains of seven percentage points in smaller districts (fewer than 500 students) and 11 points in larger districts (Parker-Chenaille, 2012). Although turnover does affect rural student achievement, the overall impact remains modest. Superintendents who have a tenure of less than three years in those districts indicated "little to no impact on student achievement" (Parker-Chenaille, 2012).

Kopicki (2018) sought to determine the levels of turbulence faced by superintendents in Pennsylvania and examine how this turbulence might affect their job satisfaction. The researcher investigated whether these superintendents were satisfied with their professional roles. Secondarily, the researcher investigated the factors and impact of turbulence on superintendents' job satisfaction and examined whether a relationship existed between turbulence and job satisfaction. Kopicki determined that satisfying aspects of the superintendent position included observing accomplishments, collaborating with peers, participating in a larger school community, positive outcomes for faculty and students, and developing a rapport with teachers, parents, students, and school board members.

Superintendent Transition Planning

In 1997, Kasper purported there was no one model or even several models of transition planning for superintendents. Kasper purported that one model of transition would not be beneficial to all superintendents as the diverse circumstances of school

districts would influence the succession process. Kasper found that if the predecessor resigned under positive situations, the incoming superintendent would have a period of working with the predecessor. The interactions varied from learning about the history, sharing information, or the occasional phone call. The survey respondents reported that they enjoyed the interactions and benefitted from them; the length of the interaction did not matter. According to Kasper (1997), the new superintendents chose ideal succession plans that include themes like building relationships, interactions with the community, flexibility for change, collaboration, mission, direction, strategic planning, and curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

The concept of the first 90 days being the critical period during the beginning of a new superintendency is not a new concept. Numerous 90- or 100-day plans have been utilized by incoming superintendents (Martinez-Perez, 2005). Watkins (2003) stated that similar strategies used in the business world can also be effective for superintendents in education. The first 90 days should follow a 10-element plan, which includes promoting yourself, accelerating learning, matching strategy to the situation, securing early wins, negotiating success, achieving alignment, building your team, creating coalitions, maintaining balance, and expediting everyone's progress. These areas are critical for new leaders and applicable to superintendents. However, successful implementation requires discipline, follow-through, and continuous monitoring of results. The implementation of an entry plan for a transitioning superintendent depends significantly on the preexisting factors and organizational climate of a school district (Martinez-Perez, 2005). The plan, whether formal or informal, should be specifically tailored to the district. Since no two school districts are exactly alike, it is wise for an entering superintendent to thoroughly

study a district's situation even before seeking employment or assignment there (Martinez-Perez, 2005). The findings provided evidence that the entry period is crucial to a superintendent's success. However, there is a notable lack of understanding and research on this period, highlighting a gap in preparation and professional development for aspiring superintendents regarding entry planning. The researcher identified factors during the first 90 days that contributed to a successful superintendency and sought to find common theoretical frameworks or ideas based on superintendents' experiences during their entry period. Utilized in this study was an electronic survey to which 321 California superintendents responded and used 20 qualitative personal interviews. The results of the study indicated that 78.8% of superintendents felt inadequately prepared in entry plan development, highlighting the need for better preparation in this area (Martinez-Perez, 2005). Additionally, 267 out of 321 respondents emphasized the importance of superintendent-school board relations for fulfilling their roles effectively (Martinez-Perez, 2005). Personal interviews echoed this sentiment, with some superintendents unaware of the necessity for good communication with school boards and surprised by the amount of time spent communicating with various constituents (Martinez-Perez, 2005). The political aspect of the position also surprised some superintendents, who recognized the importance of being highly visible and engaged with the public (Martinez-Perez, 2005).

Hargreaves and Goodson (2006) conducted 200 interviews and observations and reviewed archival data. Hargreaves and Goodson's third case study was designed consciously as a learning organization in which they tried to sustain its uniqueness by purposefully planning for leadership succession. Established protocols for transitioning

from one leader to another could ensure the transfer of essential inbound knowledge;

however, these are often not in place to ensure the success of the transfer. More often,

incoming leaders are inexperienced and unprepared for the challenges they will

encounter. Meanwhile, seasoned leaders are either retiring or moving on to other

opportunities, making them unavailable to mentor new leaders or share their insider

knowledge (Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006).

Fink and Brayman (2006) asserted that the transition of knowledge between the

predecessor and the incoming leader has a critical impact on sustainable reform. A

formalized transition from one leader to another provides evidence that thoughtful

succession plans can really help to sustain school improvement (Fink & Brayman, 2006).

The transition knowledge has had an impact on sustaining the development and

maintenance of trust within an organization. A succession plan could provide

considerable lead-time, develop shared understanding and commitment among faculty

through meaningful communication, and recognize the new leader's inbound knowledge

with the outbound knowledge of the departing leader and his or her concern to maintain

and build on what has already been achieved in the school (Fink & Brayman, 2006). Yet,

most succession events are unplanned, arbitrary, and ethically questionable. In the main,

unplanned or hastily arranged successions seem to serve only as an enemy of

improvement (Fink & Brayman, 2006).

Riordan (2008) discussed that leaders transitioning in their careers must

demonstrate agility and adaptability by acquiring new skills that ensure success in their

new roles. A common transition for leaders involves changing jobs or roles (Riordan,

2008). Leaders must decide whether to stay ahead, keep pace, or fall behind. Their ability

to navigate transitions effectively depends on how well they manage the inputs and challenges of their new environment (Riordan, 2008). Successful navigation of transitions requires leaders to adjust their mindset, develop the necessary skills and competencies for the new context, and modify their behaviors accordingly. Riordan stated that the importance of "riding the waves" of transition by learning how to work with different bosses, subordinates, and peers cannot be overstated. These interactions might bring together new people who possess diverse ideas, preferences, and styles, which can be difficult to learn (Riordan, 2008).

Cullotta (2008) stated that first-year superintendents often face a challenging journey, managing district needs amidst pressures from diverse internal and external stakeholders with competing interests. Their vulnerability is heightened by varying academic, cultural, and stakeholder perceptions within school districts. Cullotta found that successful first-time superintendents must adeptly fulfill roles as political, managerial, and educational leaders while maintaining a nuanced understanding of their interconnectivity. Effective strategies for division leadership include establishing a clear superintendent identity, cultivating relationships with school boards, governing bodies, and stakeholders, and crafting a shared vision. Challenges such as navigating school and governing board dynamics, handling unexpected incidents, and ensuring accountability are prevalent during the first year in the superintendency. To overcome these challenges and promote effective leadership, communication, collaboration, and visibility within schools and the community are essential practices (Cullotta, 2008).

A study conducted by Jones (2011) examined factors of a successful transition into the role of a new superintendent, using data collected from superintendents in urban,

suburban, and rural school districts in Texas. Jones collected quantitative data through an electronic survey with 289 respondents. The survey was divided into six sections: demographic information, preparation for the superintendency, the situation prior to entering the current superintendency, entry or transition plans, entry or transition strategies, and opinions on current leadership (Jones, 2011). Qualitative data were gathered using a focus group of eight superintendents from urban, suburban, and rural districts, addressing preparation, the importance of the entry period, transition plans, and strategies during the transition (Jones, 2011). The survey results highlighted the importance of having an entry plan, with over 75% having one in place. Nearly a third of the respondents had been in their current position for one to two years, and they averaged 7.4 years of experience as superintendents (Jones, 2011). More than half of the respondents felt their professional development had adequately prepared them for the role. Most respondents emphasized the importance of studying the district's budget and student achievement levels before starting the job (Jones, 2011). Additionally, Jones (2011) purported the importance of interacting with colleagues, board members, and the district leadership team during the entry period. Jones (2011) found that qualitative data revealed three key themes. The first theme was the importance of community, where participants emphasized the significance of relationships with the board of trustees, engaging with the school community, and building trust. The second theme centered on learning through on-the-job experiences (Jones, 2011). Despite lacking formal training for the entry period, most participants highlighted the value of mentorship and hands-on learning during their first 90 days (Jones, 2011). The third theme involved setting goals and expectations, both personally and for the district, which included understanding the

expectations of board members and establishing objectives for the superintendent and the school district (Jones, 2011).

Russell (2012) studied five first-year superintendents who were employed in each of the nine Educational Service District regions in the state of Washington. Russell determined that the most successful strategies for school superintendents during their first year include listening to stakeholders, building strong relationships with the school board and stakeholders, understanding district finances and successfully passing levies and bonds, mastering human resources, connecting with mentors and colleagues, and focusing on student achievement. These practices and strategies are foundational for a successful transition. Three themes that emerged to develop successful transition planning were listening to stakeholders, having an entry or transition plan that involved gathering information, and establishing a successful school board-superintendent relationship (Russell, 2012).

In a qualitative study, Gandhi (2019) sought to determine the experiences of five superintendents during their first superintendency. Using narrative inquiry and autoethnographic methodology guided by the Zaccaro et al. (2004) model of trait leadership, Gandhi (2019) explored leadership traits utilized or developed during the transition. Primary data was sourced from individual interviews and reflective journal entries, revealing themes such as board-superintendent relations, change management, and personnel issues juxtaposed with successes in relationship-building and staff trust development (Gandhi, 2019). Leadership traits like oral and written communication, general problem-solving, interpersonal skills, honesty/integrity, and decision-making were recurrently utilized or developed. The significance of the superintendent's

relationship with the Board of Education surfaced as a central finding across all participants (Gandhi, 2019). Dynamics with school boards emerged as a primary learning experience, alongside successes in establishing relationships with cabinet teams. Effective communication and problem-solving were highlighted as crucial during the transitional phase (Gandhi, 2019).

