

ABSTRACT

HOGANS, CORY H. Learning to Lead: Principals' Perceptions of the Principalship Using Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation. (Under the direction of Lance Fusarelli.)

The purpose of this study was to ascertain elements contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction respectively in the principalship, utilizing the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory as a framework. An established tool used within the Herzberg framework called the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey was used by this study in an attempt to determine characteristics correlated to satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the principalship.

The methodology employed for this study was an electronic survey. The 35 item survey was delivered to practicing principals across the state of North Carolina as identified in the public database of principals maintained by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Five hundred sixty-three principals representing all levels responded to the survey. Survey results were analyzed for trends utilizing descriptive statistics.

The findings indicated that participating principals were generally satisfied with their job as principals with salary scoring as a contributing item to dissatisfaction. These findings appeared to hold true across the demographic variables gathered through the survey instrument. It is recommended that further study be conducted given some of the limitations of this study, namely that the survey be conducted on a larger scale and that participation in the survey be mandatory for practicing principals.

Learning to Lead: Principals' Perceptions of the Principalship Using Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation

by
Cory H. Hogans

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Educational Administration & Supervision

Raleigh, North Carolina

2013

APPROVED BY:

Lance D. Fusarelli, Ph.D.
Chair of Advisory Committee

James Bartlett, Ph.D.

Paul F. Bitting, Ph.D.

Kevin Brady, Ph.D.

BIOGRAPHY

Cory Horne Hogans was born at Tyndall Air Force Base in Florida. After spending his early schooling in Florida and in United States Department of Defense Schools in Hanau, Germany and Darmstadt, Germany, Cory moved to North Carolina at a young age where he completed studies at Spring Lake Junior High School in Spring Lake, NC, and graduated from Pine Forest Senior High School in Fayetteville, NC, both near Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Cory graduated high school having earned a North Carolina Teaching Fellows Scholarship. Cory attended North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University where he met and later married the love of his life, Danita Mason, and mother of their two children, Akinlabi and Akanke. Following his graduation from NCA&TSU in 1993 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Secondary English Education, Cory began his career in 1994 teaching English at James B. Dudley High School in Greensboro, NC. Desiring to be closer to family, Cory and his wife relocated to Chapel Hill, NC in 1996. Cory would later join the teaching staff at East Chapel Hill High School in 1997 teaching English. In 2000, Cory earned a Principal Fellows Scholarship to pursue a Master of Administration degree, which he earned from North Carolina State University in 2002. Cory next served as assistant principal of Frank Porter Graham Elementary in Chapel Hill, NC from 2002 until 2004. He accepted the appointment to serve as principal of Morehead Elementary in Durham, NC in 2004. Cory has most recently served as principal of Little River Elementary from 2012 to the present. Cory currently resides with his wife Danita, and their two children, Akinlabi and Akanke, in Durham, NC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| Chapter One | 1 |
| Background of the Study | 1 |
| Purpose of the Study | 5 |
| Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Motivation | 6 |
| Research Questions | 8 |
| Brief Overview of the Study | 9 |
| Significance of the Study | 10 |
| Summary | 11 |
| Chapter Two..... | 14 |
| Review of Literature | 14 |
| Role of the Principalship..... | 15 |
| Leadership Competencies | 19 |
| Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Motivation | 24 |
| Job Satisfaction Among Principals | 29 |
| Summary | 35 |
| Chapter Three..... | 37 |
| Methods..... | 37 |
| Research Design..... | 38 |
| Research Questions | 40 |
| Description of the Population..... | 41 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Research Procedures | 41 |
| Instrumentation | 42 |
| Data Collection | 45 |
| Data Analysis | 46 |
| Research Validity and Reliability | 46 |
| Limitations of the Study..... | 47 |
| Summary..... | 49 |
| Chapter 4: Results..... | 51 |
| Introduction..... | 51 |
| Description of Sample..... | 51 |
| Reliability Measure of the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey | 56 |
| Crosstab Summary of Responses on Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey | 57 |
| Correlation between Demographic Information and Survey Responses on Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in the Principalship | 70 |
| Summary..... | 97 |
| Chapter Five: Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations | 98 |
| Introduction..... | 98 |
| Conclusions..... | 99 |
| Discussion..... | 104 |
| Implications..... | 105 |
| Recommendations..... | 110 |
| For Future Study | 110 |

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| For Practice | 111 |
| Conclusion | 112 |
| REFERENCES | 114 |
| APPENDIX..... | 122 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: <i>Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Data for Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction</i> | 44 |
| Table 2: <i>Frequencies and Percentages Breakdown of Respondents' Demographic Characteristics</i> | 54 |
| Table 3: <i>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Statistics of Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey</i> | 57 |
| Table 4: <i>Frequency and Percentages Breakdown of Survey Responses on Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in the Principalship</i> | 62 |
| Table 5: <i>Pearson's Correlation Rest Result</i> | 87 |

Chapter One

Background of the Study

Arguably the principalship is one of the toughest jobs in education, yet it has been viewed as one of the most critical roles in supporting student achievement (U.S. News & World Report, 2003). This binary between tough and critical has not made the job appealing to aspiring principals in large enough numbers to meet the growing demand for committed, highly qualified candidates. Moreover, it appears that more candidates are likely to fail in their principalship precisely because of the demands and challenges of the role. Given this, however, the support to principals engaged in this critical work has been inconsistent, contributing to the challenges faced by principals (Daresh, 2004). Despite the number of individuals who possess principal licensure, fewer numbers are lining up to heed the call and more numbers of those who might report as successful are lining up to leave the principalship—all because of the challenges and demands of being a principal (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003, p. 1). Although jokingly, the following job description hints at the very real challenges and demands:

Seeking school principals: Qualifications: Must be faster than a speeding bullet, more powerful than a locomotive, able to leap tall buildings in a single bound; must communicate in multiple languages. Ability to be in more than one place simultaneously, to perform miracles and to walk on water highly desirable. Blue uniform with tights and cape furnished by employer. (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003, p. 1)

Daresh further comments,

[T]he shortage of future principals predicted in the mid–1980s to the mid–1990s has now arrived. School districts and numerous state education agencies have noted that not only are there significant numbers of practicing administrators leaving the profession, but there are fewer educators showing any interest in pursuing careers as school administrators. In short, there is a value and a need to look into more effective approaches for the development of educational leaders. (Daresh, 2004, p. 496)

Daresh's 2004 comment verifies a trend predicted by a 1998 study of elementary and middle school principals conducted by the National Association of Elementary School Principals which found that the 42 percent turnover that has existed during the ten years prior to the referenced study would likely continue into the next decade.(Hertling, 2001). This study further noted that these shortages occurred among all types of schools (rural, urban, suburban) and among all levels (elementary, middle, high school), suggesting that filling principalship vacancies with qualified candidates would continue to be a concern for schools (Whitaker, 2001). In a separate study, the National Association of Secondary School Principals reported a 50 percent turnover in U.S. principalships during the 1990s, and noted that another 40 percent will turn over by 2010 (Whitaker, 2001). Whitaker further notes a study conducted in Utah found that half of surveyed districts reported principal shortages at all levels while still another 1999 University of Minnesota study estimated that by 2010, approximately 75 percent of principals in that state will be lost through retirement or attrition despite growing student enrollment (2001).

The National Association of Secondary Principals documented in a report published in 2007 the extent to which the principalship has changed. Among other changes, the classroom has expanded into virtual learning domains, safety concerns continue to be a focus since the Columbine High School shootings, and No Child Left Behind continues to mount accountability pressures. Principals are not merely managers of the physical plant in which adults work and children study fixed outcomes, but are coordinators of the instructional program in which both adults and children are expected to learn in a continuous cycle of improvement (NASSP, 2007).

Principals must be active to ensure students meet standards (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). Too little attention, however, is focused on the working conditions under which principals must labor to attain these goals: too few rewards, low pay, job stress, and long hours. Human resource directors and superintendents identify these as reasons there are not enough qualified individuals applying for principal positions (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003). Principals are community leaders who must possess strong interpersonal skills who are able to effectively communicate with a wide range of stakeholders, all the while motivating them to continuously strive toward the common work of the school, still maintaining the physical plant, inculcating 21st century technology standards, ensuring the health, safety, and well-being of all students and adults in the school, and meeting local, state, and federal academic standards in a consistent manner (NASSP, 2007).

With the continual rise in student enrollment and the consequent growth in schools,

there is a need for more principals as well as a need to support currently practicing principals. Nearly 40% of active principals are retiring (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2007). Principals who report as being successful state that the motivation for accomplishing the aforementioned aims must be intrinsic given the demands and challenges of the principalship. Could the challenges and demands of the principalship be the explanation for the shortage of credentialed applicants? Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation offers a framework for helping to possibly answer this question (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003).

This investigation surveyed a group of practicing principals on their job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. This study utilized Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation as a framework for analysis. There is a shortage of individuals willing to accept the growing challenges of the principalship. This study is important to add to the body of leadership studies on the principalship (Hansford & Ehrich, 2006).

This investigation explored the leadership behaviors of principals and motivation of principals. Leadership studies have widely examined leadership behavior and motivation, the goal of which is to highlight a way to cultivate exemplary leadership traits, practices, and characteristics as well as to highlight how to create a culture of stakeholder participation around organizational aims (Jacques, Garger, & Thomas, 2008). The work of Frederick Herzberg in his Two-Factor Theory has been seminal in this field of study in the areas of leadership and motivation (Deshields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship through the examination of their causes as identified by practicing principals using the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey (Wood, 1976). The research is needed for several reasons. First, research will assist novice principals in navigating the principalship by offering data on what the new practitioner will experience, thereby improving principal effectiveness. Principal leadership is a strong determinant of school effectiveness (Adamowski, Bowles-Therriault, & Cavanna, 2007). However, novice principals, given their lack of experience despite credentials, have to build their capacity for quality leadership over time (Hansford & Ehrich, 2006).

Given that the school principal—being charged with the care and stewardship of teaching and learning—gives the school tone and character, data gleaned from this study might help superintendents in hiring and supporting novice principals, provide information for aspiring principals about the challenges of the principalship, and help show that many of the challenges of the principalship are universal.

The second reason behind this study is to identify job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers, as identified by practicing principals, to compel constructive and meaningful growth in the role for the practitioner as expressed in the field. In establishing the lifestyle of the organization that produces a successful operation, things have to get done and it is the role of the principal from which this springs (Hansford & Ehrich, 2006). When everyone understands the processes put in place by such leadership to accomplish the goals of the school

organization, principal leadership is successfully actualized (National Association of Elementary School Principals [NAESP], 2008). The leader's fundamental objective should be to induce people to define their values so meaningfully that they can be moved to purposeful action for the organization. Consequently, how the behaviors of successful principals—analyzing the use of time, planning time, setting priorities and establishing balances, delegating, and concentrating on the problem at hand, all while dealing with people and resources—become a non-imposing leadership practice that inspires stakeholder participation is a chief goal.

A prevailing notion is that self-development is the essential starting point for leadership improvement: determine and set goals; determine the size of the job to be done; determine how to do the job; and become determined to get the job done. However, novice principals need to learn how to do this without becoming overwhelmed, autocratic, or too heavily reliant on positional power. Successful principals develop an attitude toward analysis, planning, setting priorities, delegating, concentrating and finishing tasks, an attitude that allows them to spend time on the important aspects of the principalship such as supporting constructive relationships among stakeholders, supervising what is good for teaching and learning, and managing the resources of the school to sustain these endeavors (Gawlick, 2008).

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation

According to Herzberg, individuals are not content with the satisfaction of lower-order needs at work, for example, attaining a minimum salary or safe and pleasant working

conditions. Rather, individuals look for the gratification of higher-level psychological needs having to do with achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, and the nature of the work itself. Herzberg proposed a two-factor theory of motivation, based on the notion that the presence of a certain set of job characteristics or incentives leads to worker satisfaction, whereas a different set of job characteristics leads to worker dissatisfaction. Thus, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not on a continuum, with one increasing as the other diminishes, but are independent phenomena (Herzberg, 1959). This theory suggests that to improve job attitudes and productivity, administrators must recognize and attend to both sets of characteristics and not assume that an increase in satisfaction leads to a decrease in dissatisfaction.

The two-factor theory asserts that job characteristics related to what an individual does—that is, to the nature of the work he or she performs—apparently can gratify such needs as achievement, competency, status, personal worth, and self-realization, thus making him or her happy and satisfied. However, the absence of such gratifying job characteristics does not appear to lead to unhappiness and dissatisfaction. Instead, dissatisfaction results from unfavorable assessments of such job-related factors as company policies, supervision, technical problems, salary, interpersonal relations on the job, and working conditions. Thus, if management wishes to increase satisfaction on the job, it should be concerned with the nature of the work itself—the opportunities it presents for gaining status, assuming responsibility, and for achieving self-realization. If, on the other hand, management wishes to reduce dissatisfaction, then it must focus on the job environment—policies, procedures,

supervision, and working conditions. If management is equally concerned with both, then managers must give attention to both sets of job factors (Herzberg, 1959).

Research Questions

In education, the principal has been identified as the embodiment of school leadership working to achieve the singular organizational aim of schools: student achievement. Within the area of educational leadership studies, much attention has been given in recent years to the role of the principal, yet little has been done in the areas of job satisfaction for practicing principals or job dissatisfaction for practicing principals. This study aimed to add to the body of leadership studies by endeavoring to explore this area via the following research questions:

1. What are principals' perceptions of job satisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?
2. What are principals' perceptions of job dissatisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?

Across North Carolina, there are school principals who work tirelessly in the service of students. Each confronts unpleasant or dissatisfying aspects of their job with optimism. Fueled by motivating or satisfying experiences and aspects of their practice, they work to achieve their organizational goals. The importance and challenges of principal leadership in student performance have been much discussed in the literature; second to teacher quality, principal leadership is core to school success (Adamowski, Bowles-Therriault, & Cavanna, 2007). This study joins the discussion by adding the voices of practicing principals in an

effort to provide the best insight into study of what constitutes job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship.

This study aimed to assist practicing principals in being aware of job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers for professional improvement, as each builds leadership capacity while navigating the principalship. The leader brings to the principalship job skills, abilities, understanding, and values that influence performance. These qualities are influenced by a combination of expectations from internal forces (teachers and other administrative personnel, clerical staff, maintenance, parents of children in school, children in school, residents of the school area), external-internal forces (board of education, superintendent, central office staff, district office personnel, and other principals), and external forces (professional groups, colleges and universities, business personnel, accreditation agencies, and governmental agencies like police and social welfare workers) (Jacques, Garger, & Thomas, 2008). The researcher asserts that foreknowledge of how these forces are universal to the landscape that all principals—regardless of experience, level, or credential—must navigate, prepares principals to create plans to aid them in developing professional development to help them to leverage job satisfiers and to handicap job dissatisfiers to maximize their respective performance as principals.

Brief Overview of the Study

This quantitative study surveyed principals in an effort to identify sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. To identify members of this population, this study utilized the public database of practicing principals in the state of

North Carolina maintained by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. The author of the study sent to this population an electronic questionnaire wherein each provided information to match the project definition as subject and information about their respective leadership practices. Their responses were examined for trends. This investigation not only added to the body of existing research on the principalship but will be helpful to novice principals as well as to leadership preparation programs to enable them to improve the professional training of principals.

Significance of the Study

This study sought to add to the literature on the principalship and to improve in-service training for principals. The significance of this study was to ascertain job satisfaction among select principals currently practicing in North Carolina. Their job satisfaction was derived from investigating certain aspects of job satisfaction and job dissatisfactions according to Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation. This study sought to use descriptive research methodological design as described by Merriam and Simpson (2000). The study was designed to systematically describe the facts and characteristics of a given phenomenon, population, or area of interest. The description includes (a) collections of facts about existing phenomena, (b) identification of problems or justification of current conditions and practice, (c) project or product evaluation, and (d) comparison of experience between groups with similar problems to assist in future planning and decision making. In this instance, the phenomenon of interest is how practicing veteran principals might express job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. The descriptive research methodology

was employed to collect the characteristics that describe several existing phenomena of practice.

Summary

Roland Barth, former director of the Principal's Center at Harvard University, posits about how new principals--novice beginners as well as experienced veterans in new schools—go about crafting a successful principalship:

How does one prepare for one of the most important and difficult positions in our society? By taking courses. By observing mentors. By learning the job. By talking with other principals (Alvy & Robbins, 1998, p. xiv).

The author of this study seeks to facilitate such a conversation. The work of principals is too critical to student outcomes to not attempt to add to the conversation constituting the body of research on the principalship (Daresh, 2004).

Research has documented how the principalship has matured and changed over the years from being a manager and disciplinarian (of adults and children) to one whose evolving focus has become that of the instructional leader (Daresh, 2004). Principals must be the manager, instructional leader, supervisor, disciplinarian, public relations coordinator, police and community liaison all the while sustaining and bolstering a school environment that compels teachers to love coming to work and instills in children a love of learning. As stated earlier, this is no simple challenge. Most candidates who might be qualified have responded resoundingly, 'Not me.' Researchers have observed that there is not a shortage of individuals who are credentialed to serve as principals but far fewer seek positions as principals

(Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003). In many states, teachers who possess principal licensure receive a pay increase on state salary schedules regardless of whether or not they become principals.

Within the context of the body of literature on the principalship, there needs to be an exploration into how principals navigate the demands and challenges that inspirationally conveys the opportunity for success and achievement in the role. This is what the author of this study hoped to begin to accomplish with this investigation, which posited that if a group of practicing principals were surveyed as to the job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers of their practice, much of what would be shared would reveal rich data on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. This investigation utilized an electronic questionnaire wherein each participant was provided information to match the project definition and information about their respective leadership practice. Their replies were examined for commonalities. This study added to the literature on the principalship.

The investigation opened with an overview of the background of the study. The author stated that the study is important because it seeks to add to the body of research on the principalship. The author also stated that given there is a shortage of candidates willing to take on the challenges of the principalship, that the study is important in that for those navigating the challenges of the principalship it is vital for the practitioner to know what are the common factors producing job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg's Two Factory Theory Motivation--of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction--serves as the theoretical framework for the study and is the foundation upon which the research questions are based.

The author of this study further clarified the purpose of the study. The author identified the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey as the instrument to be used in surveying participating principals because of its thematic connection to Herzberg's analytical model (Wood, 1976). Finally, the author identified three supports undergirding the purpose of the study: it will assist novice principals by offering data on survey responses; it will identify job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers of the principalship; and it will increase awareness of practicing principals of the factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

This review of select literature presents information related to aspects of the principalship as related to the research questions organized into the following thematic headings: the role of the principalship; leadership behaviors of principals; motivation theory in the principalship; Herzberg's research and the principalship; and job satisfaction in the principalship. The literature selected also explores job satisfaction of principals as it relates to size and location of school. Leadership studies have widely examined leadership behavior and motivation, the goal of which is to highlight how to cultivate exemplary leadership traits, practices, characteristics, and how to create a culture of stakeholder participation around organizational aims (Jacques, Garger, & Thomas, 2008). Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation has been seminal in this field of study in the areas of leadership and motivation (Desields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005).

In education, the school principal has been identified as the embodiment of school leadership working to achieve a significant organizational aim of schools: student achievement. Within the area of educational leadership studies, much attention has been given in recent years to the role of the principal, yet little has been done in the area of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for practicing principals. This study aims to add to the body of leadership studies by exploring the following research questions:

1. What are principals' perceptions of job satisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?

2. What are principals' perceptions of job dissatisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?

Role of the Principalship

The role of the principalship has evolved based on school management functions. Research in leadership studies shows that there are core competencies to successful leadership (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Looking into the development of the nature of the role of the principalship conveys how these competencies have become the standard expectation of what a principal should be able to do (Murphy, 2006). In the 1800s, the principal of the schoolhouse was simply the lead teacher who was also responsible for opening and closing the school and for the care of the building. From the early twentieth century through the post-World War II era, the principalship grew from an autonomous manager to a manager working within a set and defined hierarchal structure. It followed that the individuals who sought and attained roles of leadership were born leaders; leadership was not cultivated. The 1970s brought the notion that the leadership ability of principals could be acquired and developed, leading to the discipline of instructional leadership. However, leadership in the principalship was still transactional: leaders received mandates and then presented them to the staff.

In the 1990s, the idea that leadership in the principalship needed to be transformational blossomed. The leadership role of the principalship became increasingly about leading an organization through a process by which collectively the organization establishes its vision, mission, and goals (Goodwin et al., 2005; Grubb & Flessa, 2006;

Pierson, 2008; Portin, 2006). This leadership approach has come to be characterized as transformational leadership.

Murphy (2006) examines the development of the principalship in looking at the writings as well as scholarship and research surrounding the principalship from its turn of the century origins to the present. In particular, he focuses on the development of principal preparation programs as a response to the needs of practitioners. Murphy tracks the trends in the development of the principalship as going through a series of eras, periods of time marked by particular characteristics of school leadership from the ideological to the managerial.

Admittedly, the principalship is a difficult role for which there is arguable preparation for its complexities. Eighty percent of superintendents and 69 percent of principals surveyed by Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007) thought that leadership training in university certification programs was not in sync with the realities faced by most school districts. Hansford and Ehrich (2006) further found that principal training in the modern era is in some respects an “uncoordinated approach,” while Thomas and Barnes (2007) stated bluntly—if not cynically—that the principalship is “undoable” in the modern context.

There is a shortage of individuals willing to take on the challenge of the principalship (Daresh & Capasso, 2006; Page, 2006). Its challenges are numerous:

For better or worse, public school principals are best viewed as middle managers in a much larger system of public education. They do not have the luxury of acting like

CEOs, boldly leading their schools in new directions. Rather, their primary role is to buffer their schools and staffs from external pressures while meeting the demands placed upon them by district, state, and federal policies. (Adamowski et al., 2007, p. 25)

Adamowski et al. (2007) presented seven core functions of school leadership. Duties include determining the number and type of faculty and staff positions, hiring faculty and staff, assigning faculty and staff, transferring and/or discharging unsuitable faculty and staff, allocating resources, allocating time for instruction, and determining student discipline procedures. The two most important elements to student achievement, both of which are identified as significant foci of schools, are teacher quality and principal leadership (Adamowski et al., 2007).

Improving teacher quality is the most critical function of the principalship and results from the supervisory role of the principal. Improving teacher quality translates specifically to getting rid of unsuitable teachers. Yet, improving the quality of the principalship appears to be, in most instances, the responsibility of the practitioner and not governed by a supervisor-supervisee relationship (Adamowski et al., 2007). Collins (2005) observed that this dichotomy persists despite the demands of leadership evolving beyond simply carrying out the “directives of central administration,” for the principal’s duties include not only management but also direction. Districts seem to operate under the belief that leaders are simply born rather than cultivated. To this point, Collins observed that principals seem to have a great deal of responsibility in the care and education of children, yet are not closely

supervised (Collins, 2005). Hansford and Ehrich (2006) correlated this dichotomy to poor principal preparation and support. They found that principals exercise a great deal of autonomy and little professional development. Instead, according to Hansford and Ehrich, what often is allowed to persist is the business-as-usual model of principalship: “long hours, lots of night work, lots of conflicting demands from various stakeholders for not that much more than what an experienced teacher receives,” and bottom-line expectations that do not speak to the complexity of the role that schools play in the lives of communities (Hansford & Ehrich, 2006, p. 37).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 2008) noted that of all the things that schools do for populations, continuous learning is the “core business” of education and principals are the catalysts for this learning. They also noted the following:

Traditional leaders may have considered their jobs to be solely the managers of schools, ensuring that daily operations run smoothly. But the current social and educational context—which combines high-stakes accountability with the ideals of supporting social, physical, and emotional needs of children—demands that all principals demonstrate the vision, courage, and skill to lead and advocate for effective learning communities in which all students reach their highest potential.

(NAESP, 2008, p. 11)

Hence, the NAESP (2008) wrote that principals should be able to place student and adult learning at the core, set high expectations for the academic, social, emotional, and physical development of students, ensure student achievement based on agreed-upon standards, create

a culture of continuous learning, manage data and information to inform school performance, and actively engage the community to create shared responsibility for student performance and development.

Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) appeared to agree with the NAESP in that these duties of school principals contribute significantly to the concept of continuous learning. In addition, they can be learned and cultivated, provided there is sustained support for leadership development of principals (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007).

Leadership Competencies

Leadership can be learned. Hay (2007) suggested that balancing the overwhelming duties of school leadership is the key to quality leadership practice. Competencies to address the managerial duties of school leadership are as vital as facilitating the direction of the school program (Hay, 2007). Practitioners find this balance outside of a supervisor-supervisee relationship and have attempted to define effective leadership by looking at leadership in the business and military context (Collins, 2005). However, Collins acknowledged that schools serve a unique function in our society. Leadership competencies in schools should address those unique aspects in particular. Business and military norms should not be the model for public education, as schools have their own unique environments (Collins, 2005).

The climate that a principal fosters is vital to teaching and learning and therefore critical to school success. School staff acknowledged, and research concurs, that a principal's leadership style affects the climate of a school. A positive school climate is correlated to

constructive student development, and learning underscores the principal's influence in this process. Five specific principal behaviors are key in instituting a constructive school culture: being trustworthy, forthrightness in problem solving, loyalty, interest in teambuilding, and having engaging interpersonal skills. How a principal chooses to employ these behaviors toward accomplishing school success is a matter of leadership style in practice, referring to how a leader crafts his or her practice to accomplish a given set of outcomes, bringing together tools of skill, experiences, and positional authority. Principals learn to become successfully transformative by reflecting on their experiences. Management is subsumed into leadership. Every action in the school must support student learning, and all resources must be used wisely and efficiently to support the essential core of instruction. The principal directs this process through leadership practice, the quality of which impacts outcomes (NAESP, 2008).

According to Gray and Streshly (2008), effective principals set goals, are ethical, define explicit strategies to solve problems, and focus on the solutions. Moreover, in order for a principal to make successful choices in a given situation, the principal must be a reflective practitioner. The authors found that highly successful principals build trust, promote participative governance, and manage by being visible. Further, most principals learn to be successful in this way by developing a constructive approach to their leadership role on the job:

The highly successful principal is modest, builds trusting relationships, possesses unwavering resolve, is professional, is a cheerleader for student potential and the

ability of the school to reach it, is disciplined, confronts brutal facts, is persistent in getting the right people and has ambition for the success of the school. (Gray & Streshly, 2008, p. 9)

Adamowski et al. (2007) underscored these findings by stating that most principals tend to accept the difficulty of the principalship and learn how to engage the hierarchal structure of which they are a part:

District principals in general accept these limitations as immutable realities associated with their jobs. Instead of battling them, principals develop tactics to work with, through, or around them. The tactics differ depending upon the principal and the local context, but the common denomination was developing positive working relationships inside and outside the school building. In other words, know the right people and know how to work the system. (Adamowski et al., 2007, p. 32)

So, in some respects, Gray and Streshly (2008) observed that individuals who attain the role of principal are forced to cultivate leadership competencies on their own without much supervisory support. Adamowski et al. (2007) noted that individuals who attain the principalship accept this reality and proceed in their practice by flowing with the ambiguity inherent in the managerial and leadership duties of the principalship.