Davidson et al. (2021) conducted a quantitative study by surveying superintendents from Arizona, Kansas, Minnesota, and Washington during the fall and winter of 2019. The researchers outlined several research questions addressing gaps in understanding the role of predecessors in assisting transitions, variations in support based on gender and district size, and the priority of board relationships during transitions. Davidson et al. stated the need for more systematic succession planning and support mechanisms for incoming superintendents. Common challenges for new superintendents include navigating board relations, managing change, and handling personnel issues. The findings indicated that one-third of successor superintendents have a strongly favorable view of the helpfulness of their predecessors. Internally promoted successor superintendents viewed the helpfulness of their successor significantly more favorably than successor superintendents employed from outside the district. There was little difference in the helpfulness of the predecessor to the new superintendent based on the successor's location, gender, or size of the district, with the largest-sized districts rated slightly higher with helpfulness provided. Fellow superintendents, administrative assistants, and district administrators were viewed as a much greater source of support than predecessor superintendents.

Davidson et al. (2021) stated that the superintendent's role in transitions has two primary actions. The first is by advising and assisting the board with the search and selection of the new superintendent. The second is communicating with and assisting the successor after they have been selected (Davidson et al., 2021). New superintendents did not view their predecessors as a significant source of support or assistance during their transition. Predecessors leaving for another superintendency were not viewed as helpful. The group with moderately favorable perceptions were those who retired from the superintendency. A large majority did not have a favorable view of the helpfulness of their predecessors (Davidson et al., 2021).

Hutchings and Brown (2021) observed that new superintendents experience a range of environments upon starting their careers. These experiences occur in districts that vary from high-functioning, well-organized districts to highly dysfunctional ones. Experiences like these necessitate immediate changes to address academic, cultural, and stakeholder perceptions.

Participants in Furr's (2024) study of first year superintendents from North Carolina stated that despite their extensive educational background and prior professional experiences, they frequently encountered professional challenges without clear policy guidance and were faced with vague existing policies. In these situations, they commonly sought advice from resources such as their school district attorney or fellow superintendents. The participants underscored the importance of having a supportive network of colleagues, particularly other superintendents, and commended the North Carolina Association of School Superintendents for its proactive role in mentoring new superintendents. Furr's findings provided evidence that participants in the study

highlighted several key themes regarding their successes during their first year as superintendents. Firstly, they emphasized the importance of relationship building with stakeholders such as students, parents, faculty, and community members. The relationship building involved actively spending time away from their offices to engage directly with these groups, seeking input to understand the district's culture and informing planning efforts. Secondly, the participants noted the significance of high visibility. This visibility not only fulfilled symbolic expectations but also facilitated trust-building and enhanced understanding of organizational dynamics, thus bolstering confidence in their planning endeavors through continuous feedback from constituents. Thirdly, organizational planning emerged as another critical area of success. Participants stressed the importance of strategic planning to establish shared goals and strategies, to foster organizational alignment and focus over the long term. Lastly, participants recognized the political environment within which school districts operate. Participants actively engaged with elected officials, particularly members of boards of education and county commissions, recognizing the need for their support to implement initiatives effectively. This engagement required significant time and effort to communicate and collaborate with these stakeholders strategically (Furr, 2024). The final theme emerging from this research highlighted the necessity for superintendents to cultivate a professional network of trusted colleagues. Given the inherently challenging nature of the superintendent role, participants frequently reported feelings of isolation while navigating complex responsibilities. Thus, the participants advocated for new superintendents to establish a strong network of dependable colleagues to provide assistance and support.

Furthermore, participants highlighted that having veteran superintendents within this network was especially advantageous (Furr, 2024).

Farley (2024) investigated the transition from a long-serving superintendent to a newly hired superintendent in a rural Midwestern school district, focusing on leadership behaviors and their impact on stability, change, and integration of new ideas. Using a mixed methods convergent design and drawing on Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations theory, Farley addressed the lack of knowledge about the leadership behaviors of newly hired superintendents during transitions. Farley emphasized the importance of effective communication with stakeholders during the incoming superintendent's transition. The findings revealed that the outgoing superintendent exhibited transformational and distributive leadership behaviors, while the incoming superintendent employed various frameworks (transformational, servant, distributive, adaptive) depending on the situation and individual involved. Both superintendents facilitated information sharing, built district knowledge, established communication systems, and identified key supportive individuals. Farley emphasized the importance of effective communication with stakeholders and recommended listening to stakeholders, building relationships, developing communication systems, and employing situational leadership behaviors. Farley also highlighted the importance of respectful communication between outgoing and incoming superintendents, identifying key supportive stakeholders, and utilizing tailored leadership behaviors. Increasing leadership framework knowledge in superintendent preparation programs was suggested to better equip future leaders for effective transitions.

Superintendent Succession Planning

Hargreaves and Goodson (2006) used Wenger's (1998) theory on succession, which describes three essential stages of knowledge for effective leadership and continuity during transitions: inbound, insider, and outbound knowledge. Inbound knowledge involves the understanding necessary to implement changes or make significant improvements in leadership or within a school. Insider knowledge is the expertise gained and shared with the community after earning their trust and acceptance. Outbound knowledge focuses on maintaining previous successes, ensuring ongoing progress, and leaving a lasting legacy after departure. When a succession plan includes sufficient time for transferring essential insider knowledge, it supports the maintenance and improvement of programs. "In addition to fostering a smooth transition, a carefully implemented entry plan enables a new leader to introduce symbolic change—any new effort, direction, or modification of school policy or practice that implicitly communicates a profound departure from the past" (King & Blumer, 2000, p. 361). Jentz and Murphy (2005) stated that an entry plan for a new superintendent offers several advantages that can contribute to early success. An entry plan allows the superintendent to navigate the initial confusion typical of a new role, turning it into a valuable opportunity for personal and organizational learning. The plan promotes self-examination within the organization, fostering trust and credibility as the superintendent engages openly with the school community to assess current conditions and discuss potential improvements. Additionally, it supports the development of a leadership style that balances top-down direction with bottom-up collaboration (Jentz & Murphy, 2005).

Senge (2006) stated that the effectiveness of a succession management system is significantly influenced by the organization's systems thinking approach. Leaders who thoroughly understand the organization's vision, purpose, and core values are more likely to guide it toward sustained improvement. When individuals grasp the organization's vision and recognize the interconnectedness of its structure and their role within it, their collective knowledge can drive the district toward ongoing improvement (Senge, 2006).

Sanaghan and Lytle (2008) found that a new superintendent must skillfully manage the complexities of culture, politics, and stakeholder expectations. This demanding journey calls for meticulous and strategic oversight. Research on how predecessors can assist their successors is limited. However, mentoring and networking play crucial roles in transitions, with informal mentors and networks proving valuable. This assistance is especially vital in rural districts where support networks and experienced superintendents are scarce. Sanaghan and Lytle reflected on one superintendent who adopted a strategic learning approach to understand critical subject areas and issues, demonstrating a learning attitude and creating a forum for stakeholders to engage. Upon joining the school district, the superintendent requested daily tutoring on key topics like the budget and curriculum over two weeks. For instance, the chief financial officer delivered accessible presentations on the budget, which were open to other administrators, parents, teachers, community members, and principals. These sessions included question-and-answer periods and open discussions, fostering a collaborative learning environment.

Watenpaugh (2007) conducted a study of 25 members from the Northern California superintendents' group. Out of these 25, seven were experienced

superintendents who had successfully led more than one school district. The interviews took place in October 2006. Watenpaugh asserted that experienced superintendents used their prior administrative experiences. Research participants stated that their administrative experiences acquired prior to becoming a superintendent were more valuable in planning their entry into the superintendency. Watenpaugh found that participants reported that they were less prepared for board/superintendent relations and governance. During their initial period, new superintendents prioritized building positive and trusting relationships with individual trustees and the entire board as their primary focus and time commitment. "The failure to establish positive relationships with the board of trustees was viewed as the greatest detractor from being an effective superintendent" (Watenpaugh, 2007, p. 153).

Wildman's (2020) qualitative multiple case study conducted in six K-12 California public school districts was focused on the intricate dynamics of superintendent succession planning. Wildman examined districts with enrollments ranging from 1,000 to 10,000 students and had experienced superintendent transitions in the past three years. The researcher sought to identify and describe succession planning strategies across three crucial stages: prepare, pivot, and thrive. Five common themes emerged from the research: open communication, stakeholder engagement, relationship-building, strategic planning, and district stabilization. The succession planning strategies for superintendent transition in six California K-12 public school districts varied but consistently emphasized open communication, strong relationships, strategic planning, and stakeholder input across all stages (Wildman, 2020). Superintendents balanced current roles with preparing for new ones, while cabinet members focused on district

stabilization and support. Board members played critical roles in planning, community communication, and introducing new superintendents, often relying on external agencies for guidance. Unexpectedly, crises or emergencies facilitated accelerated relationship building, underscoring the importance of effective leadership during challenging times. The findings emphasized role-specific variations in strategy utilization during each stage of transition, revealing that while overarching strategies remained consistent across roles, distinct approaches were necessary (Wildman, 2020). The findings highlighted the multifaceted nature of leadership succession, emphasizing the importance of collaborative efforts and tailored strategies in effectively navigating superintendent transitions. A further challenge for leaders hired externally is the process of organizational socialization. Every school district has distinct operational procedures and a unique culture. The new leader becomes integrated into the district's culture through various socialization tactics, stages, contexts, and outcomes (Wildman, 2020).