Yet, given increasing demands, dwindling resources, and questionable leadership development, principal motivation to face this ambiguity is key. Bassett-Jones and Lloyd (2005) found that motivation to do a good job is arguably the singular most important enigma that a principal must solve to attain mission success. This can be accomplished by working

with staff in a school setting and core to facilitating the continuous learning cycle that the NAESP found vital for school success. Carr (2007) observed that there is no formula for good leadership, but “maintaining open lines of communication is a good start and being willing to answer questions, provide feedback, encourage creative expression and deliver frequent praise lets staff know in sincere and meaningful ways that they are doing a good job.” (p. 6) Bassett-Jones and Lloyd (2005) noted that motivation is about achievement, recognition for achievement, responsibility, and personal growth. Koltoko-Rivera (2006) found that leadership addressed motivation through behavior, stating that the work of leadership becomes how to fulfill and direct higher needs of staff through motivation.

Leadership can be cultivated; current education reform establishes that transformational leadership is demanded of the principal of today. Whereas managers seek directions from above, leaders seek to make a cooperative school culture where everyone has a responsibility to lead and make important choices (Gawlick, 2008; Marzano, Walters, & McNulty, 2005; NAESP, 2008; Raymer, 2006). There is a difference between the needed transformational leadership and the transactional style that passed for leadership in previous eras. Transactional leadership takes a more managerial approach by delineating tasks and offering rewards, while transformational leadership involves working with external environments. Usually, achievement is realized within the organization that maps new directions, obtains resources, and responds to present and future challenges. Eberlin and Tatum (2008) utilized the metaphor of watching a street parade to explain the difference between transactional and transformation leadership:

There are two unique perspectives when viewing a parade: distal (rooftop view) and proximal (street view). If one views the parade from the distal perspective (rooftop view), one gains a more global understanding of the parade, seeing the larger picture and overall direction. This rooftop view is the essence of transformational leadership. In contrast, one who views the parade from the proximal perspective (street view) may forgo the broad perspective gained by observing from the rooftop (global understanding), but instead is able to see the subtle nuances not accessible from the rooftop view. This street view is characteristic of the transactional leader. (Eberlin & Tatum, 2008, p. 312)

So, leadership becomes directing the activities of a group toward a common goal (Hsien-Wen & Grier, 2008). The behavioral theory of leadership identifies two aspects of leadership: concern for the task and concern for the people. Successful leaders use multiple leadership styles to bring about desired results for followers in a given situation (Jacques et al., 2008). Leadership style becomes the key to successful performance of a school. A quote from sports coach Rick Pitino underscores the point:

The only way to get people to like working hard is to motivate them. Today, people must understand why they're working hard. Every individual in an organization is motivated by something different. (Carr, 2007, p. 6)

Jacques et al. (2008) posited that leaders can be made rather than be merely born, as suggested by the "great man" view of leadership. Furthermore, a reflective practitioner identifies the problem, responds to the problem, frames and reframes the problem, posits

reasons for the problem, and actively evaluates the outcome of addressing the problem by utilizing various models and tools to support reflection. Individuals in managerial roles like the principalship can accomplish inspired leadership only through a process of self-reflection and sharing, yet the way principals are trained and supported leaves them with few opportunities to develop other than through trial and error.

Schools are dynamic environments with a crucial purpose. School leaders cannot depend solely on leadership by command and control through the strength of their personality. School heads are charged with leading the educational process and often forced to go it alone without guidance. School leaders must reacquaint themselves with the world of their stakeholders constantly, must explore in the presence of these stakeholders, must reach out and touch these people they are presuming to lead, and must, occasionally at least, risk making a mistake rather than doing nothing. For a novice principal or even a veteran principal in a new school, this can create stressors to job satisfaction.

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation

Jones (2007), Smith (2008), and Johnson (2009) clarified the internal dynamics involving people within organizations, their motivation to work, and the focus of assessing staff motivation in the leadership practice of the principal. However, to a large extent, the framework of this study relies heavily on Herzberg's model of motivation. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation has become standard in exploring job satisfaction and motivation (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Deshields et al., 2005; Herzberg, 1959; Stello, 2011). Herzberg's theory posits that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are separate

phenomena that are not directly related to one another.

As an idea, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation has been researched extensively across the field of human resource development since its first appearance in 1959 (Stello, 2011). It has been applied in various ways to education in particular, in both K-12 and higher education settings, examining the motivations of students and adults alike. In its history, it has been the subject of vibrant commentary amongst scholars—some studies purporting to validate its contentions while others challenge them.

The two decades following the publication of the two-factor theory were marked by replication, analysis of the original study, and academic debate about the validity of the study. It was also a period of prolific publication on the topic. In the 1980s, publication on the two-factor theory became an occasional article mostly found outside the field of HRD. In the mid-1990s, the two-factor theory again gained popularity both within HRD and in other fields. Some still discuss the controversy, while others now regard the theory as an established and valid framework. (Stello, 2011, p. 22)

The author goes on to assert in her review of the scholarly commentary on Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation that the practical implications of applying the theory far outweigh any concerns about its established legitimacy. With his framework, Herzberg provided a means through which scholars could uncover new ideas about job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Stello, 2011).

Given that much has been written about Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of

Motivation, several recent studies are worth particular note to this study. Shockley, Watlington, and Felsher (2011) used Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation as the theoretical framework for analysis in their study of the effectiveness of teacher induction programs over the last decade. Their purpose was to identify the essential elements that make such programs effective in reducing teacher attrition. They found that comprehensive induction may not be as effective as believed with hygiene and motivational factors possibly confounding results. Still, of note to this project proposal is the extent to which the study by Shockley, Watlington, and Felsher was able to support the theory in an educational setting with some degree of success.

Another recent study found greater resonance of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory in an educational setting. Katt and Condly (2009) found affirmation of the same psychological growth factors serving as motivators that Herzberg outlined as well as that pain avoidance factors tended to serve as hygiene factors in their application of Herzberg's theory to questions about student motivation. Their study sought to begin answering two simple questions, as is the similar design of this project proposal: "What motivates our students?" and "What prevents our students from being motivated?" (2009). Herzberg's theory holds that people's motivation stems from the desire to grow psychologically and the desire to avoid pain or unpleasantness; Katt and Condly found that similar patterns are present in the classroom in regards to student motivation. Broadly, the researchers found in this theory a succinct way of understanding student motivation.

Similarly but more comprehensively, Saglam (2007) examined academics' viewpoints

according to sex, academic title, and professional seniority in a study utilizing Herzberg's theory to find out the effect of hygiene and motivation factors in motivating the staff. With promise as to what this project proposal also aims to do in disaggregating trends in responses of K-12 principal leadership along expressed demographic profiles, Saglam found, among other things, that hygiene and motivation factors in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory are important in the motivation of the academic staff as well as hygiene factors are valuable in motivation, and that basic conditions such as physical work conditions, salary and other incomes, work assurance, and good interpersonal relations must be given importance. |

Dufour (1986) credits Fredrick Herzberg as the standard for research on motivation of employees. Most significantly, Dufour asserts, Herzberg countered the dominant thinking that salary was the chief motivating factor for employee motivation to work and brought to light several factors that could potentially contribute to employee satisfaction as well as employee dissatisfaction (Dufour, 1986). Dufour further found that Herzberg's later replication of his original study further engrained his theory into contemporary views in work motivation studies. Dufour further utilizes Thomas Sergiovanni's replication of Herzberg's study with teachers as an observation that Herzberg's theory is applicable in the field of education when exploring the question of motivation in work.

There are two sets of factors for job satisfaction and motivation. The first set consists of satisfiers, or motivators, that, if met, result in high job satisfaction. The second set is dissatisfiers, or hygiene factors, that if not met, cause high job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959). In Herzberg's model, motivators are typically intrinsic factors considered "a part of

job content,” whereas hygiene factors are extrinsic and considered “under the control of the supervisor” or principal in a school setting (Deshields et al., 2005, p. 132).

The following hygiene factors tend to contribute to dissatisfaction: policy, supervision, relationship with supervisor, work conditions, salary, and relationship with peers. The following motivators tend to contribute to satisfaction: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth (Herzberg, 1959; Hopkins, 2005).

The foundation of human motivational theory consists of a hierarchy of human needs that range from basic to advanced and that decrease in potency as development progresses or growth is achieved. Human beings possess a multitude of needs that are instinctive or innate. Satisfaction of certain of these needs is continual. Moreover, Maslow is credited with fully developing this “hierarchy of needs” concept (Koltoko-Rivera, 2006; Maslow, 1943). The higher the need, the later it emerges in life; higher-order needs are less related to survival; satisfaction produces deep happiness, peace of mind, and richer inner life, whereas higher-order needs require more preconditions for their emergence and satisfaction than lower-order needs.

Herzberg tested the concept that humans possess two sets of needs: (a) the need as an animal to avoid pain, and (b) the need as a human being to grow psychologically. As a result of having interviewed 200 engineers and accountants, he formulated a conceptual structure that is termed “the motivation-hygiene theory.” Motivation factors are satisfiers that lead to job satisfaction because of the need for growth or self-actualization, whereas hygiene factors essentially are dissatisfiers that describe the environment and serve primarily to

prevent job satisfaction while having little effect on positive job attitudes. Hygiene even leads to job dissatisfaction because of the need to avoid unpleasantness. Five factors stand out as strong determiners of job satisfaction: (a) achievement, (b) recognition, (c) work itself, (d) responsibility, and (e) advancement. By contrast, five factors serve to produce job dissatisfaction: (a) company policy and administration, (b) supervision, (c) salary, (d) interpersonal relations, and (e) working conditions (Herzberg, 1959).

These two clusters of job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers carry two central themes. While one cluster of factors relates to the work being performed, the other relates to the situation or the conditions under which the performance occurs. The dissatisfiers describe the environment and serve to prevent job satisfaction. While having little effect on positive job attitudes, they have been named hygiene factors. The satisfier factors have been named motivation or motivator factors since they are effective in motivating the individual to high-quality performance (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005).

Job Satisfaction Among Principals

Within the managerial context of a principal's leadership is influence, necessitating some understanding of human behavior. Whereas the field of psychology is well over a century old, the close study of leadership is recent and not part of management philosophy in general. It is clear that leadership and management are tied together in the principalship. The historical role of the principalship is an outgrowth of school management functions such as budgeting and enforcing rules, regulations, and timelines. Executing this aspect of the role of principal requires a level of expertise that defines success in the job. Some researchers

have spent extensive time outlining the managerial functions within a principal's leadership responsibilities. In considering the questions of interest to this study, it is vital to look at the principalship within both its managerial and leadership contexts in order to contextualize how successful principals comment on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. A number of studies have found variables that are correlated to high job satisfaction among educators.

Establishing the looming principal shortage in the face of increasing federal and state mandates, Pengilly (2010) sought in his study to find what attracts principals to the job of the principalship. His study surveyed principals in California from elementary, middle, and high schools. He found that satisfaction levels reveal that superintendents, hiring panels, and district personnel may continue to struggle to attract and sustain principals as the budgetary constraints and on-going pressure for achievement continue. Still, Pengilly found, for those who take on the call, success in the role will be contingent upon how the practitioner reconciles the various responsibilities and prerequisite leadership skills of the principalship. Practitioners will need to constantly evolve with their talents, individual needs and desire to succeed as the trends continue to change while being influenced by the changing environment (Pengilly, 2010). Pengilly's research supports improving satisfaction levels of practitioners by identifying what contributes to high satisfaction levels to improve the ability of the practitioner to experience success in the principalship.

Somewhat more promising is a study conducted by Oliver (2003) wherein he investigated the job satisfaction and desire to pursue the principalship of practicing assistant principals in Orange County, California. He found, despite the aforementioned

shortage and challenges facing the principalship, that over two-thirds of those responding are satisfied with their jobs and desire to become principals. Within the context of this study proposal, the author's belief is that if job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction factors are made explicit, superintendents, hiring panels, and district personnel may struggle less to attract and retain principals as the budgetary constraints and on-going pressure for achievement continues to challenge the principalship.

In a study by Oplatka and Mimon (2008), the researchers sought to unearth subjective interpretations of women principals concerning job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in their career and to examine whether their interpretations differ from common constructions of job satisfaction developed outside the field of education. They found job satisfaction is constructed in a negative sense while job dissatisfaction is perceived to be vital for effective principals. In addition, they found that high task accomplishment, innovativeness, and critical reflection were correlated to satisfaction levels. Within the context of the current project proposal, some framework taking into account the nature of the constituent elements of the principalship is necessary to gain insight into job satisfaction levels.

As stated earlier, Dufour (1986) and Sergiovanni (1967) connected Herzberg's theory to the work of teachers and education leadership respectively. Two studies by Else and Sodoma (1999, 2009) focused on job satisfaction among principals using Herzberg's theory. Else and Sodoma conducted two studies in 1999 and 2005 respectively to examine the job satisfaction of public school principals in Iowa, and, in the later study, to contrast the satisfaction levels noted between the two studies using Herzberg's theory as a framework.

The study examined public elementary, middle, and high school principals. Participants were surveyed via questionnaire wherein each was asked to respond to a set of questions noting demographic characteristics and to a set of questions indicating their level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction according to a scale. Their findings revealed, among other things, that principals were more satisfied with hygiene factors than with motivators in both studies; hence, of the principals involved, more principals are motivated by factors related to achievement and growth than any other motivators. In asserting a connection between leadership practice and motivation of teachers in school organization as critical, Dufour (1984) foreshadows the importance of the transformational leadership style. The author of this study asserts that a transformational leader is a motivated leader:

The implication for a principal seeking to motivate staff members seems clear— simply give teachers more freedom in what they teach and how they teach and how they teach it and watch their morale improve. However, before closing himself or herself in the office, secure in the knowledge that a laissez-faire approach to instruction is certain to improve morale, a principal would be well served to review...the most consistent finds of the effective schools research is that effective schools have strong principals who take an active interest. (Dufour, 1984, p. 35)

There is a connection between leadership and job satisfaction. Other researchers have looked at school leadership and job satisfaction. Alzaidi (2006) found that the number of years of experience seems to be a factor in the job satisfaction of principals. This study sought to identify factors which might impact secondary head school teachers' job

satisfaction in the city of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Using a mixed methods approach, the author identified several themes into which satisfaction and dissatisfaction fell: relationship with educational administration; head teacher's practices; school environment; relationships with students and parents; head teacher's authority; relationship with educational supervisors; and relationships with teachers. The author found that factors causing dissatisfaction were: lack of authority to transfer underperforming teachers; lack of finance and manpower for the cleaning of school buildings; lack of financial resources to improve school buildings; salary; poor revenue from school meals as a financial resource; and lack of financial rewards. In addition to this study, a number of select studies have been found that noted a strong correlation between job satisfaction and leadership (Nir & Kranot, 2006; Richards, 2005; Turner, 2006; Wheelis, 2005).

Nir and Kranot (2006) emphasized in their study the positive job experiences that promote an individual's satisfaction on the job and how a transformational leadership style impacts the experiences. Questionnaires were distributed to a population of teachers in several Israeli school districts with the permission of principals. This study found that a transformational leadership style was only as effective as the satisfaction levels of teachers (Nir & Kranot, 2006). In asserting that a transformational leadership style is most effective and having noted that teaching and learning in the 21st century demands transformational leadership, this find further underscores the author of this study's assertion that a transformational leader is a motivated leader.

Another study by Richards (2005) was a follow up to an earlier study by Richards wherein the perceptions of teachers of principals' leadership styles were correlated to their motivation to stay in teaching. Divided into groups according to their level of experience, teachers of K-8 students were surveyed as to their attitudes about characteristics of principal practice. The survey identified the top five behaviors of principals that tend to contribute to positive teacher motivation: respects and values teachers as professionals; an open door policy; is honest and trustworthy; supports teachers with parents; and supports teachers in matters of student discipline (Richards, 2005).

Another study aimed to assess job satisfaction of middle school principals in upstate South Carolina utilizing the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Turner, 2006). The general question was to determine the general satisfaction of the targeted principals according to a set of demographic characteristics. Through descriptive statistics, the author found significant relationships between the demographic variable and the general satisfaction of the examined principals (Turner, 2006). Yet another study examined the relationship between school performance and principal job satisfaction (Wheelis, 2005). Utilizing descriptive statistics, the study surveyed elementary, middle, high, and PK-12 public school principals in Louisiana using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The author found that satisfaction of principals not only could be correlated to demographic characteristics, but could also be correlated to the principal's view of his or her managerial tasks (Wheelis, 2005). Clearly, researchers have looked at school leadership and job satisfaction, uncovering variables correlating the two.

Some literature suggests that the principalship shortage is experienced differently by varying types of schools—urban, suburban, and rural—as well as grade levels—elementary, middle and high school, which may impact job satisfaction as well as student performance. A 2003 study by DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran found that elementary assistant principals are almost twice as likely to pursue a principal position as high school assistant principals are (65% compared with 34%). Pijanowski, Hewitt and Brady (2009), when urban and rural communities are compared based on the National Center for Education Statistics' urban-centric locale codes, stark differences in principal applicant pools stand out.

While rural schools experience low applicant numbers, urban schools and schools with higher percentages of students who perform at lower academic levels are more likely to have principals who bring fewer years of administrative experience to the position and who attended less-competitive undergraduate colleges. Large urban centers are most likely to have the quality of their applicant pools affected (p. 86).

Summary

Recent research has devoted much attention to the principalship in the area of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction impacts the intrinsic motivation needed to have a successful principalship, and, given what research has found as the critical role that principals play in schools, is worthwhile to explore. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation has been established as a standard in exploring job satisfaction. It provides a lens through which job satisfaction in the principalship might be analyzed, continuing the convention of using practicing principals of varying levels of experience to offer insight into the principalship.

This study seeks to add to the body of leadership studies that seeks to explore job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the principalship and to improve in-service training for principals.

Chapter Three

Methods

To address the research questions of this study, the project will be to ascertain job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of select practicing principals to be derived from investigating the role through certain aspects of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation: job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, job functions, and job qualifications. Sources of job satisfaction will be identified in the set of respondents as defined by Herzberg's motivation factors: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and personal growth. Sources of job dissatisfaction will be identified in the set of respondents as defined by Herzberg's motivation and hygiene factors: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, personal growth, supervision, interpersonal relationships, physical working conditions, salary, district policy and administrative practices, benefits/personal life, and job satisfaction. This differs from looking at satisfaction and dissatisfaction as opposite extremes of a continuum and posits that the continuums for satisfaction and dissatisfaction respectively are separate and distinct. To further highlight how the data retrieved from the respondents highlight correlations that address the research questions, demographic data on the principals will be gathered: age, race, gender, self-report about principalship success or challenge, type of school, years of experience, and academic credentials.

Research Design

This study sought to use a descriptive research design as described by Merriam and Simpson (2000). Descriptive research involves recording phenomena in human situations as close to the natural state or occurrence of the phenomena as possible. In the instance of the research design of this study, the recording of phenomena was the self-reporting of the survey respondents. The resulting gathered data was used to make judgments about trends in habits or morale and was used to identify variables around the phenomena to help draw possible correlations (Merriam & Simpson, 2000). Descriptive statistics is the most widely used methodology in the social sciences (Babbie, 1995). The researcher chose survey research within the descriptive statistics methodology because of its practicality to the design of the study. Because of a range of factors including time frame, access to resources, focus of questions, and location of target population, most doctor of education students who conduct quantitative studies utilize survey research (Watson, 1998).

Babbie (1995) found that survey research is the optimal procedure for gathering data for describing a very large target group, one too large to observe directly. This study sought to survey principals across the state of North Carolina. The researcher determined that utilizing an electronic survey would best yield results from the target population. In order to reach such a large group, the researcher chose to utilize email and Survey Monkey. Thach (1995) states that email surveys are appropriate when: the population has email access, the researcher has access to targeted networks, and the researcher has the support to create and administer the instrument. Email surveys are inexpensive, easy to revise, and participation

can be easily adduced (Thach, 1995).

This study also employed the tailored design method in its implementation of the survey instrument, following procedures for web survey implementation outlined by Dillman (2009) in his work *Internet, Mail, and Mixed Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. For web, email surveys, Dillman (2009) suggests sending an introductory letter via email, followed by the survey itself, and then followed by a reminder. These procedures increase the likelihood of an increase response rate. The tailored design method bases its techniques on social exchange theory, which attempts to give explanation as why people do things for others. Dillman applies its principles to conducting surveys like the design for this proposal to offer researchers with a methodology for survey implementation designed to maximize response rates. This methodology emphasizes rules to minimize total survey error and techniques to establish rapport with the respondent(s) in effort to increase incidence of response and to minimize the burden placed on the respondent (Dillman et al, 2009).

Broadly, descriptive research is a grouping of methodologies such as observation, survey, and self-report (Merriam & Simpson, 2000).. This study utilized survey research due to its ability to best enable reliable responses to the research questions. Due to the size of the target population and the challenge in observing them directly, the survey procedure is the best fit for this study (Babbie, 1995). In addition, because it allows for gathering data without any manipulation of the research context, it non-intrusively allows for addressing naturally occurring phenomena in human situations. In addition, data collection affords an opportunity to gather data from large groups spread across a large geographical area. For social science

fields like studies in leadership, descriptive research is the most widely used type of research method in adult education research designs (Merriam & Simpson, 2000).

The study was designed to systematically describe the facts and characteristics of a given phenomenon, population, or area of interest. The description includes: (a) collections of facts about existing phenomena, (b) identification of problems or justification of current conditions and practice, (c) project or product evaluation, and (d) comparison of experience between groups with similar problems to assist in future planning and decision making. The descriptive research methodology will be employed to collect the characteristics that describe several existing phenomena of practice. Some strengths of descriptive research are that it allows for the study of relationships or events as they happen in human life situations, for the production of data that are accurate and representative of what is, and for the discovery of additional variables that may be uncovered that could shed new light upon the examined phenomenon (Gay, 1987).

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed:

1. What are principals' perceptions of job satisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?
2. What are principals' perceptions of job satisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?

Description of the Population

The targeted population of concern for this study was the group of practicing principals of the nearly 100,000 schools in the K-12 public education system in the United States (USDoE, 2011). The population surveyed by this study consisted of practicing principals in the state of North Carolina. This population qualified as being representative of the larger, targeted population due to their respective credentialing for serving as principals. The survey was sent to 2,143 contacts, each currently a practicing principal in a North Carolina K-12 public school; the survey served as a census of the entire referenced population to be surveyed. The author of the study collected demographic information on the respondents to analyze trends in responses as they related to the research questions. In order to collect relative pertinent data from the population, a survey instrument was used in the form of an online questionnaire through a web-based program called Survey Monkey. The questionnaire included elements and items used by previous researchers without adaptation to gather the data that would address the research questions.

This online questionnaire consists of 35 question items and 13 demographic items incorporating the recommendations for reliability and validity presented by Merriam and Simpson (2000), which included variation in design but focused on the research problem or questions.

Research Procedures

This descriptive research study used a survey instrument in the form of a questionnaire. The questionnaire was e-mailed to the population. Included in the email

invitation was a cover letter, instructions to complete the questionnaire within a set time period after receiving it, and a thank-you comment. When the data was collected, it was compiled for statistical analysis for findings to answer the research questions. For participants who did not reply within a set time period, a follow-up email notice and invitation was emailed. Throughout the process, the response rate was monitored. Babbie (1995) asserts that for mail surveys, a fifty percent response rate is the minimum acceptable rate for analysis and reporting while sixty percent is good and seventy percent is very good. In a study on acceptable electronic survey response rates, Kaplowitz, Hadlock, and Levine (2004) assert that electronic survey response rates are comparable to mail surveys provided the survey is carefully designed. Upon receipt of each questionnaire, the data will be coded using tools in the Survey Monkey program designed for such purposes, as well as advanced tools in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Instrumentation

The questionnaire survey is called the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey. Targeting a sample of North Carolina community college instructors, Wood (1976) sought to explore the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of this population. At the time of the study, North Carolina was facing an increasing number of individuals leaving faculty positions in community colleges, creating a shortage of instructors at this level. The design of the study required demographic information, items representative of the factors of the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory of Motivation, and a single item of overall job satisfaction (Wood, 1976). The goal of Wood's study was to design an "instrument

suitable for use in measuring the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction” (Wood, 1976, p. 56). The Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey includes elements and items used by Herzberg. The survey can be found in the Appendix. Select items queried symptoms that might determine the respondents’ perceived job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction and symptoms that might determine how the job itself would tend to foster job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. In addition, demographic information will be collected for cross tabulation to derive pertinent data for analysis. The Wood Survey measures ten areas of job satisfaction based on Herzberg’s theory. It contains three parts: demographic, job dimension, and overall job satisfaction. Wood (1973) established reliability and validity in his dissertation, *An analysis of faculty motivation to work in the North Carolina community college system*. Wood ran reliability coefficients for internal consistency and test-retest data for each dimension of Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory and concluded that it had an “adequate level of refinement, validity and reliability” (Monagan, 1981, p. 58). Monagan presented a table, offered below as Table 1, summarizing the internal consistency and test-retest data as found by Wood (1981).

Table 1

Internal Consistency and Test-Retest Data for Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

| Sub-Scale | Number of Items | Internal Consistency Coefficients | Test Retest Coefficients |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Achievement</i> | 7 | .81 | .91 |
| <i>Growth</i> | 7 | .86 | .85 |
| <i>Interpersonal Relations</i> | 8 | .93 | .92 |
| <i>Policy and Administration</i> | 8 | .95 | .95 |
| <i>Recognition</i> | 5 | .85 | .94 |
| <i>Responsibility</i> | 6 | .88 | .90 |
| <i>Salary</i> | 6 | .92 | .93 |
| <i>Supervision</i> | 11 | .96 | .95 |
| <i>Work Itself</i> | 5 | .86 | .90 |
| <i>Working Conditions</i> | 6 | .87 | .95 |
| All Sub-scales | 69 | .98 | .99 |

Note: Reprinted from *Job satisfaction of Dietitians in the Army Medical Specialist Corps* by C.F. Monagan, 1981, Ohio State University: Columbus, Ohio.

Validity was established in this same study by Wood by factor analysis and verification by a panel of judges. The survey utilizes a 6-point Likert scale rating system from “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied.” Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction along this scale. The sections of the scale were scored by adding the scores for each item and then dividing by the number of items on the scale to yield a respondent’s job satisfaction score in each factor (Monagan, 1981).

A great deal of social science investigation falls within the general rubric of observation and analysis of more than one statistical variable at a time (Babbie, 1995). In any

case, findings (attributes) are represented through simultaneous associations for age, gender, education, and other demographic information. Furthermore, such representations are displayed in contingency tables or cross tabulations in frequency distributions and intuitive formats. The two research questions relate to sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship according to Herzberg's theory. The data will be collected, compiled, coded, and then analyzed.

Data Collection

Processes by which collected data was analyzed included construction of charts, tables, and graphs as the case dictates and in ways that demonstrate percentages, frequencies, attributes, and characteristics. The researcher utilized the computer program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) consistent with descriptive statistics; SPSS is one of the most widely used software programs in the social sciences. In order to successfully complete the study, the researcher needed statistical analysis, data management, and data documentation, all of which are features of the software. The survey itself was administered utilizing Survey Monkey, a web based program that enabled the researcher to create a web-survey, manage administration of the survey via email, adduce participation, and upload compiled data into an advanced program like SPSS for substantive analysis.

Attention was also be paid in this study non response bias issue. Miller and Smith state that "questionnaires require sound procedures to produce sound results." (Miller & Smith,, 1983, p. 49) With care taken to utilize a previously established survey instrument that has had its reliability and validity properly vetted, the author feels confident to generalize the

results to the larger population and to answer the question that the results of the survey would likely be the same as “if a 100% response rate” would be achieved, regardless of the actual response rate (Linder, 2001).