Summary

The literature review covered the impact of superintendent turnover, the intricacies of superintendent transition planning, and the critical elements of superintendent succession planning. It examined how turnover is influenced by factors such as school board relations, performance evaluations, community dissatisfaction, and retirement, and its varied impact on student achievement. The review also delved into the importance of knowledge transfer during transitions, the challenges faced by new superintendents, and the strategies for successful leadership transitions, emphasizing the role of stakeholder engagement and effective communication. Succession planning was explored in terms of managing culture, politics, and expectations, highlighting the

necessity of open communication, strategic planning, and organizational socialization. This literature review provided a comprehensive understanding of the factors affecting superintendent stability and effectiveness, laying the groundwork for addressing the research questions of the present study. Chapter 3 includes the methods utilized in this study.

Chapter 3

Methods

The focus of this study was the investigation of the perceptions of new superintendents during their first three years in their role in Kansas districts. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of new superintendents' perceptions of how previous superintendents were helpful in the transition and were affected by district enrollment and the reasons for the previous superintendents' departures. The next purpose was to determine the extent the support from administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders was useful and whether the usefulness was affected by district enrollment. This chapter contains detailed information about the methodology used in conducting this study. This chapter includes the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and the limitations.

Research Design

According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), "A survey design provides a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, and opinions of a population, or tests for associations among variables of a population, by studying a sample of that population" (p. 147). This study was completed using a quantitative descriptive research design with survey methods. The dependent variables examined in this study were the Kansas new superintendents' perceptions of the helpfulness of the previous superintendent's support in assisting with the transition and the usefulness of stakeholder support (administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business

leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders)**.** The independent variables specified in this study were district size (0-500, 501-5,000, over 5,000 students), the reason for the previous superintendent's departure from the district (retirement from the superintendency, nonrenewal or termination of contract, accepted another superintendency, accepted another position, unknown, or other), and the stakeholder category (administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders).

Selection of Participants

The population in this study was Kansas superintendents. Purposive sampling, which Lunenburg and Irby (2008) established as "selecting a sample based on the researcher's experience or knowledge of the group to be sampled" (p. 175), was used in this study. The criteria used for selecting the sample was new to the position Kansas superintendents from the 2021-2022 through 2023-2024 school years. The list of the superintendents was located on the KSDE website. Serving in the role of superintendent within their first three years made the respondents eligible to participate; they further self-selected by choosing to complete the anonymous survey.

Measurement

A survey was used to gather data on new superintendents' perceptions of the level of helpfulness and usefulness of the support from various stakeholders to new superintendents in Kansas. The Transitions in Superintendent Leadership survey was designed with the assistance of professional membership associations in Kansas, Arizona, Minnesota, and Washington (Davidson et al., 2021). The survey designers had each

previously served as a superintendent in at least one of the states (Kansas, Arizona, Minnesota, and Washington) where the survey was administered. The experience of the survey designers, all of whom had served as superintendents, is evidence for the content validity of the survey. The authors used the survey to collect descriptive information regarding the superintendent's experience, current position, and the size and location of the district. It was also used to obtain information regarding the extent of the assistance new superintendents receive from the previous superintendent and to understand if there was a difference in the helpfulness of the support based on the reason the previous superintendent left the position. The researchers gathered data to better understand the perceived value of other stakeholder assistance during the transition to the new superintendency.

Permission to use (see Appendix A) or modify the survey (see Appendix B) in the current study was requested from and granted by Davidson in January 2021. The following modifications were made (see Appendix C for Davidson's original survey items):

- On Question 11, the size of the districts was changed to 0-500, 501-5,000, and over 5,000 students.

- In Questions 15, 16, and 17, the word predecessor was changed to previous superintendent.

- On Question 19, the scale was changed to a five-point scale (not at all useful, somewhat useful, useful, very useful, extremely useful, not applicable).

- On Question 19, *others* was changed to *other stakeholders*.

A select set of questions was utilized to gather descriptive statistical data to inform the study, while other questions were designed to gather data based on the study's research questions. Other questions from the original survey were not utilized in this research as they did not align with the purpose of the research (see Table 2). The modified survey used in the current study is found in Appendix D.

In the survey used in this study, Question 1 was a filter item to determine if the participants met the criterion of being in the first three years of their current position. If the participants reported more than three years of experience in their current position, they were thanked and did not qualify for the study. Questions 2 through 5 were multiple-choice demographic items. Participants responded to Question 6 using a scale of 1 (not at all helpful), 2 (slightly helpful), 3 (moderately helpful), 4 (very helpful), and 5 (extremely helpful). Participants responded to a series of statements in Question 7 using a scale of 1 (not at all useful), 2 (slightly useful), 3 (moderately useful), 4 (very useful), and 5 (extremely useful).

Table 2

Alignment of Transitions in Superintendent Leadership Items and Research Questions

Survey Item	RQ
In what U.S. state is your school district located?	Not Used
In what type of district are you a superintendent?	Not Used
How many years have you been in your current position?	DS
How many years have you served as a superintendent?	DS
In how many different districts have you been a superintendent?	DS
How many years have you been in the field of education?	Not Used
How many years have you served as a teacher?	Not Used
How many years have you served as an administrator?	Not Used
What is your gender?	Not Used
What is the current enrollment in your school district?	RQ1, RQ5
How soon do you plan to retire from the superintendency?	Not Used
In what capacity were you employed prior to your current position?	Not Used
If known, what was your previous superintendent's primary reason for leaving the position?	RQ2, RQ5
On a scale between 1 and 5, how helpful was the previous superintendent in assisting you with the transition to your current role?	RQ1, RQ2
Are there any comments you would like to make regarding assistance you received from your predecessor?	Not Used
Please indicate the usefulness of the support that you received from the following positions (administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders) when you transitioned to your current position.	RQ3, RQ4, RQ5
Are there any comments you would like to make regarding the support you received from the positions listed above?	Not Used
In general, please rate the level of trust that you believe others have in you.	Not Used
In general, please rate the level of trust that you have in others.	Not Used
In relation to other priorities, how high of a priority were board relationships when you first transitioned to your current position?	Not Used
Considering the definitions of district type, which best describes the type of school district you serve (city, suburban, town, rural)?	Not Used
What steps does your district currently take to prepare future leaders?	Not Used

Note. DS = descriptive statistics.

A reliability analysis was not needed because a scale was not constructed from the survey items. The researcher used single-item measurement. According to Sackett and Larson (1990),

> Most commonly used single-item measures can be divided into two categories: (a) those measuring self-reported facts ... and (b) those measuring psychological constructs, e.g., aspects of personality ... measuring the former with single items is common practice. However, using a single-item measure for the latter is considered to be a "fatal error" in research. If the construct being measured is sufficiently narrow or is unambiguous to the respondent, a single item may suffice. (p. 631)

The individual items used in this research were self-reported facts that were sufficiently narrow and unambiguous. Therefore, reliability was not an issue for the measurement using this survey instrument.

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to data collection, a proposal to conduct research was submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board on April 4, 2024. The Institutional Review Board formally granted permission to conduct the research study on April 10, 2024 (see Appendix E). The email addresses for the Kansas superintendents were downloaded from the KSDE website. An email was sent to the superintendents on April 15, 2024 (see Appendix E). The email outlined the study and explained that participation was voluntary, and that they could discontinue their participation at any time. The letter included a statement regarding the responses collected; the responses were anonymous and would not be associated with any individual. The email also included a link to the

survey via Google Forms and as well as the researcher's and major advisor's contact

information. The same email was sent as a reminder on June 1, 2024. After the survey

was closed on July 18, 2024 the data were downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Data from Google Forms were downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet and then

imported into IBM® SPSS® Statistics 29. The analysis focused on five research questions

and 13 hypotheses. Each research question is delineated below with the corresponding

hypotheses and method of statistical analysis.

RQ1

To what extent did the new superintendents perceive the previous superintendents

were helpful in assisting new superintendents with the transition to the position?

H1. New superintendents perceived the previous superintendents were helpful in

assisting with the transition to the position.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H1. The sample mean was compared to

a test value of 2. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it

involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is

calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When

appropriate, the effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

RQ2

To what extent is the perceived helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the

new superintendents affected by district enrollment and the reason for the previous

superintendents' departures?

H2. The helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the new superintendent is affected by district enrollment.

A one-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test H2. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, helpfulness in assisting with the transition, was district enrollment (0-500, 501-5,000, over 5,000 students). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size, as measured by eta squared, is reported.

H3. The helpfulness of the previous superintendents in assisting with the transition of the new superintendent is affected by the reason for the previous superintendents' departures.

A second one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H3. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, helpfulness in assisting with the transition, was reason for the previous superintendents' departure (retirement from the superintendency, nonrenewal or termination of contract, accepted another superintendency, accepted another position, unknown, or other). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size, as measured by eta squared, is reported.

RQ3

To what extent did the new superintendents perceive the support from the administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board

members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders was useful?

H4. New superintendents perceived the support from administrative assistants was useful.

H5. New superintendents perceived the support from district administrators was useful.

H6. New superintendents perceived the support from previous superintendents was useful.

H7. New superintendents perceived the support from board members was useful.

H8. New superintendents perceived the support from business leaders was useful.

H9. New superintendents perceived the support from teachers was useful.

H10. New superintendents perceived the support from fellow superintendents in other districts was useful.

H11. New superintendents perceived the support from other stakeholders was useful.

Eight one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H4-H11. Each sample mean was compared to a test value of 2. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

RQ4

To what extent is there a difference in the perceived usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board

members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other
stakeholders?

H12. There is a difference in the usefulness of the support among administrative
assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business
leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders.