Data Analysis

Data was displayed via cross tabulations in an effort to note correlation of demographic variables to survey responses. Cross tabulation provided a matrix display of trends in the data and also enabled the researcher to note the frequency of occurrence of certain attributes and characteristics of the target population in order observe trends in the data. The researcher sought not only to answer the research questions through such analysis but also to derive attributes, perspectives, trends, outcomes, and to consider other directions in which the data may lead. The analysis and interpretation was the basis for conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

Research Validity and Reliability

Each participant completed the Wood Survey, which is based on Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory (Wood, 1976). This survey deals with demographic variables, job dimensions, and job satisfaction. It was chosen due to its applicability to the research questions. Wood (1973) established reliability and validity in previous studies utilizing factor analysis and verification by a panel of judges. The Wood Survey has undergone extensive analysis by its creator and has been found to be a reliable and valid instrument to survey job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Wood, 1973, 1976). According to Wood in his 1976 study,

review of the procedures used in the development of the instrument, the results of factor analyses, reliability coefficients for internal consistency and test-retest, and recommendations from a panel led to the conclusion that the validity, reliability, and level of refinement of the instrument were adequate for the collection of the research data. (p. 58)

In their 1984 study of job satisfaction of community college professionals in North Carolina, Ridey, Bingham, and Harvey (1984) cited Wood's 1973 work as having found test-retest reliability coefficients for the composite scales to range between .79 and .98. They further point out that validity had been established by factor analysis and verification by a panel of judges (Ridey, Bingham, & Harvey, 1984). Additionally, in their later 2000 study of community college professionals, Murray, Murray, and Summar (2000) utilized the Wood Survey citing its aforementioned, previously established reliability and validity, citing also previous studies having utilized the Wood Survey. Evidence for the validity of the Wood Survey is derived mainly from its performing according to expectations in the noted studies, or its construct validity. Construct validity is the extent to which an instrument can be shown to measure the construct being studied (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003).

Limitations of the Study

Although this dissertation research project was carefully prepared, there still exist limitations in its attempt to fulfill its research aims. First of all, the survey window impacted the survey response rate. Although care was made in timing the survey so that it did not appear burdensome to the schedules of participants, the fact that the researcher sought responses

from currently practicing principals who live very busy lives and may have viewed the invitation to participate in the survey as yet one more thing to do might have impacted the number of responses as well as the quality of the responses. Future researchers may find it better if the survey window was open for a longer time and future researchers may get a higher response rate and higher quality of response if the survey itself was a part of a larger principal satisfaction survey effort, much like the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey. To be straightforward, this study calls that a Principal Working Conditions Survey be implemented. Without the same backing force of the expectations of superintendents, human resource departments and state level education office enjoyed by the Teacher Working Conditions Survey, a study like this one would fall subject to the whims of the respondent. Second, the sample population was broad.

It was the aim of the researcher to determine through disaggregating the demographic profiles of the participants a representative sample of the total population of practicing principals in North Carolina in an effort to make generalizations about the principalship. Future researchers may find it helpful to continue to conduct research along the lines of these questions relevant to demographic characteristics and how these may impact job satisfaction in the principalship. A Principal Working Conditions Survey implemented as mentioned above would help create data sets that future research could mine and track for trends relative to satisfaction levels across demographic variables over multi-year periods. The benefits to future research—and inevitably future practice—would be invaluable. Third, unforeseen elements arose from the research design which might have revealed unanticipated directions

in the data. For example, there are a large number of correlations in the data set from which generalizations may be difficult to glean. Simply, there are a large number of them; hence, they must be interpreted with caution. What may be statistically significant in the data set may not be practically significant for generalizing about future research and practice. Future research may find this noteworthy as such phenomena presents in the data. Fourth, the Wood survey was done in 1976 and focused on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of community college faculty. This may be a limitation given that this study has a focus on satisfaction in the principalship rather than in higher education faculty. Still, thirty years ago community colleges were essentially extensions of high school and so still may have some relevance. Finally, since the research design conducted by the author himself speaks to issues encountered in his own leadership practice as a principal in North Carolina, it is unavoidable that in this study, a certain degree of subjectivity may be found.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to ascertain job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction among select principals currently practicing in North Carolina. Their job satisfaction derived from investigating certain aspects of job satisfaction and job dissatisfactions according to Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation. This study sought to use descriptive research methodological design as described by Merriam and Simpson (2000). The study was designed to systematically describe the facts and characteristics of a given phenomenon, population, or area of interest. The description included (a) collections of facts about existing phenomena, (b) identification of problems or justification of current conditions and practice,

(c) project or product evaluation, and (d) comparison of experience between groups with similar problems to assist in future planning and decision making. In this instance, the phenomenon of interest was how practicing veteran principals might express job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. The descriptive research methodology was employed to collect the characteristics that describe several existing phenomena of practice. This study sought to add to the literature on the principalship.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The objective of this study is to analyze job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship through the examination of their causes as identified by practicing principals. This study was conducted by using the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey. Statistical analyses of the data were conducted using Crosstab and Pearson's correlation test. The following research questions guide the analysis:

- What are principals' perceptions of job satisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?
- What are principals' perceptions of job dissatisfaction as measured by Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory?

This chapter begins with frequency tables to summarize the demographic information for the whole sample of principals. Following that, the results of the crosstab summary of the responses in the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey and the Pearson's correlation test were presented to address the research question were presented.

Description of Sample

As stated, the sample of respondents consisted of practicing principals in the state of North Carolina from schools in the K-12 public education system. The total number sample consisted of 562 principals. The demographic information obtained include the principal's age, race, gender, self-report about principalship success or challenge, type of school, years

of experience, and academic credentials. The frequency and percentages breakdown are summarized in Table 2.

The statistics in Table 2 showed that for the current principalship rating, 309 (55%) out of the 562 principals rated that 'I believe I am successfully meeting the challenges inherent' while 224 (39.9%) believed that I believe that 'I am still learning to meet the challenges in the principalship.' For the school level, more than half (55%) or 279 of the 562 principals' school level were elementary schools, 106 (18.9%) were middle schools, 116 (20.6%) were high school, and there were only 18 (3.2%) alternative schools. For the school surrounding, more than half (57.7%) or 325 out of the 526 principals' school were in rural areas, 98 (17.4%) were in urban schools, and 110 (19.6%) were in suburban areas. For the race/ethnicity of the school principals, most (71%) or 399 out of 526 of the principals were Caucasian. There were also 117 (20.8%) African-American, 6 (1.1%) Hispanic/Latino, and 1 (0.2%) was Asian. For the gender of the principals, there were more females which consist of 305 (54.3%) out of the 526 principals and there were 238 (42.3%) male principals. For the age of the principals, 114 (20.3%) were aged between 30 to 39 years old, 203 (36.1%) principals were aged between 40 to 49 years old, and 182 (32.4%) were aged between 50 to 59 years old. There were only 44 (7.8%) that were aged 60 or older.

For the principals' 'total years of experiences as an educator prior to first administrative job,' 94 (16.7%) had 3 to 5 years of experience, 176 (31.13%) principals had 6 to 10 years of experience, 118 (21%) had 11 to 15 years of experience, 90 (16%) had 16 to 20 years, and 63 (11.2%) had 21 or more years of experience. For the principals' 'total years

of experience as an assistant principal prior to first principalship', most of the principals (74.6%) or 419 out of the 526 principals have 0 to 5 years of experience and 106 (18.9%) principals had 6 to 10 years of experience. For the principals' 'total years of experience as principal in current job,' most of the principals (68.9%) or 419 out of the 526 principals have 0 to 5 years of experience and 118(21%) principals had 6 to 10 years of experience. For the 'total years of experience as a principal,' 246 (43.8%) out of the 526 principals have 0 to 5 years of experience, 178(31.7%) principals had 6 to 10 years of experience, 84 (14.9%) had 11 to 15 years of experiences, and there were only 19 (2.4%) and 17 (3%) that have 16 to 20 years and 21 or more years of experience, respectively.

For the 'highest degree attained by the principals,' many (66.4%) or 373 out of the 526 principals had Master's degree. There were only 93 (16.5%) that had Education specialist degree and 79 (14.1%) that had Doctorate degree. Also, majority (87.4%) or 491 out of the 526 principals plan to remain in their profession. Lastly, for the school size, schools of 59 (10.5%) principals had total number of students of 50 to 200, 185 (32.9%) had a school size of 201 to 500 students, 237 (42.2%) had school size of 501 to 1000 students, and 64 (11.4%) had school size of over 1000 students.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages Breakdown of Respondents' Demographic Characteristics

| | Frequency | Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Current principalship Rating | | |
| I believe I am successfully meeting the challenges inherent | 309 | 55 |
| I believe that I am still learning to meet the challenges in | 224 | 39.9 |
| Missing | 29 | 5.2 |
| School level | | |
| Elementary | 279 | 49.6 |
| Middle | 106 | 18.9 |
| High | 116 | 20.6 |
| Alternative | 18 | 3.2 |
| Other | 27 | 4.8 |
| Missing | 16 | 2.8 |
| School surroundings | | |
| Rural | 324 | 57.7 |
| Urban | 98 | 17.4 |
| Suburban | 110 | 19.6 |
| Other | 11 | 2 |
| Missing | 19 | 3.4 |
| Race/ethnicity | | |
| African-American | 117 | 20.8 |
| Asian | 1 | 0.2 |
| Caucasian | 399 | 71 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | 1.1 |
| Other | 19 | 3.4 |
| Missing | 20 | 3.6 |
| Gender | | |
| Female | 305 | 54.3 |
| Male | 238 | 42.3 |
| Missing | 19 | 3.4 |
| Age | | |
| 26-29 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 30-39 | 114 | 20.3 |
| 40-49 | 203 | 36.1 |
| 50-59 | 182 | 32.4 |
| 60 or older | 44 | 7.8 |
| Missing | 18 | 3.2 |

Table 2 Continued

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| Total years of experience as an educator prior to first administrative job | | |
| 3-5 | 94 | 16.7 |
| 6-10 | 176 | 31.3 |
| 11-15 | 118 | 21 |
| 16-20 | 90 | 16 |
| 21 or more | 63 | 11.2 |
| Missing | 21 | 3.7 |
| Total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to first principalship | | |
| 0-5 | 419 | 74.6 |
| 6-10 | 106 | 18.9 |
| 11-15 | 10 | 1.8 |
| 16-20 | 4 | 0.7 |
| 21 or more | 2 | 0.4 |
| Missing | 21 | 3.7 |
| Total years of experience as principal in current job | | |
| 0-5 | 387 | 68.9 |
| 6-10 | 118 | 21 |
| 11-15 | 30 | 5.3 |
| 16-20 | 5 | 0.9 |
| 21 or more | 3 | 0.5 |
| Missing | 19 | 3.4 |
| Total years of experience as a principal | | |
| 0-5 | 246 | 43.8 |
| 6-10 | 178 | 31.7 |
| 11-15 | 84 | 14.9 |
| 16-20 | 19 | 3.4 |
| 21 or more | 17 | 3 |
| Missing | 18 | 3.2 |
| Highest degree attained to date | | |
| Master's degree | 373 | 66.4 |
| Education Specialist | 93 | 16.5 |
| Doctorate | 79 | 14.1 |
| Missing | 17 | 3 |

Table 2 Continued

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| Do you plan to remain in the profession or to leave the profession? | | |
| I plan to leave the profession. | 53 | 9.4 |
| I plan to remain in the profession. | 491 | 87.4 |
| Missing | 18 | 3.2 |
| Range that best describes the size (total students) of your school | | |
| 50-200 | 59 | 10.5 |
| 201-500 | 185 | 32.9 |
| 501-1000 | 237 | 42.2 |
| Over 1000 | 64 | 11.4 |
| Missing | 17 | 3 |

Reliability Measure of the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey

The reliability of the results of the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey was measured since the current study used an altered version of the survey instrument. The current study used 35 items only. The reliability was tested through the internal consistency of the survey response among the sample of principals to ensure the reliability and validity of the instrument was established. The Cronbach's Alpha statistic was computed as the reliability measure. Table 3 summarized the Cronbach's Alpha reliability statistics.

Based from Table 3, it can be observed that all of the Cronbach's Alpha statistics for the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey ($\alpha = 0.95$) was greater than the minimum acceptable value of 0.7 implying that the measures of principals' perceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction was acceptable reliably and internally consistent in

measuring the study variables. In fact, the reliability measure was excellent since the Cronbach's alpha value was greater than 0.9.

Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Statistics of Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| 0.945 | 35 |

Crosstab Summary of Responses on Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey

The summary of the 526 responses on the 35 item Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey were summarized using frequencies and percentages. This was conducted to determine the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. The breakdown is summarized in Table 4.

It can be observed from the table that the principals were satisfied in 34 out of the 35 items related to the principalship job. To be specific, more than half (52.6%) or 293 out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied with the actual achievement of work related goals and 158 (28.4%) principals were slightly satisfied. More than half (51.7%) or 287 out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 111 (20%) principals were very satisfied, and 119 (21.4%) principals were slightly satisfied with the immediate results from their work.

More than half (51.3%) or 286 out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 123 (22.1%) principals were very satisfied, and 110 (19.7%) principals were slightly satisfied with the actual adoption of practices which they recommend. Almost half (48.9%) or 272 out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 171 (30.8%) principals were very satisfied, and 77 (13.8%) principals were slightly satisfied with their personal goal attainment. Almost half (44.4%) or 272 out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 204 (37%) principals were very satisfied, and 81 (14.7%) principals were slightly satisfied with their job of observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time. Two hundred eight (208; 37.4%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 159 (28.6%) principals were very satisfied, and 103 (18.5%) principals were slightly satisfied with their opportunities for increased responsibility in education.

One hundred ninety six (196; 35.4%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 131 (23.8%) principals were very satisfied, and 139 (25.2%) principals were slightly satisfied with their participation in in-service education. One hundred eighty eight (188; 34.1%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 97 (17.6%) principals were very satisfied, and 148 (26.8%) principals were slightly satisfied with the types and levels of in service education in their schools. One hundred eighty nine (189; 34.4%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 169 (30.7%) principals were very satisfied, and 120 (21.8%) principals were slightly satisfied with their opportunities to grow professionally through formal education. One hundred fifty (150; 27.1%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 160 (28.9%) principals were very satisfied, and 115 (20.8%) principals

were slightly satisfied with their opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, and etc in their school. Two hundred thirty nine (239; 43.5%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 252 (30.7%) principals were very satisfied, and 39 (7.1%) principals were slightly satisfied with the principal-teacher relationships in their school. Two hundred thirty nine (239; 43.6%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 230 (42%) principals were very satisfied, and 50 (9.1%) principals were slightly satisfied with the professional relationship on their job.

Two hundred forty nine (249; 44.9%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 188 (33.9%) principals were very satisfied, and 87 (15.7%) principals were slightly satisfied with the personal relationship on their job. Almost half (49.8%) or 276 out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 109 (19.7%) principals were very satisfied, and 127 (22.9%) principals were slightly satisfied with the extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed in their schools. One hundred sixty six (166; 30.2%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 155 (28.2%) principals were very satisfied, and 58 (10.6%) principals were slightly satisfied with the recognition of your accomplishments by their colleagues in the school. One hundred fifty three (153; 27.9%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 124 (22.6%) principals were very satisfied, and 141 (25.7%) principals were slightly satisfied with the recognition of your accomplishments by their supervisors in the school. One hundred eighty eight (188; 33.8%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 95(17.1%) principals were very satisfied, and 170 (30.6%) principals were slightly satisfied with their district committee responsibilities. Two

hundred thirty (230; 41.6%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 195(35.3%) principals were very satisfied, and 92 (16.6%) principals were slightly satisfied with the interesting and challenging aspects of their work.

Two hundred thirty eight (238; 43%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 220(39.8%) principals were very satisfied, and 63 (11.4%) principals were slightly satisfied with the general type of work they do. Two hundred five (205; 37.2%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, almost half (49.5%) or 273 principals were very satisfied, and 48 (8.7%) principals were slightly satisfied with their level of enthusiasm about their work. Two hundred three (203; 36.7%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 250(45.2%) principals were very satisfied, and 63 (11.4%) principals were slightly satisfied with the number of teachers for whom they are responsible. One hundred seventy seven (177; 32.2%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 87(15.8%) principals were very satisfied, and 161 (29.3%) principals were slightly satisfied with the amount of time devoted to preparing their agenda for the next day's activities. One hundred seventy nine (179; 32.4%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 86(15.6%) principals were very satisfied, and 133 (24.1%) principals were slightly satisfied with their work schedule compared to that of their colleagues. Almost half (46.2%) or 254 out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 168 (30.5%) principals were very satisfied, and 81 (14.7%) principals were slightly satisfied considering all aspects of their job as principal, or their overall level of job satisfaction.

One hundred eighty one (181; 32.8%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 54(9.8%) principals were very satisfied, and 141(25.6%) principals were slightly satisfied with the level of benefits in their school. One hundred sixty six (166; 30.1%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 71 (12.9%) principals were very satisfied, and 153(27.8%) principals were slightly satisfied with the degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available in their school. One hundred fifty five (155; 28.1%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 82(14.9%) principals were very satisfied, and 143(26%) principals were slightly satisfied with their advancement opportunities compared to those in similar positions. One hundred eighty five (185; 33.6%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 108 (19.6%) principals were very satisfied, and 124 (22.5%) principals were slightly satisfied with the process used to define job security within their school district. Two hundred (200; 36.2%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 147 (26.6%) principals were very satisfied, and 113(20.5%) principals were slightly satisfied with their job security compared to those in similar positions. Two hundred fourteen (214; 39%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 141 (25.7%) principals were very satisfied, and 108 (19.7%) principals were slightly satisfied with the level of job security with their position. Two hundred twenty (220; 39.8%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 126(22.8%) principals were very satisfied, and 110(19.9%) principals were slightly satisfied with the overall feeling of job security within their organization. Two hundred eighteen (218; 39.4%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 91(16.4%) principals were very satisfied, and 152 (27.4%) principals were slightly satisfied

with the authority delegated compared to duties delegated. Lastly, 154 (27.9%) out of the 526 principals were moderately satisfied, 177 (32.1%) principals were very satisfied, and 106 (19.2%) principals were slightly satisfied with the sensitivity of their supervisor to their own needs.

The one item of the 35 item Adapted Wood Faculty Job wherein the principals were not satisfied was on their salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions. It was observed that 206 (37.1%) out of the 526 principals were very dissatisfied, 121 (21.8%) principals were moderately satisfied, and 88 (15.9%) principals were slightly dissatisfied with the sensitivity of their supervisor to their own needs. However, in general, the principals were satisfied with their job as principals.

Table 4
Frequency and Percentages Breakdown of Survey Responses on Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in the Principalship

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| The actual achievement of work related goals | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 3 | 0.5 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 9 | 1.6 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 19 | 3.4 |
| Slightly satisfied | 75 | 13.5 |
| Moderately satisfied | 293 | 52.6 |
| Very satisfied | 158 | 28.4 |

Table 4 Continued

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| The immediate results from your work | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 3 | 0.5 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 12 | 2.2 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 23 | 4.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 119 | 21.4 |
| Moderately satisfied | 287 | 51.7 |
| Very satisfied | 111 | 20 |
| The actual adoption of practices which you recommend | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 5 | 0.9 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 11 | 2 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 22 | 3.9 |
| Slightly satisfied | 110 | 19.7 |
| Moderately satisfied | 286 | 51.3 |
| Very satisfied | 123 | 22.1 |
| Personal goal attainment. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 9 | 1.6 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 10 | 1.8 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 17 | 3.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 77 | 13.8 |
| Moderately satisfied | 272 | 48.9 |
| Very satisfied | 171 | 30.8 |
| Observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 5 | 0.9 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 17 | 3.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 81 | 14.7 |
| Moderately satisfied | 245 | 44.4 |
| Very satisfied | 204 | 37 |
| Opportunities for increased responsibility in education. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 13 | 2.3 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 20 | 3.6 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 53 | 9.5 |
| Slightly satisfied | 159 | 28.6 |
| Moderately satisfied | 208 | 37.4 |
| Very satisfied | 103 | 18.5 |

Table 4 Continued

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| Participation in in-service education. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 11 | 2 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 26 | 4.7 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 48 | 8.7 |
| Slightly satisfied | 139 | 25.2 |
| Moderately satisfied | 196 | 35.6 |
| Very satisfied | 131 | 23.8 |
| Types and levels of in-service education. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 15 | 2.7 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 31 | 5.6 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 73 | 13.2 |
| Slightly satisfied | 148 | 26.8 |
| Moderately satisfied | 188 | 34.1 |
| Very satisfied | 97 | 17.6 |
| Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 9 | 1.6 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 23 | 4.2 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 40 | 7.3 |
| Slightly satisfied | 120 | 21.8 |
| Moderately satisfied | 189 | 34.4 |
| Very satisfied | 169 | 30.7 |
| Opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 34 | 6.1 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 32 | 5.8 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 62 | 11.2 |
| Slightly satisfied | 115 | 20.8 |
| Moderately satisfied | 150 | 27.1 |
| Very satisfied | 160 | 28.9 |
| Principal-teacher relationships. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 1 | 0.2 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 6 | 1.1 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 13 | 2.4 |
| Slightly satisfied | 39 | 7.1 |
| Moderately satisfied | 239 | 43.5 |
| Very satisfied | 252 | 45.8 |

Table 4 Continued

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| Professional relationships on the job. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 3 | 0.5 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 9 | 1.6 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 17 | 3.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 50 | 9.1 |
| Moderately satisfied | 239 | 43.6 |
| Very satisfied | 230 | 42 |
| Personal relationships on the job. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 2 | 0.4 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 6 | 1.1 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 22 | 4 |
| Slightly satisfied | 87 | 15.7 |
| Moderately satisfied | 249 | 44.9 |
| Very satisfied | 188 | 33.9 |
| The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 4 | 0.7 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 11 | 2 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 27 | 4.9 |
| Slightly satisfied | 127 | 22.9 |
| Moderately satisfied | 276 | 49.8 |
| Very satisfied | 109 | 19.7 |
| Recognition of your accomplishments by your colleagues. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 12 | 2.2 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 31 | 5.6 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 58 | 10.6 |
| Slightly satisfied | 155 | 28.2 |
| Moderately satisfied | 166 | 30.2 |
| Very satisfied | 127 | 23.1 |
| Recognition of your accomplishments by your supervisors. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 25 | 4.6 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 35 | 6.4 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 70 | 12.8 |
| Slightly satisfied | 141 | 25.7 |
| Moderately satisfied | 153 | 27.9 |
| Very satisfied | 124 | 22.6 |

Table 4 Continued

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| District committee responsibilities. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 10 | 1.8 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 20 | 3.6 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 73 | 13.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 170 | 30.6 |
| Moderately satisfied | 188 | 33.8 |
| Very satisfied | 95 | 17.1 |
| Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 206 | 37.1 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 121 | 21.8 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 88 | 15.9 |
| Slightly satisfied | 64 | 11.5 |
| Moderately satisfied | 57 | 10.3 |
| Very satisfied | 19 | 3.4 |
| The interesting and challenging aspects of your work. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 3 | 0.5 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 14 | 2.5 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 19 | 3.4 |
| Slightly satisfied | 92 | 16.6 |
| Moderately satisfied | 230 | 41.6 |
| Very satisfied | 195 | 35.3 |
| The general type of work you do. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 2 | 0.4 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 8 | 1.4 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 22 | 4 |
| Slightly satisfied | 63 | 11.4 |
| Moderately satisfied | 238 | 43 |
| Very satisfied | 220 | 39.8 |
| Your level of enthusiasm about your work. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 4 | 0.7 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 8 | 1.5 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 13 | 2.4 |
| Slightly satisfied | 48 | 8.7 |
| Moderately satisfied | 205 | 37.2 |
| Very satisfied | 273 | 49.5 |

Table 4 Continued

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| The number of teachers for whom you are responsible. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 4 | 0.7 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 8 | 1.4 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 25 | 4.5 |
| Slightly satisfied | 63 | 11.4 |
| Moderately satisfied | 203 | 36.7 |
| Very satisfied | 250 | 45.2 |
| The number of hours you work each week. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 53 | 9.7 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 76 | 13.8 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 110 | 20 |
| Slightly satisfied | 101 | 18.4 |
| Moderately satisfied | 146 | 26.6 |
| Very satisfied | 63 | 11.5 |
| The amount of time devoted to preparing your agenda for the next day's activities. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 14 | 2.6 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 27 | 4.9 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 83 | 15.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 161 | 29.3 |
| Moderately satisfied | 177 | 32.2 |
| Very satisfied | 87 | 15.8 |
| Your work schedule compared to that of your colleagues. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 22 | 4 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 50 | 9 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 83 | 15 |
| Slightly satisfied | 133 | 24.1 |
| Moderately satisfied | 179 | 32.4 |
| Very satisfied | 86 | 15.6 |
| Considering all aspects of your job as principal, your overall level of job satisfaction. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 5 | 0.9 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 19 | 3.5 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 23 | 4.2 |
| Slightly satisfied | 81 | 14.7 |
| Moderately satisfied | 254 | 46.2 |
| Very satisfied | 168 | 30.5 |

Table 4 Continued

| | | |
|---|-----|------|
| The level of benefits. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 39 | 7.1 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 57 | 10.3 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 79 | 14.3 |
| Slightly satisfied | 141 | 25.6 |
| Moderately satisfied | 181 | 32.8 |
| Very satisfied | 54 | 9.8 |
| The degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 27 | 4.9 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 47 | 8.5 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 87 | 15.8 |
| Slightly satisfied | 153 | 27.8 |
| Moderately satisfied | 166 | 30.1 |
| Very satisfied | 71 | 12.9 |
| Your advancement opportunities compared to those in similar positions. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 37 | 6.7 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 40 | 7.3 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 94 | 17.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 143 | 26 |
| Moderately satisfied | 155 | 28.1 |
| Very satisfied | 82 | 14.9 |
| The process used to define job security within your school district. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 30 | 5.5 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 30 | 5.5 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 73 | 13.3 |
| Slightly satisfied | 124 | 22.5 |
| Moderately satisfied | 185 | 33.6 |
| Very satisfied | 108 | 19.6 |
| Your job security compared to those in similar positions. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 20 | 3.6 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 22 | 4 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 50 | 9.1 |
| Slightly satisfied | 113 | 20.5 |
| Moderately satisfied | 200 | 36.2 |
| Very satisfied | 147 | 26.6 |

Table 4 Continued

| | | |
|--|-----|------|
| The level of job security with your position. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 20 | 3.6 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 26 | 4.7 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 40 | 7.3 |
| Slightly satisfied | 108 | 19.7 |
| Moderately satisfied | 214 | 39 |
| Very satisfied | 141 | 25.7 |
| The overall feeling of job security within your organization. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 21 | 3.8 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 24 | 4.3 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 52 | 9.4 |
| Slightly satisfied | 110 | 19.9 |
| Moderately satisfied | 220 | 39.8 |
| Very satisfied | 126 | 22.8 |
| Authority delegated compared to duties delegated. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 13 | 2.3 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 26 | 4.7 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 54 | 9.7 |
| Slightly satisfied | 152 | 27.4 |
| Moderately satisfied | 218 | 39.4 |
| Very satisfied | 91 | 16.4 |
| The sensitivity of your supervisor to your needs. | | |
| Very dissatisfied | 32 | 5.8 |
| Moderately dissatisfied | 33 | 6 |
| Slightly dissatisfied | 49 | 8.9 |
| Slightly satisfied | 106 | 19.2 |
| Moderately satisfied | 154 | 27.9 |
| Very satisfied | 177 | 32.1 |

Correlation between Demographic Information and Survey Responses on Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in the Principalship

The succeeding analysis will seek to investigate the correlation between demographic data on the principals on age, race, gender, self-report about principalship success or challenge, type of school, years of experience, and academic credentials; and the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. Pearson's correlation test is conducted to determine if there was a relationship between demographic variables and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the hypothesis testing. A significant relationship existed once the probability value of significance (sig.) is less than or equal to the level of significance value. The Pearson's correlation test also investigated the degree of the correlation (positive or negative) and the strength of the correlation. The results of the Pearson's correlation test are summarized in Table 5.