A two-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H12 and H13. The two categorical
variables used to group the dependent variable, the usefulness of the support, were
stakeholder category (administrative assistants, district administrators, previous
superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in
other districts, and other stakeholders) and district enrollment category (0-500, 501-
5,000, over 5,000 students). The results of the two-factor ANOVA can be used to test for
differences in the means of a numerical variable among three or more groups, including a
main effect for the stakeholder category, a main effect for the district enrollment
category, and a two-way interaction effect (Stakeholder Category x District Enrollment
Category). The main effect for stakeholder category was used to test H12. The level of
significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

RQ5

To what extent is the difference in the perceived usefulness of the support among
administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board
members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other
stakeholders affected by the district enrollment?

H13. The difference in the usefulness of the support among administrative
assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business

leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders is affected by the district enrollment.

The interaction effect for stakeholder category by district enrollment category was used to test H13. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

Limitations

According to Lunenburg & Irby (2008), "limitations of a study are not under the control of the researcher . . . [but] may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or on the generalizability of the results" (p. 133). The results of the study were limited because not all new Kansas superintendents completed the survey. Another limitation was that the email addresses found on the KSDE website might not have been listed correctly.

Summary

Chapter 3 included a restatement of the purposes of the research study. The chapter included research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and the limitations. Chapter 4 contains the descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis testing.

Chapter 4

Results

The focus of this study was to determine the new Kansas superintendents'

perceptions of the helpfulness of their predecessors, how district enrollment and the

previous superintendent's reason for departure influenced the helpfulness of the support,

and the perceived usefulness of assistance from administrative assistants, districts

administrators, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents from

other districts, and other stakeholders. Also explored in this study were the differences in

the perceived usefulness of this support from various stakeholders based on district

enrollment. To address the purpose of the study, five research questions were posed and

13 hypotheses were tested. The descriptive statistics and the findings of the hypothesis

testing are included first in this chapter.

Descriptive Statistics

The survey was sent to 286 email addresses that were gathered from the KSDE

website. In this study, 121 Kansas superintendents responded to the survey. Of the 121

respondents, 87 met the criterion for participating in the study by having 0-3 years of

experience in their current position. This section of the chapter contains frequency tables

for participants' years of experience as a superintendent, the number of districts the

participant served as a superintendent, and the participant's district enrollment. These

tables were constructed from categorical data.

Table 3 contains data regarding the participants' years of experience as a

superintendent. The ranges for the years of experience were 0-1. 2-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20,

and over 20 years. Of the superintendents who participated in the survey, 35.63%

reported 0-1 years of experience, 47.13% reported 11-15 years of experience, and 9.2%

reported 16 or more years of experience, and 1.14% reported over 20 years of experience.

Table 3

Participants' Years of Experience as a Superintendent

Years of Experience	*N*	%
0-1 year	31	35.63
2-5 years	4	4.60
6-10 years	2	2.30
11-15 years	41	47.13
16-20 years	8	9.20
Over 20 years	1	1.14

Table 4 contains data regarding the number of districts the participants served as a

superintendent. The number of districts served ranged from 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or more. Of the

superintendents who participated in the survey, two participants did not answer the

question and were categorized as missing. Also, 71.3% of the participants had served 1

district, while 24.1% had served two, leaving 2.3% serving three districts.

Table 4

Number of Districts the Participants Served as a Superintendent

Number of Districts	*N*	%
1	62	71.3
2	21	24.1
3	2	2.3
4	0	0.0
5 or more	0	0.0
Missing	2	2.3

Table 5 contains data regarding the participants' district enrollment. The ranges for district enrollment were 0-500 students, 501-5,000 students, and over 5,000 students. Of the participants who answered the question, 42.5% were in small-sized districts (0-500 students), 48.3% were in medium-sized districts (501-5,000 students), and only 9.2% were in large-sized school districts (over 5,000 students).

Table 5

Participants' District Enrollment

Enrollment	*N*	%
0-500 students	37	42.5
501-5,000 students	42	48.3
Over 5,000 students	8	9.2

Table 6 contains data regarding the previous superintendent's primary reason for leaving. The survey responses included only two responses of unknown, 10 responses that were listed as interims that were recoded as other (e.g., health-related, interim, retired returned as interim until fully hired, dysfunctional board). The two responses of unknown were removed from the analysis.

Table 6

Recoded Previous Superintendent's Primary Reason for Leaving the Position

Previous superintendent's departure	N	%
Retirement from superintendency	41	47.13
Nonrenewal or termination	12	13.79
Accepted another superintendency	9	10.34
Accepted another position	10	11.49
Other	13	14.94
Unknown	2	2.30

Hypothesis Testing

To address the purposes of the study, five research questions were posed, and 13 hypotheses were tested. Results are reported in this section of Chapter 4. The research questions are followed by the hypothesis statements, data analysis paragraphs, and the explanation of the results of the hypothesis testing.

RQ1

To what extent did the new superintendents perceive the previous superintendents were helpful in assisting new superintendents with the transition to the position?

H1. New superintendents perceived the previous superintendents were helpful in assisting with the transition to the position.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H1. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 2. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(86) = 4.733$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.507$. The sample mean ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 1.47$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H1 was supported. New superintendents perceived that the previous superintendents were moderately helpful in assisting with the transition to the position. The effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, indicated a medium effect.

RQ2

To what extent is the perceived helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the new superintendents affected by district enrollment and the reason for the previous superintendents' departures?

H2. The helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the new superintendent is affected by district enrollment.

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H2. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, helpfulness in assisting with the transition, was district enrollment (0-500, 501-5,000, over 5,000 students). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size, as measured by eta squared, is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(2, 82) = 0.812$, $p = .447$. See Table 7 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow-up post hoc was not warranted to determine which pairs of means were different. H2 was not supported. The previous superintendent's helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the new superintendent was not affected by district enrollment.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H2

District Enrollment	*M*	*SD*	*N*
0-500	2.67	1.64	36
501-5,000	2.93	1.35	41
>5,000	2.25	1.28	8

H3. The helpfulness of the previous superintendents in assisting with the transition of the new superintendent is affected by the reason for the previous superintendents' departures.

A second one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H3. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, helpfulness in assisting with the transition, was the reason for the previous superintendents' departure (retirement from the superintendency, nonrenewal or termination of contract, accepted another superintendency, accepted another position, or other). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size, as measured by eta squared, is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(4, 80) = 6.512$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .246$. See Table 8 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow-up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Three of the differences were significant. The retirement from the superintendency category mean ($M = 3.29$) was higher than the nonrenewal or termination category mean ($M = 1.42$) and higher than the accepted another superintendency category mean ($M = 1.78$). The other category mean ($M = 3.15$) was higher than the nonrenewal or termination category mean ($M = 1.42$). H3 was supported. The effect size, as indexed by eta squared, indicated a large effect.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H3

Previous superintendent's departure	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Retirement from superintendency	3.29	1.33	41
Nonrenewal or termination	1.42	1.16	12
Accepted another superintendency	1.78	0.97	9
Accepted another position	2.50	1.51	10
Other	3.15	1.41	13

RQ3

To what extent did the new superintendents perceive the support from the administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders was useful?

Eight one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H4-H11. Each hypothesis is listed below with an explanation of the results from the test. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 2 for each of the tests. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

H4. New superintendents perceived the support from administrative assistants was useful.

The results of the one-sample *t* test used to test H4 indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(84) = 15.705$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.703$. The sample mean ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.21$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H4 was supported. New superintendents perceived that the support from administrative assistants was very to extremely useful. The effect size, as indexed by Cohen's d, indicated a large effect.

H5. New superintendents perceived the support from district administrators was useful.

The results of the one-sample *t* test used to test H5 indicated a difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(80) = 9.747$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.083$. The sample mean ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.32$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H5 was supported. New superintendents perceived that the support from district administrators was moderately to very useful in assisting with the transition to the position. The effect size, as indexed by Cohen's d, indicated a large effect.

H6. New superintendents perceived the support from previous superintendents was useful.

The results of the one-sample *t* test used to test H6 indicated a difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(85) = 4.872$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.53$. The sample mean ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.46$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H6 was supported. New superintendents perceived that the support from previous superintendents was slightly to moderately useful in assisting with the transition to the position. The effect size, as indexed by Cohen's d, indicated a medium effect.

H7. New superintendents perceived the support from board members was useful.

The results of the one-sample t test used to test H7 indicated a difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(85) = 9.225$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.00$. The sample mean ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.98$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H7 was supported. New superintendents perceived that the support from board members was slightly to moderately useful in assisting with the transition to the position. The effect size, as indexed by Cohen's d, indicated a large effect.

H8. New superintendents perceived the support from business leaders was useful.

The results of the one-sample t test used to test H8 indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(85) = 1.164$, $p = .110$. The sample mean ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.14$) was not significantly higher than the test value (2). H8 was not supported. New superintendents did not perceive the business leaders were more than slightly useful.

H9. New superintendents perceived the support from teachers was useful.

The results of the one-sample t test used to test H9 indicated a difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(85) = 6.237$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.673$. The sample mean ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.09$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H9 was supported. New superintendents perceived that the support from teachers was slightly to moderately useful in assisting with the transition to the position. The effect size, as indexed by Cohen's d, indicated a medium effect.

H10. New superintendents perceived the support from fellow superintendents in other districts was useful.

The results of the one-sample *t* test used to test H10 indicated a difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(86) = 19.926$, $p = .000$, Cohen's *d* $= 2.136$. The sample mean ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 1.01$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H10 was supported. New superintendents perceived that the support from fellow superintendents in other districts was very to extremely useful in assisting with the transition to the position. The effect size as indexed by Cohen's *d*, indicated a large effect.

H11. New superintendents perceived the support from other stakeholders was useful.

The results of the one-sample *t* test used to test H11 indicated a difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(59) = 8.667$, $p = .000$, Cohen's *d* $= 1.119$. The sample mean ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.24$) was significantly higher than the test value (2). H11was supported. New superintendents perceived that the support from other stakeholders was moderately to very useful in assisting with the transition to the position. The effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, indicated a large effect.

RQ4

To what extent is there a difference in the perceived usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders?

H12. There is a difference in the usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders.

A two-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H12 and H13. The two categorical variables used to group the dependent variable, the usefulness of the support, were stakeholder category (administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders) and district enrollment category (0-500, 501-5,000, over 5,000 students). The results of the two-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means of a numerical variable among three or more groups, including a main effect for the stakeholder category, a main effect for the district enrollment category, and a two-way interaction effect (Stakeholder Category x District Enrollment Category). The main effect for stakeholder category was used to test H12. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis for the main effect for stakeholder category indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(7, 364) = 14.227$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .215$. See Table 9 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's HSD post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Eighteen of the differences were significant. New superintendents perceived that administrative assistants were more useful ($M = 4.04$) than previous superintendents ($M = 2.73$), board members ($M = 2.93$), business leaders ($M = 2.25$), teachers ($M = 2.69$), and other stakeholders ($M = 3.40$). New superintendents perceived that district administrators were more useful ($M = 3.45$) than previous superintendents ($M = 2.73$), business leaders ($M = 2.25$), and teachers ($M = 2.69$). New superintendents perceived that board members were more useful ($M = 2.93$) than business leaders ($M = 2.25$). New superintendents perceived that fellow

superintendents were more useful in other districts ($M = 4.13$) than district administrators ($M = 3.45$), previous superintendents ($M = 2.73$), board members ($M = 2.93$), business leaders ($M = 2.15$), teachers ($M = 2.69$), and other stakeholders (M = 3.40). New superintendents perceived that other stakeholders were more useful ($M = 3.40$) than previous superintendents ($M = 2.73$), business leaders ($M = 2.15$), and teachers ($M = 2.69$). H12 was supported. The effect size, as indexed by eta squared, indicated a large effect.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H12

Stakeholders	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Administrative assistants	4.04	1.23	55
District administrators	3.45	1.34	55
Previous superintendent	2.72	1.52	55
Board members	2.93	0.98	55
Business leaders	2.15	1.11	55
Teachers	2.69	1.02	55
Fellow superintendents	4.13	1.00	55
Other Stakeholders	3.40	1.23	55

RQ5

To what extent is the difference in the perceived usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board

members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other

stakeholders affected by the district enrollment?

H13. The difference in the usefulness of the support among administrative

assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business

leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders is

affected by the district enrollment.

The interaction effect for stakeholder category by district enrollment category was

used to test H13. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size

is reported.

The results of the analysis of the interaction effect indicated a statistically

significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(14, 364) = 3.034$, $p = .000$,

$\eta^2 = .104$. See Table 10 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow

up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The

Tukey's HSD post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Four of the differences of interest were

statistically significant. In districts with an enrollment of 0-500 students, new

superintendents perceived that administrative assistants provided more useful support

($M = 4.10$) than business leaders ($M = 1.65$). In districts with an enrollment of 501- 5,000

students, new superintendents perceived that administrative assistants provided more

useful support ($M = 4.25$) than business leaders ($M = 2.25$). In districts with an

enrollment of 501-5,000 students, new superintendents perceived that district

administrators provided more useful support ($M = 3.93$) than business leaders ($M = 2.25$).

In districts with an enrollment of > 5,000 students, new superintendents perceived other

stakeholders provided more useful support ($M = 4.57$) than previous superintendents

(M = 2.14). H13 was supported. The effect size, as indexed by eta squared, indicated a

medium effect.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H13

Stakeholder Group	District Enrollment	M	SD	N
Administrative assistants	0-500	4.10	0.91	20
	501-5,000	4.25	1.21	28
	>5,000	3.00	1.73	7
District administrators	0-500	2.70	1.42	20
	501-5,000	3.93	1.09	28
	>5,000	3.71	1.25	7
Previous superintendent	0-500	2.55	1.70	20
	501-5,000	3.00	1.44	28
	>5,000	2.14	1.21	7
Board members	0-500	2.70	0.98	20
	501-5,000	2.89	0.96	28
	>5,000	3.71	0.76	7
Business leaders	0-500	1.65	0.99	20
	501-5,000	2.25	1.11	28
	>5,000	3.14	0.69	7
Teachers	0-500	2.40	0.99	20
	501-5,000	2.75	0.97	28
	>5,000	3.29	1.11	7
Fellow superintendents	0-500	4.15	1.113	20
	501-5,000	4.07	0.98	28
	>5,000	4.29	0.76	7
Other Stakeholders	0-500	3.25	1.21	20
	501-5,000	3.21	1.23	28
	>5,000	4.57	0.53	7

Summary

In this chapter, the results of the analyses were presented. Included in the chapter were descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis testing. A study summary, findings related to the literature, and the conclusions are included in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Interpretation and Recommendations

In the current study, new superintendents' perceptions of the helpfulness and usefulness of support from various individuals during their transition were examined. The participants of the study were in their first three years of their current position as a superintendent of schools. This chapter contains the study summary, findings related to the literature, and the conclusions.

Study Summary

School districts in Kansas have experienced a notable number of transitions in the superintendency in both rural and urban districts (USA-KS, 2024). In the current study, new Kansas superintendent's perceptions were gathered regarding the helpfulness of the support provided by the previous superintendent and the usefulness of the support from the administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders. This section contains an overview of the problem, the purpose statement and research questions, a review of the methodology, and the major findings of the study.

Overview of the Problem

The state of Kansas has experienced a high percentage of superintendent turnover in the past two years (USA-KS, 2024). Kansas school districts experienced 64 new transitions in 2022-2023 and 61 in 2023-2024 (USA-KS, 2024). As these transitions unfold, new superintendents might experience a variety of supports during their first three years. Kansas school districts have continued to experience superintendent transitions that impact the functioning of the district, relationships within the system, student

achievement in smaller school districts, and organizational priorities (Alsbury, 2008). The usefulness and helpfulness of this support could determine the impact the new superintendent has on the district they serve. The preparation of boards of education, higher education, and mentorships need to know if the support is working or not. "Given the importance and influence of the position, it stands to reason that the transition from one superintendent to the next merits thoughtful consideration" (Davidson et al., 2021, p. 25).

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The first purpose of this study was to determine the extent the previous superintendents were helpful in assisting new superintendents with the transition to the position. The second purpose of this study was to determine the extent the helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the new superintendents was affected by district enrollment and the reason for the previous superintendents' departures. The third purpose of this study was to determine the extent the new superintendents perceived the support was useful from the administrative assistants, district administrators, the previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders. The fourth purpose was to determine the extent of difference in the usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders. The fifth purpose was to determine the extent of the usefulness of the support from administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders was affected by

the district enrollment. To address the purposes of this study, five research questions were posed.

Review of the Methodology

A quantitative descriptive research design was utilized in the new Kansas superintendents' perceptions of the helpfulness and usefulness of support from various stakeholders during their transition. The dependent variables defined in this study were the Kansas new superintendents' perceptions of the helpfulness of the previous superintendent's support in assisting with the transition and the usefulness of stakeholder support (administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders). The independent variables defined in this study were district size (0-500, 501-5,000, over 5,000 students), the reason for the previous superintendent's departure from the district (retirement from the superintendency, nonrenewal or termination of contract, accepted another superintendency, accepted another position, unknown, or other), and the stakeholder category (administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders). The population for this study was current Kansas superintendents. The criteria used for selecting the sample was Kansas superintendents who were in the first three years of their superintendency from the 2021-2022 through 2023-2024 school years. The Transitions in Superintendent Leadership survey was modified with permission from Davidson (see Appendix B). An email was sent to Kansas superintendents that provided an overview of the study, stated voluntary participation in the survey completion, and included a link to the survey

collected on Google Forms. Several modifications were made to the original survey: the ranges for the district size were changed, predecessor was changed to previous superintendent, the scale was changed from a four-point scale to a five-point scale, questions were omitted, and the category "other" was changed to "other stakeholders." The researcher found the list of superintendents from the KSDE database website. Hypothesis testing was conducted using one-sample t tests, one-factor ANOVAs, and a two-factor ANOVA.

Major Findings

The researcher in the current study examined new superintendents' perceptions of the usefulness and helpfulness of various stakeholder support during their first three years in their role in Kansas and whether the helpfulness or usefulness was affected by district enrollment or the reason for the previous superintendent's departure.

- For RQ1, it was determined that new superintendents perceived the previous superintendents as moderately helpful in assisting with the transition to the position.

- For RQ2, it was determined that the helpfulness in assisting with the transition of the new superintendent was not affected by district enrollment. The helpfulness of the previous superintendents in assisting with the transition of the new superintendent was affected by the reason for the previous superintendents' departures. The retirement from the superintendency reason mean was higher than the nonrenewal or termination reason mean and higher than the accepted another superintendency reason mean. The other reason mean was higher than the nonrenewal or termination reason mean.