For the relationship between the demographic data of current principalship rating and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant negative relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. This means that principals that reported believe that they 'successfully meet the challenges inherent' had higher job satisfaction. The test results showed that the demographic data of current principalship rating

was significantly negatively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of:

- The actual achievement of work related goals ($r(530) = -0.20, p < .0001$)
- The immediate results from your work ($r(530) = -0.24, p < .0001$)
- The actual adoption of practices which you recommend ($r(431) = -0.13, p < .0001$)
- Personal goal attainment ($r(531) = -0.21, p < .0001$)
- Observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time ($r(527) = -0.20, p < .0001$)
- Opportunities for increased responsibility in education ($r(531) = -0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Principal-teacher relationships ($r(526) = -0.13, p < .0001$)
- Professional relationships on the job ($r(524) = -0.10, p < .0001$)
- Personal relationships on the job ($r(529) = -0.10, p = 0.02$)
- The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed ($r(529) = -0.10, p = 0.02$)
- District committee responsibilities ($r(531) = -0.14, p < .0001$)
- Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions ($r(531) = -0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The interesting and challenging aspects of your work ($r(529) = -0.13, p < .0001$)

- Your level of enthusiasm about your work ($r(528) = -0.14, p < .0001$)
- Considering all aspects of your job as principal, your overall level of job satisfaction ($r(527) = -0.13, p < .0001$)
- The amount of time devoted to preparing your agenda for the next day's activities. ($r(526) = -0.14, p < .0001$)
- The process used to define job security within your school district ($r(527) = -0.10, p = 0.03$)
- Your job security compared to those in similar positions ($r(529) = -0.13, p < .0001$)
- The level of job security with your position ($r(526) = -0.16, p < .0001$)
- The overall feeling of job security within your organization ($r(530) = -0.18, p < .0001$)
- Authority delegated compared to duties delegated ($r(532) = -0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The amount of time devoted to preparing your agenda for the next day's activities ($r(131) = -0.406, p < .0001$)

For the relationship between the demographic data of school level and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant negative relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in two aspects of the principalship. The strength of correlations was all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of school level was significantly negatively related with the job satisfaction and job

dissatisfaction in principalship areas of participation in in-service education ($r(530) = -0.10$, $p = 0.02$) and types and levels of in-service education ($r(530) = -0.12$, $p = 0.01$). This means that principals at lower school level had higher job satisfaction in these two areas.

For the relationship between the demographic data of school surrounding and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant negative relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the aspect of opportunities to grow professionally through formal education ($r(538) = -0.10$, $p = 0.02$) only. The strength of correlation was all weak since the correlation coefficients was less than 0.3. This means that principals at schools that are in suburban areas had higher job satisfaction in this area as compared to the principals in rural areas.

For the relationship between the demographic data of race/ethnicity and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in four aspects of principalship of the actual achievement of work related goals ($r(539) = 0.13$, $p < .0001$), the immediate results from your work ($r(540) = 0.11$, $p = 0.01$), observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time ($r(536) = 0.09$, $p = 0.03$), and principal-teacher relationships ($r(535) = 0.11$, $p = 0.01$). Also, race/ethnicity had a significant positive relationship with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship aspect of the level of benefits ($r(537) = -0.14$, $p < .0001$). The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3.

For the relationship between the demographic data of gender and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant negative relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in four aspects of the principalship of observing teacher's growth and success over a period of time ($r(536) = -0.11, p = 0.01$), participation in in-service education ($r(536) = -0.17, p < .0001$), types and levels of in-service education ($r(537) = -0.14, p < .0001$), and personal relationships on the job ($r(539) = -0.12, p = 0.01$). This means that male principals had higher job satisfaction in these four areas. Also, gender had a significant positive relationship with two aspects of the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship of the number of hours you work each week ($r(535) = 0.12, p = 0.01$) and your work schedule compared to that of your colleagues ($r(536) = 0.09, p = 0.03$). The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. This means that female principals had higher satisfaction in these two areas.

For the relationship between the demographic data of age and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. This means that principals that are older have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of age was significantly positively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship areas of:

- The actual achievement of work related goals ($r(541) = 0.17, p < .0001$)
- The immediate results from your work ($r(541) = 0.14, p < .0001$)
- The actual adoption of practices which you recommend ($r(431) = -0.13, p < .0001$)
- Personal goal attainment ($r(542) = 0.12, p = 0.01$)
- Observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time ($r(538) = 0.12, p < .0001$)
- Opportunities for increased responsibility in education ($r(542) = 0.09, p = 0.05$)
- Participation in in-service education ($r(537) = 0.14, p < .0001$)
- Types and levels of in-service education ($r(539) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education ($r(537) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- Principal-teacher relationships ($r(537) = 0.15, p < .0001$)
- Professional relationships on the job ($r(535) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Personal relationships on the job ($r(540) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed ($r(540) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- Recognition of your accomplishments by your colleagues ($r(535) = 0.10, p = 0.03$)
- District committee responsibilities ($r(542) = 0.13, p < .0001$)

- Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions ($r(542) = 0.19, p < .0001$)
- The interesting and challenging aspects of your work ($r(540) = 0.17, p < .0001$)
- Your level of enthusiasm about your work ($r(539) = 0.12, p = 0.01$)
- The number of teachers for whom you are responsible ($r(541) = 0.12, p = 0.01$)
- The number of hours you work each week ($r(537) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The amount of time devoted to preparing your agenda for the next day's activities ($r(537) = 0.14, p < .0001$)
- Your work schedule compared to that of your colleagues ($r(5421) = 0.16, p < .0001$)
- Considering all aspects of your job as principal, your overall level of job satisfaction ($r(538) = 0.15, p < .0001$)
- The degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available ($r(540) = 0.02, p = 0.03$)
- Your advancement opportunities compared to those in similar position ($r(538) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- The process used to define job security within your school district ($r(538) = 0.14, p < .0001$)

- Your job security compared to those in similar positions ($r(540) = 0.15, p < .0001$)
- The level of job security with your position ($r(537) = 0.16, p < .0001$)
- The overall feeling of job security within your organization ($r(541) = 0.15, p < .0001$)
- Authority delegated compared to duties delegated ($r(543) = 0.14, p < .0001$)

For the relationship between the demographic data of ‘total years of experience as an educator prior to first administrative job’ and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson’s correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. This means that principals that have greater total years of experience as an educator prior to first administrative job have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of total years of experience as an educator prior to first administrative job was significantly positively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of:

- The actual achievement of work related goals ($r(538) = 0.14, p < .0001$)
- Participation in in-service education ($r(534) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education ($r(534) = 0.9, p = 0.04$)
- Principal-teacher relationships ($r(534) = 0.13, p < .0001$)

- District committee responsibilities ($r(539) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Your level of enthusiasm about your work ($r(536) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- The number of teachers for whom you are responsible ($r(538) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Your work schedule compared to that of your colleagues ($r(538) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- Considering all aspects of your job as principal, your overall level of job satisfaction ($r(535) = 0.14, p < .0001$)
- The degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available ($r(537) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Your advancement opportunities compared to those in similar position ($r(535) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The process used to define job security within your school district ($r(535) = 0.09, p = 0.04$)
- Your job security compared to those in similar positions ($r(537) = 0.09, p = 0.04$)
- Authority delegated compared to duties delegated ($r(540) = 0.12, p < .0001$)

For the relationship between the demographic data of ‘total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to first principalship’ and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson’s correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of

principalship. This means that principals that have greater total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to first principalship have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to first principalship was significantly positively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of:

- The actual achievement of work related goals ($r(538) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- Personal goal attainment ($r(539) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- Principal-teacher relationships ($r(534) = 0.10, p = 0.04$)
- Professional relationships on the job ($r(532) = 0.09, p = 0.05$)
- Personal relationships on the job ($r(540) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- Recognition of your accomplishments by your colleagues ($r(532) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- Recognition of your accomplishments by your supervisor ($r(532) = 0.12, p < .0001$)
- Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions ($r(539) = 0.12, p = 0.01$)
- The general type of work you do ($r(536) = 0.10, p = 0.03$)
- The number of teachers for whom you are responsible ($r(538) = 0.17, p < .0001$)
- The number of hours you work each week ($r(534) = 0.17, p < .0001$)

- The amount of time devoted to preparing your agenda for the next day's activities ($r(534) = 0.15, p < .0001$)
- Your work schedule compared to that of your colleagues ($r(538) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- Considering all aspects of your job as principal, your overall level of job satisfaction ($r(535) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- Authority delegated compared to duties delegated ($r(540) = 0.09, p = 0.04$)
- The sensitivity of your supervisor to your needs ($r(536) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)

For the relationship between the demographic data of total years of experience as principal in current job and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. This means that principals that have greater 'total years of experience as principal in current job' have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of total years of experience as principal in current job was significantly positively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of:

- The immediate results from your work ($r(540) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- Observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time ($r(537) = 0.09, p = 0.04$)
- Principal-teacher relationships ($r(536) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)

- Personal relationships on the job ($r(539) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed ($r(539) = 0.09, p = 0.04$)
- Recognition of your accomplishments by your colleagues ($r(535) = 0.10, p = 0.03$)
- Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions ($r(541) = 0.09, p = 0.04$)
- The process used to define job security within your school district ($r(537) = 0.11, p = 0.02$)
- Your job security compared to those in similar positions ($r(539) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The level of job security with your position ($r(536) = 0.12, p = 0.01$)
- The overall feeling of job security within your organization ($r(540) = 0.09, p = 0.05$)
- Authority delegated compared to duties delegated ($r(543) = 0.14, p < .0001$)

For the relationship between the demographic data of ‘total years of experience as a principal’ and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson’s correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. This means that principals that have greater ‘total years of experience as principal’ have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients

were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of total years of experience as principal was significantly positively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of:

- The actual achievement of work related goals ($r(541) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The immediate results from your work ($r(541) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time ($r(538) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions ($r(542) = 0.16, p < .0001$)
- Your job security compared to those in similar positions ($r(540) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- The level of job security with your position ($r(537) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)

Also, the demographic data of total years of experience as principal had a significant negative relationships with the aspect of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of principalship opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc. ($r(539) = -0.10, p = 0.02$). This means that principals that have greater 'total years of experience as principal' have higher job satisfaction in the aspect of opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops.

For the relationship between the demographic data of 'highest degree attained' and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant negative relationships with the job satisfaction and job

dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. This means that principals that have higher degree attained have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of highest degree attained was significantly negatively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of:

- Participation in in-service education ($r(538) = -0.11, p = 0.01$)
- Types and levels of in-service education ($r(540) = -0.15, p < .0001$)
- Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education ($r(538) = -0.17, p < .0001$)
- Opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc. ($r(540) = -0.14, p < .0001$)
- Your level of enthusiasm about your work ($r(540) = -0.09, p = 0.04$)
- The degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available ($r(541) = -0.14, p < .0001$)
- Your advancement opportunities compared to those in similar position ($r(539) = -0.14, p < .0001$)
- The process used to define job security within your school district ($r(539) = -0.09, p = 0.04$)
- The sensitivity of your supervisor to your needs ($r(540) = -0.12, p = 0.01$)

For the relationship between the demographic data of plan to remain in the profession or to leave the profession and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the

Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. This means that principals that plan to remain in the profession have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of plan to remain in the profession was significantly positively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of:

- The immediate results from your work ($r(541) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Personal goal attainment ($r(542) = 0.12, p < .0001$)
- Participation in in-service education ($r(537) = 0.13, p < .0001$)
- Types and levels of in-service education ($r(539) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education ($r(537) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc. ($r(539) = 0.12, p = 0.01$)
- Personal relationships on the job ($r(540) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed ($r(540) = 0.10, p = 0.02$)
- Recognition of your accomplishments by your colleagues ($r(535) = 0.12, p < .0001$)

- Recognition of your accomplishments by your supervisors ($r(535) = 0.12, p < .0001$)
- District committee responsibilities ($r(542) = 0.12, p < .0001$)
- Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions ($r(542) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- The interesting and challenging aspects of your work ($r(540) = 0.16, p < .0001$)
- The general type of work you do ($r(539) = 0.21, p < .0001$)
- Your level of enthusiasm about your work ($r(539) = 0.23, p < .0001$)
- The number of teachers for whom you are responsible ($r(541) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The number of hours you work each week ($r(537) = 0.09, p = 0.04$)
- Your work schedule compared to that of your colleagues ($r(541) = 0.09, p = 0.05$)
- Considering all aspects of your job as principal, your overall level of job satisfaction ($r(538) = 0.24, p < .0001$)
- The level of benefits ($r(539) = 0.09, p = 0.03$)
- The degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available ($r(540) = 0.13, p < 0.001$)
- Your advancement opportunities compared to those in similar position ($r(538) = 0.14, p < .0001$)