- For RQ3, it was determined that new superintendents perceived the support of
  - fellow superintendents and administrative assistants as very to extremely useful.
  - district administrators and stakeholders as moderately to very useful.
  - teachers, previous superintendents, and board members as slightly to moderately useful.
  - business leaders as no more than slightly useful.
- For RQ4, it was determined that there was a difference in the usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders. The fellow superintendents and administrative assistants provided very to extremely useful support. Other stakeholders and district administrators provided moderately to very useful support. Business leaders, previous superintendents, board members, and teachers provided slightly to moderately useful support.
- For RQ5, it was determined that district enrollment affected the perceived usefulness of the support among administrative assistants, district administrators, previous superintendent, board members, business leaders, teachers, fellow superintendents in other districts, and other stakeholders. In school districts with an enrollment of 0-500 students, administrative assistants were more useful in their support of the transition of the new superintendent than business leaders. In school districts with an enrollment of 501-5,000 students, new superintendents perceived the support from administrative

assistants and district administrators was more useful than the support from

business leaders. In school districts with an enrollment of more than 5,000

students, the new superintendents perceived that the previous superintendent's

support was more useful in their support of the transition than the support

from other stakeholders.

Findings Related to the Literature

In this section, the current study's findings on the usefulness and helpfulness of

support for new superintendents' perceptions are compared to those found in the

literature from other studies. Similar studies have been conducted, but few have

conducted a similar quantitative study in Kansas. This section compares the current study

findings with previous research. Hargreaves and Goodson (2006), Fink and Brayman

(2006), Jones (2011), Davidson et al. (2021), Farley (2024), and Furr (2024) have studied

superintendent transitions.

The results of the current study provide evidence that new superintendents

perceived previous superintendents as moderately helpful in assisting with the transition

to their positions, which supports the findings of Fink and Brayman (2006), Davidson et

al. (2021), and Farley (2024). These researchers found that previous superintendents were

helpful in the transition, highlighted the importance of respectful communication, and

emphasized the transition of knowledge between the outgoing and incoming

superintendents.

In the current study, the perceived helpfulness of the previous superintendent

during the transition was not affected by district enrollment. These findings align with

Davidson et al. (2021), who found that the perceived helpfulness of predecessors showed

little difference based on district size. Additionally, the current study's findings provided evidence that new superintendents perceived the support of administrative assistants and fellow superintendents as very to extremely useful, which is consistent with the findings of Davidson et al. (2021) and Furr (2024). Davidson et al. (2021) found that fellow superintendents and administrative assistants were viewed as a much greater source of support than previous superintendents, while Furr (2024) highlighted the importance for new superintendents of establishing a strong network of dependable colleagues, particularly other superintendents, for assistance and support.

Furthermore, the findings of the current study revealed that new superintendents perceived the support of district administrators and other stakeholders as moderately to very useful during the transition. These findings are like those of Jones (2011) and Davidson et al. (2021). Jones (2011) emphasized the importance of interacting with district leadership during the entry period of the transition, while Davidson et al. (2021) found that district administrators were viewed as a much greater source of support than previous superintendents. Regarding the usefulness of support from other stakeholder groups, the researcher was not able to locate comparable findings in the literature.

The current researcher found that new superintendents perceived the support from previous superintendents, board members, and teachers as slightly to moderately useful in assisting with the transition. These findings support those of Davidson et al. (2021), who found that previous superintendents were not considered a significant source of support and that new superintendents often perceived them as unhelpful. Davidson et al. (2021) found that board members and teachers were perceived as moderately useful. The findings of the current study support this finding. In contrast, the current study's finding

that new superintendents perceived business leaders as only slightly useful aligns with

Davidson et al. (2021), whose results indicated business leaders to be not at all to

moderately useful.

Kasper (1997), Hargreaves and Goodson (2006), and Davidson et al. (2021)

studied how the reasons for a previous superintendent's departure impacted the perceived

usefulness and helpfulness of support provided to the new superintendent. The findings

of the current study support these findings, showing that superintendents who retired

were perceived as more helpful than those who were non-renewed or terminated. Kasper

(1997) found that if the previous superintendent resigned under positive circumstances,

the new superintendent would have an opportunity to work with them during the

transition period. Davidson et al. (2021) found that superintendents who retired were

viewed as the most favorable group, being identified as moderately helpful. In contrast,

Hargreaves and Goodson (2006) discovered that seasoned leaders who were retiring or

moving to other opportunities were often unavailable to share their knowledge the current

study contrasted this research.

The current study's findings support those of Davidson et al. (2021), who found

that support from previous superintendents ranked at the bottom of the list of perceived

useful support by new superintendents. In contrast, fellow superintendents, administrative

assistants, district administrators, board members, and teachers were perceived as more

useful sources of support. The findings of the current study also provided evidence that

fellow superintendents and administrative assistants provided very to extremely useful

support, while other stakeholders and district administrators provided moderately to very

useful support. Business leaders, previous superintendents, board members, and teachers

were perceived as providing slightly to moderately useful support. Davidson et al. (2021) also noted that larger districts rated the helpfulness of previous superintendents slightly higher than smaller districts. Similarly, the findings of the current study indicated that in school districts with enrollments of more than 5,000 students, the support from previous superintendents was perceived as more useful in the transition of the new superintendent compared to other stakeholders.

Conclusions

The results of this study could provide support for future new superintendents, boards of education, preparation programs, state departments of education, mentoring programs, and professional organizations. The findings might provide guidance on how useful and helpful different stakeholders are for new superintendents. The following section includes implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks.

Implications for Action

The results of this study could inform individuals who plan to become new Kansas superintendents about the expected usefulness and helpfulness of support during their first three years in the role. New superintendents can use this information to understand the level of support they might receive from various stakeholders during their transition as a new superintendent in a new or current school district. Engaging with fellow superintendents in other districts and seeking support from administrative assistants can increase the likelihood of receiving very or extremely useful support. Additionally, understanding how the helpfulness of previous superintendents may vary based on the reason for their departure can better prepare new superintendents for the

type of support they will receive. The findings also provide insight into how different types of support may be more useful regardless of district enrollment size.

The current study's results could also help new superintendents better understand the impact of stakeholder support on a new superintendent's success. The findings may benefit preparation programs, boards of education, state departments of education, and mentorship programs. Preparation programs can use this information to inform aspiring superintendents about what to expect during their first three years. Boards of education will gain a better understanding of the importance of their role in providing effective support. State departments of education could use the findings to assess the effectiveness of communities in supporting superintendent success. Mentorship programs can apply this information when pairing new superintendents with mentors and determining the most effective support during the transition period.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study add to the research related to the usefulness and helpfulness of support for new superintendents in the state of Kansas. The current study included research on how different stakeholders, district size, and the reason for the previous superintendent's departure impact the new superintendent's perceptions of stakeholder assistance. Three suggestions for future research are as follows:

- One recommendation for future research includes a researcher studying the usefulness and helpfulness of support to new superintendents at the national level. The survey could be updated to include more questions regarding the superintendent's gender, the superintendent's level of confidence during their

transition, if the position they received was their ideal job, and what their
exact administrative positions were before assuming the superintendency.

- The second recommendation for future research would be to use a qualitative study to allow for interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis. The qualitative research would gain a deeper insight into the experiences behind the new superintendent's perceptions, experiences, and perspectives.

- The third recommendation for future research would be to use a mixed methods study. This research would allow a more comprehensive viewpoint of the perceptions of new superintendents. The quantitative data would gather perception data, and the qualitative data would be used to gain more insight into the experiences behind the new superintendent's perceptions.

Concluding Remarks

Turnover in school districts continues to increase at the superintendent level. Superintendents across the country have been retiring at higher rates, leaving school districts seeking replacements with a smaller number of applicants (Mullen & Mullikin, 2023). Superintendent turnover is not limited to one part of the country and affects all school districts. School district boards of education need to understand the importance of planning for a new superintendent transition and how different stakeholders will need to be leveraged to provide useful and helpful support. A stable and effective superintendent positively correlates with higher student achievement and community perception (Pascopella, 2011). Ensuring that new superintendents have the support needed to be

successful in their positions could create job retention and school district success. The time for understanding how to support our new superintendents is now.

References

Alsbury, T. L. (2008). School board member and superintendent turnover and the

    influence on student achievement: An application of the dissatisfaction theory,

    Leadership and Policy in Schools, 7(2), 202-229).

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760701748428

Bryant, M. T., & Grady, M. L. (1989). Superintendent turnover in rural school districts,

    Educational Considerations, 16(1), 33-36. https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-

    9282.1580

Chingos, M. M., Lindquist, K. M., & Whitehurst, G. J. (2014, September 3). *Schools*

    superintendents: Vital or irrelevant? https://www.brookings.edu/articles/school-

    superintendents-vital-or-irrelevant/

Collins (n.d.). School Superintendent. In CollinsDictionary.com dictionary.

    HarperCollins. https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/school-

    superintendent

Cullotta, P. (2008). *Critical dimensions of the first-time superintendency in the*

    Commonwealth of Virginia (Publication No. 304437325) [Doctoral dissertation,

    University of Virginia]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and*

    mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). Sage Publishing.

Davidson, F. D., Schwanenberger, M., & Carlson, H. (2021). Superintendents'
        perceptions of the assistance provided by their predecessors during a change in
        leadership. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, *17*(4), 24–41.
        https://www.aasa.org/docs/default-source/publications/journal-of-scholarship-
        and-practice/2021-jsp/superintendents-perceptions-of-the-assistance-provided-by-
        their-predecessors-during-a-change-in-leadership.pdf

Dlugosh, L. L. (1994). *Why administrators move: Factors contributing to the turnover of*
        school administrators in Nebraska (ED375505). ERIC.
        https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED375505.pdf

Farley, D. (2024). *A case study of superintendent leadership behaviors: Bridging the*
        transition between a new and long-serving superintendent (Publication No.
        31147441) [Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University].
        ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global

Fink, D., & Brayman, C. (2006). School leadership succession and the challenges of
        change. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42(1), 62–89.*
        https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X05278186

Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.*
        Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Furr, D. (2024). *A case study of the experiences of beginning superintendents*
        (Publication No. 30995334) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of North
        Carolina at Charlotte]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global

Gandhi, R. M. (2019). *Becoming a new superintendent of schools: Examining the Tyro transition* [Doctoral dissertation, Northwest Nazarene University]. NNU Graduate Education Dissertations Archive. ttps://nnu.whdl.org/sites/default/files/Rupak%20Gandhi%20FINAL%20DISSER TATION.pdf.

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

Grissom, J. A., & Andersen, S. (2012). Why superintendents turn over. *American Educational Research Journal*, *49*(6), 1146–1180. https://my.vanderbilt.edu/jasongrissom/files/2012/05/grissom-andersen-why-superintendents-turn-over.pdf

Grissom, J. A., & Mitani, H. (2016). Salary, performance, and superintendent turnover. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(3), 351–391 https://doi.org/10.1177/00316X15627677

Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (2006). Educational change over time? The sustainability and nonsustainability of three decades of secondary school change and continuity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *42*(1), 3–41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013161X05277975

Hutchings, G. C., Jr., & Brown, J. L. (2021). The current work of the American superintendent. In C. H. Tienken (Ed.), *The American superintendent: 2020 decennial study* (pp. 39–49). Rowman & Littlefield.

In the Life Of Group. (2022). *Updated analysis shows leadership disruption impacts almost half of nation's largest school districts*. https://www.ilogroup.com/research/updated-analysis-shows-leadership-disruption-impacts-almost-half-of-nations-largest-school-districts/

In the Life Of Group. (2024). *Assessing persisting gender disparities in k-12 education leadership*. https://www.ilogroup.com/news/new-release-finds-persistent-turnover-gender-gaps-racial-disparities-among-leadership-in-top-500-school-districts/

Jentz, B. C., & Murphy, J. T. (2005). Starting confused: How leaders start when they don't know where to start. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *86*(10), 736-743. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508601005

Jones, N. (2011). Factors contributing to successful transitions into the role of a new superintendency in Texas: A mixed methods triangulation convergence inquiry. *Administrative Issues Journal*, *1*(3), 46-48. https://dc.swosu.edu/aij/vol1/iss3/12

Kansas State Department of Education. (2023). *Kansas education reports: Kansas K-12 report generator*. https://datacentral.ksde.org/report_gen.aspx

Kasper, D. G. (1997). *Superintendent succession: An imperative for transition planning* (Publication No. 9728934) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

King, M., & Blumer, I. (2000). A good start. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *81*(5), 356-360. http://www.schtools.com/membersnew/documents/MSSAA/15-16LLP_SPL_AGoodStart.pdf

Kopicki, J. J. (2018). *The superintendency: a turbulent profession.* (Publication No. 10742866). [Doctoral dissertation, Temple University] ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008) *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences.* Corwin Press.

Martinez-Perez, I. (2005). *Factors of a successful transition into a new superintendency* (Publication No. 3180462) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Metzger, C. (1997). Involuntary turnover of superintendents. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 26(4)*, 20.

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013161X15627677

Meyer, J. N. (2013). *Turnover of public school superintendents in Arizona* (Publication No. 3606828) [Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University]. ProQuest Dissertations and These Global.

Meyers, S. P. (2010). *A multiple regression analysis of six factors concerning school district demographics and superintendent tenure and experience in 2007-2008 schools relative to student achievement on the third grade Kansas reading assessments* (Publication No. 3408143) [Doctoral dissertation. Kansas State University]. Pro Quest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Mullen, B., & Mullikin, J. (2023, October 18). *3 ways districts can find and develop leaders to solve the superintendent shortage*. The 74 Million.

https://www.the74million.org/article/3-ways-districts-can-find-develop-leaders-to-solve-the-superintendent-shortage/

Natkin, G., Cooper, B., Fusarelli, L., Alborano, J., Padilla, A., & Ghosh, S. (2002). Myth of the revolving-door superintendency. *School Administrator*, *59*(5), 28–31 (EJ644936). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ644936

National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). *Common core of data: search for public schools*. Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/

Pascopella, A. (2011). Superintendent staying power. *District Administration*, *47*(4), 31-36 (EJ929893). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ929893.pdf

Parker-Chenaille, R. (2012). *The impact of superintendent turnover on student achievement in rural districts* [Doctoral dissertation, St. John Fisher University]. St. John Fisher College Digital Archive. https://fisherpub.sjf.edu/education_etd/157

Peetz, C. (2023, August 23). More superintendents are quitting as school year begins. *Education Week*. https://www.edweek.org/leadership/more-superintendents-are-quitting-as-school-year-begins/2023/08

Riordan, C. (2008). Navigating through leadership transitions: Making it past the twists and turns. *Ivey Business Journal, 72*(3), 1-9. https://iveybusinessjournal.com/publication/navigating-through-leadership-transitions-making-it-past-the-twists-and-turns/

Rosenberg, D., (2022, February 24). *Checking the data: Superintendent turnover is high and rising*. Education Resource Strategies. https://www.erstrategies.org/news/school_superintendent_turnover

Russell, R. L. (2012). *Successful transition planning for incoming school superintendents: A qualitative study of best practices and strategies* (Publication No. 3537430) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global

Sackett, P. R., & Larson, J. R. (1990). Research strategies and tactics in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnett, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organization psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 419-489). Consulting Psychologist Press.

Sanaghan, P., & Lytle, J. (2008, January). Creating a transition map for a new superintendency: 7 powerful strategies. *New Superintendents E-Journal (1)*, 2-6. Retrieved from https://www.scribd.com/document/432357701/Creating-a-Transition-Map-for-a-New-Superintendency-7-Powerful-Strategies

Schwanenberger, M., Carlson, H., & Davidson, F. D. (2020). Transitioning with integrity and foresight. *School Administrator*, *77*(4), 34-37. https://my.aasa.org/AASA/Resources/SAMag/2020/Apr20/Schwanenberger-Carlson-Davidson.aspx

Schwartz, N., Kang, H., Loeb, S., Grissom, J., Bartanen, B., Cheatham, J., Chi, O., Donaldson, M., Lemos, R. F., Mellon, G., Moffitt, S., Nurshatayeva, A., Owens, J., Pinker, E., White, R., & Zimmerman, S. (2023). *Studying the superintendency: A call for research*. https://annenberg.brown.edu/publications/studying-superintendency-call-research

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (5th ed.). Currency.

Sharp, W. L. (1994). *Superintendent vulnerability and the bottom line* (ED384117). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED384117.pdf

Shields, B. A. (2002). *A review of the literature on administrator turnover: Why they move on or are displaced* (ED464404). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED464404.pdf

Tekniepe, R. J. (2015). Identifying the factors that contribute to involuntary departures of school superintendents in rural America. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 30(*1), 1-13. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273063385_Identifying_the_Factors_that_Contribute_to_Involuntary_Departures_of_School_Superintendents_in_Rural_America

United School Administrators of Kansas. (2022, July 25). *22-23 Superintendent changes*. Retrieved on January 12, 2023, from https://www.usakansas.org

United School Administrators of Kansas (2024, January 19) *23-24 Superintendent changes.* Retrieved on January 23, 2024, from https://www.usakansas.org

Watenpaugh, M. R. (2007). *Strategies used by successful superintendents during the first 90–180 days as perceived by experienced superintendents* (Publication No. 3322848) [Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Watkins, M. (2003). *The first 90 days: Critical success strategies for new leaders at all levels*. Harvard Business School Press.

Wildman, J. (2020). *Superintendent transitions: Planning for the expected* (Publication

No. 27831167) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Global].

ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Wenger, E. (1998) Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity. *Journal of

Mathematics Teacher Education*, *6*, 185-194.

https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023947624004

Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis

& D. v. Day (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (3rd ed., 29-55). Sage.

Zalaznick, M. (2024, September 10). *Superintendent turnover: New data show reasons

for recent move.* https://districtadministration.com/superintendent-turnover-new-

data-show-reasons-for-recent-moves/

Appendices

Appendix A: Permission to Use the Survey

From: Susan Rogers <Susan.Rogers@bakeru.edu>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL]RE: Superintendents' Perceptions of the Assistance
Provided by Their Predecessors During A Change in Leadership
Date: June 9, 2022 at 7:37:24 AM CDT
To: JoshuaNSnyder <JoshuaNSnyder@stu.bakeru.edu>

Susan K. Rogers, Ph.D.
Baker University
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Education
P.O. Box 65
Baldwin City, Kansas 66006
Mobile: 785-230-2801

Follow us on Social!

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Frank David Davidson <Frank.Davidson@nau.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 8:18 AM
To: Susan Rogers <Susan.Rogers@bakeru.edu>
Subject: [EXTERNAL]RE: Superintendents' Perceptions of the
Assistance Provided by Their Predecessors During A Change in
Leadership

*CAUTION: This email originated from outside Baker University. Do
not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender
and content are valid. If you are unsure, please use the phish button
to report the email and it will be reviewed*

Good morning, Dr. Rogers –

I'm happy to share the survey, and grant permission for its use, in
whole or in part. It was developed in collaboration with recently-
transitioned superintendents and with superintendents in the
process of transitioning. I did not conduct any reliability tests, so
that data is not available.

Appendix B: Permission to Edit the Survey

Wed 1/11/2023 6:05 PM

FD

Frank David Davidson <Frank.Davidson@nau.edu>

[EXTERNAL]Re: Transitions in Superintendent Leadership Survey

To   JoshuaNSnyder

Cc   Susan Rogers

ℹ️ You forwarded this message on 4/11/2023 3:46 PM.

Hi Joshua -

Congratulations on moving forward with your research. You have my permission to make the modifications you've stipulated. Good luck, and please let me know if I can be of any assistance.

- Frank Davidson

_____

Frank Davidson, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
Northern Arizona University - Tucson

On Jan 11, 2023, at 4:57 PM, Joshua N Snyder <JoshuaNSnyder@stu.bakeru.edu> wrote:

Dr. Davidson,

Good evening, on January 21st, 2021 you gave Dr. Susan Rogers (my dissertation advisor) permission to use the Transitions in Superintendent Leadership Survey in whole and part for future research. I am completing my dissertation on the usefulness and helpfulness of support given to new superintendents in the state of Kansas.

Would you grant permission for me to make the following changes to the survey:

1. On Question 11, I would like to change the size of the districts to 0-500, 501-5,000, and over 5,000 students.
2. In Questions 15, 16, and 17, I would like to change the word predecessor to previous superintendent.
3. On Question 19, I would like to change the scale to a five-point scale (not at all useful, somewhat useful, useful, very useful, extremely useful, not applicable).
4. On Question 19, change "Others" to "Other Stakeholders."

Thank you for your consideration of these changes. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Joshua Snyder
Doctoral Candidate
Baker University

Appendix C: Original Survey

Transitions in superintendent leadership

Q1. You are being invited to participate in a research study titled Preparing for transitions in superintendent leadership. This study is being done by Frank Davidson, Michael Schwanenberger, and Howard Carlson from Northern Arizona University. The purpose of this research study is to survey superintendents in an effort to gain insights regarding the assistance and support provided by outgoing superintendents that are of greatest benefit in promoting a successful transition. If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey/questionnaire. This survey/questionnaire will ask about your experiences with superintendent transitions and it will take you approximately 5 minutes to complete. You may not directly benefit from this research; however, we hope that your participation in the study may provide helpful insights into transition experiences that could be instructive in designing learning experiences for practicing and aspiring superintendents. We believe there are no known risks associated with this research study; however, as with any online related activity the risk of a breach of confidentiality is always possible. To the best of our ability your answers in this study will remain confidential. We will minimize any risks by refraining from collecting any personally-identifiable information. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time. You are free to skip any question that you choose. If you choose not to participate it will not affect your relationship with Northern Arizona University or result in any other penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you have questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the principal investigator, Frank Davidson, at 520-560-8501. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact Northern Arizona University IRB Office at irb@nau.edu or (928) 523-9551.

○   By submitting this survey, I affirm that I am at least 18 years of age and agree that the information may be used in the research project described above.
Q2. In what U.S. state is your school district located?

○   Arizona

○   California

○   Florida

○   Kansas

○   Michigan

○   Minnesota

○   Washington

Q3. In what type of district are you a superintendent?

○   Pre-K-12

○   Pre-K-8

○   9-12

○   County or Regional

○   Technical or Vocational

○   Other _____

Q4. How many years have you been in your current position?

○   0-1 year

○   2-5 years

○   6-10 years

○   11-15 years

○   16-20 years

○   Over 20 years

Q5. How many years have you served as a superintendent?

○   0-1 year

○   2-5 years

○   6-10 years

○   11-15 years

○   16-20 years

○   Over 20 years

Q6. In how many different districts have you been a superintendent?

○   1

○   2

○   3

○   4

○   5 or more

Q7. How many years have you been in the field of education?

◯ Less than 10 years

◯ 11-20 years

◯ 21-30 years

◯ 31-40 years

◯ Over 40 years

Q8. How many years have you served as a teacher?

◯ 0-1 year

◯ 2-5 years

◯ 6-10 years

◯ 11-15 years

◯ 16-20 years

◯ Over 20 years

Q9. How many years have you served as an administrator?

◯ 0-1 year

◯ 2-5 years

◯ 6-10 years

◯ 11-15 years

◯ 16-20 years

◯ Over 20 years

Q10. What is your gender?

◯ Male

◯ Female

◯ Prefer not to say

Q11. What is the current enrollment in your school district?

○ Under 1,000

○ 1,000 - 4,999

○ 5,000 - 9,999

○ 10,000 - 19,999

○ 20,000 or more

Q12. Which of the following best describes your district?

○ Urban

○ Suburban

○ Rural

Q13. How soon do you plan to retire from the superintendency?

○ Within 1-2 years

○ Within 3-5 years

○ Within 6-10 years

○ Not within the next 10 years

Q14. In what capacity were you employed prior to your current position?

○ as a principal in my current district

○ as a principal in another district

○ as a district administrator in my current district

○ as a district administrator in another district

○ as a superintendent in another district

○ other position _____

Q15. If known, what was your predecessor's primary reason for leaving the position?

○ Retirement from the superintendency

○ Nonrenewal or termination of contract

○ Accepted another superintendency

○ Other _____

Q16. On a scale from 0 (not at all helpful) -10 (extremely helpful), how helpful was your predecessor in assisting you with the transition to your current role?

○   0

○   1

○   2

○   3

○   4

○   5

○   6

○   7

○   8

○   9

○   10

Q17. In what areas did your predecessor provide insights and/or advice? (Check all that apply)

☐   Personnel

☐   Board relationships

☐   District goals and strategic objectives

☐   School improvement plans

☐   Potential or ongoing legal action (including pending complaints to state or federal regulatory agencies)

☐   Upcoming elections

☐   Initiatives related to curriculum, instruction, and assessment

☐   Other _____

Q18. Are there any comments you would like to make regarding assistance you received from your predecessor?

Q19. Please indicate the usefulness of the support that you received from the

following positions when you transitioned to your current position.

	Extremely useful	Moderately useful	Not at all useful	Not applicable
Administrative Assistant(s)	○	○	○	○
District Administrator(s)	○	○	○	○
Previous Superintendent	○	○	○	○
Board Members	○	○	○	○
Business Leaders	○	○	○	○
Teachers	○	○	○	○
Fellow Superintendents in other Districts	○	○	○	○
Students	○	○	○	○
Others	○	○	○	○

Q20. Are there any comments you would like to make regarding the support you

received from the positions listed above?

_____

Q21. In general, please rate the level of trust that you believe others have in you:

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Terrible
Governing Board	○	○	○	○	○
District administrators	○	○	○	○	○
Community leaders	○	○	○	○	○
Principals	○	○	○	○	○
Teachers	○	○	○	○	○

Q22. In general, please rate the level of trust that you have in others:

	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Terrible
Governing Board	○	○	○	○	○
District administrators	○	○	○	○	○
Community leaders	○	○	○	○	○
Principals	○	○	○	○	○
Teachers	○	○	○	○	○

Q23. In relation to other priorities, how high of a priority were board relationships

when you first transitioned to your current position?

	Much higher	About the same	Much lower
Importance of Board relations compared to competing priorities	○	○	○

Q24. What steps does your district currently take to prepare future
leaders? (Check all that apply.)

☐   Potential candidates for future openings have been identified.

☐   A district team identifies leadership needs and develops plans for
developing leaders.

☐   Verbal encouragement is provided to potential future leaders.

☐   Our district offers leadership-development training to aspiring leaders.

☐   Our district assigns mentors to individuals with leadership potential.

☐   Other _____

Q29. Please type your email address below if you are interested in taking part in a
30-minute follow-up telephone interview related to administrator transition and
succession.

_____

Appendix D: Transitions in Superintendent Leadership Survey

Transitions in Superintendent Leadership Survey

Thank you for volunteering to participate in the Transitions in Superintendent Leadership Survey. This survey consists of seven questions. You should be able to complete the entire survey in approximately 5 to 7 minutes. Your responses will remain anonymous and will be combined with the responses of other superintendents. Data from this survey will be used to extend research into the current practices and policies regarding superintendent transitions.

Q1 How many years have you been in your current position?

○ 0-3 years

○ More than 3 years

Q2 How many years have you served as a superintendent?

○ 0-1 year

○ 2-5 years

○ 6-10 years

○ 11-15 years

○ 16-20 years

○ Over 20 years

Q3 In how many different districts have you been a superintendent?

○ 1

○ 2

○ 3

○ 4

○ 5 or more

Q4 What is the current enrollment in your school district?

○ 0-500 students

○ 501-5,000 students

○ over 5,000 students

Q5 If known, what was the previous superintendent's primary reason for leaving the position?

○ Retirement from the superintendency

○ Nonrenewal or termination of contract

○ Accepted another superintendency

○ Accepted another position

○ Unknown

○ Other _____

Q6 On a scale from 1-5, how helpful was the previous superintendent in assisting you with the transition to your current role?

○ 1-not at all helpful

○ 2- slightly helpful

○ 3-moderately helpful

○ 4-very helpful

○ 5-extremely helpful

Q7 Please indicate the level of usefulness (not at all useful to extremely useful) of the support that you received from the following positions when you transitioned to your current position.

	Not at all useful	Slightly useful	Moderately useful	Very useful	Extremely useful
Administrative Assistant(s)	○	○	○	○	○
District Administrator(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Previous Superintendent	○	○	○	○	○
Board Members	○	○	○	○	○
Business Leaders	○	○	○	○	○
Teachers	○	○	○	○	○
Fellow Superintendents in other Districts	○	○	○	○	○
Other Stakeholders	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix E: Institutional Review Board Approval

Baker University Institutional Review Board

April 10, 2024

Dear Joshua Snyder and Susan Rogers,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.
6. If this project is not completed within a year, you must renew IRB approval.

If you have any questions, please contact me at skimball@bakeru.edu or 785.594.4563.

Sincerely,

Scott Kimball, PhD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
    Tim Buzzell, PhD
    Steve Massey, EdD
    Jiji Osiobe, PhD
    Susan Rogers, PhD