- Authority delegated compared to duties delegated ($r(543) = 0.11, p = 0.01$)
- The sensitivity of your supervisor to your needs ($r(539) = 0.15, p < .0001$)

Lastly, for the relationship between the demographic data of school size and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, the Pearson's correlation test result showed the existence of significant positive relationships with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in various aspects of principalship. This means that school size of the principals that were greater have higher job satisfaction. The strengths of correlations were all weak since the r correlation coefficients were less than 0.3. The test results showed that the demographic data of school size was significantly positively related with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship areas of your level of enthusiasm about your work ($r(540) = 0.10, p = 0.02$), the degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available ($r(541) = 0.10, p = 0.02$), and your advancement opportunities compared to those in similar position ($r(539) = 0.10, p = 0.02$) On the other hand, the demographic data of school size is significantly negatively related with the and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship aspects of the number of hours you work each week ($r(538) = -0.20, p < .0001$) and the amount of time devoted to preparing your agenda for the next day's activities ($r(538) = -0.09, p = 0.04$). This means that school size of the principals that were greater have less job satisfaction in these two aspects

Table 5
Pearson's Correlation Rest Result

| | | Current principalship Rating | School Level | School surrounding: | Race/ ethnicity | Gend- er | Age | Total years of experience as an educator prior to first administrati ve job | Total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to first principalship | Total years of experience as principal in current job | Total years of experience as a principal | Highest degree attained | Do you plan to remain in the profession or to leave the profession ? | Range that best describe s the size of your school |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------|--|---|--|--|-------------------------------|--|---|
| The actual achieve ment of work related goals | Pearson Correlati on | -0.20* | -0.05 | 0.05 | 0.13* | -0.05 | 0.17* | 0.14* | 0.09* | 0.08 | 0.11* | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.07 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.32 | 0.10 |
| | N | 530 | 543 | 540 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 541 | 542 |
| The immedia te results from your work | Pearson Correlati on | -0.24* | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.11* | -0.01 | 0.14* | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.09* | 0.10* | -0.07 | 0.10* | 0.08 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | 0.00 | 0.89 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.07 |
| | N | 530 | 543 | 540 | 540 | 540 | 541 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 541 | 542 |
| The actual adoption of practices which you recomm end | Pearson Correlati on | -0.13* | -0.02 | 0.05 | -0.02 | -0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.04 | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.23 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.32 | 0.39 | 0.75 | 0.83 | 0.30 | 0.75 |
| | N | 531 | 544 | 541 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 542 | 543 | 542 | 543 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------|
| Personal goal attainment. | Pearson Correlation | -0.21* | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.06 | -0.03 | 0.12* | 0.05 | 0.09* | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.12* | 0.05 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.37 | 0.15 | 0.49 | 0.01 | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.59 | 0.00 | 0.26 |
| | N | 531 | 544 | 541 | 540 | 540 | 542 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 542 | 543 | 542 | 543 |
| Observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time. | Pearson Correlation | -0.20* | -0.08 | 0.05 | 0.09* | -0.11* | 0.12* | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.09* | 0.10* | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.05 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.24 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.30 | 0.97 | 0.29 |
| | N | 527 | 540 | 537 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 538 | 539 | 538 | 539 |
| Opportunities for increased responsibility in education. | Pearson Correlation | -0.10* | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.09* | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.07 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.61 | 0.13 | 0.96 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.75 | 0.49 | 0.07 | 0.12 |
| | N | 531 | 544 | 541 | 540 | 540 | 542 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 542 | 543 | 542 | 543 |
| Participation in in-service education. | Pearson Correlation | -0.06 | -0.10* | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.17* | .14* | 0.09* | 0.02 | 0.04 | -0.05 | -0.11* | 0.13* | 0.06 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.18 | 0.02 | 0.57 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.72 | 0.42 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.16 |
| | N | 526 | 539 | 536 | 535 | 536 | 537 | 534 | 534 | 536 | 537 | 538 | 537 | 538 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| Types and levels of in-service education. | Pearson Correlation | -0.01 | -0.12* | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.14* | 0.13* | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | -0.07 | -0.15* | 0.11* | 0.02 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.75 | 0.01 | 0.46 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.31 | 0.62 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.66 |
| | N | 528 | 541 | 538 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 539 | 540 |
| Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education. | Pearson Correlation | -0.08 | 0.00 | -0.059 | -0.02 | -0.08 | 0.13* | 0.091* | -0.04 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.17* | 0.10* | 0.02 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.06 | 0.96 | 0.17 | 0.66 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.34 | 0.13 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.61 |
| | N | 527 | 539 | 536 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 534 | 534 | 536 | 537 | 538 | 537 | 538 |
| Opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc. | Pearson Correlation | 0.03 | -0.02 | -0.10* | -0.01 | -0.03 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.01 | -0.02 | -0.10* | -0.14* | 0.12* | -0.064 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.49 | 0.653 | 0.021 | 0.757 | 0.47 | 0.324 | 0.272 | 0.866 | 0.695 | 0.016 | 0.001 | 0.006 | 0.137 |
| | N | 528 | 541 | 538 | 537 | 538 | 539 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 539 | 540 |
| Principal-teacher relationships. | Pearson Correlation | -0.13* | -0.02 | 0.01 | 0.11* | -0.07 | 0.15* | 0.13* | 0.10* | 0.11* | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.08 | -0.01 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.67 | 0.77 | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.96 | 0.06 | 0.86 |
| | N | 526 | 539 | 536 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 534 | 534 | 536 | 537 | 539 | 537 | 538 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Professional relationships on the job. | Pearson Correlation | -0.15* | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.08 | -0.04 | 0.10* | 0.04 | 0.09* | 0.08 | 0.05 | -0.06 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.07 | 0.37 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.27 | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.19 |
| | N | 524 | 537 | 534 | 533 | 533 | 535 | 533 | 532 | 534 | 535 | 536 | 535 | 536 |
| Personal relationships on the job. | Pearson Correlation | -0.10* | 0.01 | -0.04 | 0.01 | -0.12* | 0.11* | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.13* | 0.08 | -0.06 | 0.11* | 0.04 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.02 | 0.76 | 0.31 | 0.82 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.34 |
| | N | 529 | 542 | 539 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 540 | 541 |
| The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed. | Pearson Correlation | -0.10* | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.01 | -0.07 | 0.11* | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.09* | 0.02 | -0.03 | 0.10* | -0.04 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.02 | 0.79 | 0.43 | 0.88 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.60 | 0.43 | 0.02 | 0.40 |
| | N | 529 | 542 | 539 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 540 | 541 |
| Recognition of your accomplishments by your colleagues. | Pearson Correlation | -0.05 | 0.01 | -0.05 | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.10* | 0.07 | 0.13* | 0.06 | -0.04 | -0.06 | .123* | -0.03 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.22 | 0.89 | 0.24 | 0.43 | 0.85 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.40 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.43 |
| | N | 524 | 537 | 534 | 533 | 534 | 535 | 532 | 532 | 534 | 535 | 536 | 535 | 536 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|------|
| Recognition of your accomplishments by your supervisors. | Pearson Correlation | -0.06 | -0.01 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.12* | 0.06 | 0.00 | -0.04 | 0.12* | 0.03 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.18 | 0.85 | 0.51 | 0.69 | 0.79 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.93 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.52 |
| | N | 524 | 537 | 534 | 533 | 533 | 535 | 532 | 532 | 534 | 535 | 536 | 535 | 536 |
| District committee responsibilities. | Pearson Correlation | -0.14* | 0.00 | -0.04 | 0.04 | -0.01 | 0.13* | 0.10* | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.01 | -0.07 | 0.12* | 0.04 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.94 | 0.40 | 0.34 | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.80 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.31 |
| | N | 531 | 544 | 541 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 542 | 543 | 542 | 543 |
| Your salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions. | Pearson Correlation | -0.11* | 0.07 | 0.07 | -0.03 | 0.04 | 0.19* | 0.08 | 0.12** | 0.09* | 0.16** | 0.04 | 0.09* | 0.08 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.53 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.06 |
| | N | 531 | 544 | 541 | 540 | 540 | 542 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 542 | 543 | 542 | 543 |
| The interesting and challenging aspects of your work. | Pearson Correlation | -0.13* | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.04 | -0.04 | 0.17* | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.03 | -0.05 | 0.16* | 0.04 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.83 | 0.15 | 0.39 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.29 | 0.53 | 0.51 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.39 |
| | N | 529 | 542 | 539 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 540 | 541 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| The general type of work you do. | Pearson Correlation | -0.08 | -0.01 | 0.05 | -0.02 | -0.02 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.10* | 0.06 | 0.06 | -0.05 | 0.21* | 0.06 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.06 | 0.85 | 0.25 | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.09 | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.15 |
| | N | 528 | 541 | 538 | 537 | 538 | 539 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 539 | 540 |
| Your level of enthusiasm about your work. | Pearson Correlation | -0.14* | -0.05 | 0.01 | 0.02 | -0.07 | 0.12* | 0.09* | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.05 | -0.09* | 0.23* | 0.10* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.82 | 0.64 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.40 | 0.28 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| | N | 528 | 541 | 538 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 539 | 540 |
| The number of teachers for whom you are responsible. | Pearson Correlation | -0.07 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.01 | -0.02 | 0.12* | 0.10* | 0.17* | 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.08 | 0.11* | -0.07 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.12 | 0.86 | 0.53 | 0.88 | 0.73 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.87 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.13 |
| | N | 530 | 543 | 540 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 541 | 542 |
| The number of hours you work each week. | Pearson Correlation | -0.06 | -0.01 | -0.08 | -0.07 | 0.12* | 0.11* | 0.08 | .17* | 0.02 | 0.00 | -0.01 | 0.09* | -0.20* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.16 | 0.79 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.70 | 0.94 | 0.78 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
| | N | 526 | 539 | 536 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 534 | 534 | 537 | 537 | 538 | 537 | 538 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|--------|
| The amount of time devoted to preparing your agenda for the next day's activities. | Pearson Correlation | -0.14* | 0.04 | -0.04 | -0.04 | 0.09* | 0.14* | 0.08 | 0.15* | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.06 | -0.09* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.38 | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.53 | 0.73 | 0.14 | 0.04 |
| | N | 526 | 539 | 536 | 536 | 536 | 537 | 534 | 534 | 536 | 537 | 538 | 537 | 538 |
| Your work schedule compared to that of your colleagues. | Pearson Correlation | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.02 | 0.11* | 0.16* | 0.11* | 0.13* | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.05 | .09* | -0.26* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.58 | 0.79 | 0.50 | 0.65 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.70 | 0.58 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
| | N | 530 | 543 | 540 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 541 | 542 |
| Considering all aspects of your job as principal, your overall level of job satisfaction. | Pearson Correlation | -0.13* | -0.01 | 0.04 | -0.02 | -0.01 | 0.15* | 0.14* | 0.13* | 0.07 | 0.08 | -0.01 | 0.24* | 0.01 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.79 | 0.35 | 0.67 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.91 |
| | N | 527 | 540 | 537 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 538 | 539 | 538 | 539 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|-------|
| The level of benefits. | Pearson Correlation | -0.04 | 0.04 | -0.02 | -0.14* | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.11* | 0.03 | 0.05 | -0.06 | 0.09* | -0.05 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.06 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.23 | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.27 |
| | N | 528 | 541 | 538 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 539 | 540 |
| The degree to which opportunities for advancement are made available. | Pearson Correlation | -0.04 | 0.00 | 0.03 | -0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02* | 0.10* | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.02 | -0.14* | 0.13* | 0.10* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.43 | 0.94 | 0.54 | 0.39 | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.44 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| | N | 529 | 542 | 539 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 540 | 541 |
| Your advancement opportunities compared to those in similar positions. | Pearson Correlation | -0.04 | -0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.13* | 0.11* | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.05 | -0.14* | 0.14* | 0.10* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.38 | 0.90 | 0.40 | 0.86 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| | N | 527 | 540 | 537 | 536 | 537 | 538 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 538 | 539 | 538 | 539 |
| The process used to define job security within your school district. | Pearson Correlation | -0.10* | 0.03 | -0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.14* | 0.09* | 0.08 | 0.11* | 0.07 | -0.09* | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.03 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 0.46 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.60 |
| | N | 527 | 540 | 537 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 538 | 539 | 538 | 539 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Your job security compared to those in similar positions. | Pearson Correlation | -0.13* | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | -0.02 | 0.15* | 0.09* | 0.06 | .11* | 0.09* | -0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.69 | 0.55 | 0.43 | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.30 |
| | N | 529 | 542 | 539 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 540 | 541 |
| The level of job security with your position. | Pearson Correlation | -0.16* | 0.03 | -0.05 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.16* | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.12* | 0.10* | -0.07 | 0.07 | 0.01 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.24 | 0.79 | 0.82 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.36 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.87 |
| | N | 526 | 539 | 536 | 535 | 535 | 537 | 535 | 534 | 536 | 537 | 538 | 537 | 538 |
| The overall feeling of job security within your organization. | Pearson Correlation | -0.18* | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15* | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.09* | 0.08 | -0.07 | 0.07 | 0.00 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.96 |
| | N | 530 | 543 | 540 | 539 | 539 | 541 | 538 | 538 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 541 | 542 |
| Authority delegated compared to duties delegated. | Pearson Correlation | -0.11* | 0.02 | -0.03 | -0.02 | 0.00 | 0.14* | 0.12* | 0.09* | 0.05 | 0.02 | -0.05 | 0.11* | -0.02 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.49 | 0.67 | 0.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.27 | 0.59 | 0.23 | 0.01 | 0.59 |
| | N | 532 | 545 | 542 | 541 | 541 | 543 | 540 | 540 | 542 | 543 | 544 | 543 | 544 |

Table 5 Continued

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|------|------|--------|-------|-------|
| The sensitivity of your supervision or to your needs. | Pearson Correlation | -0.04 | -0.04 | 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.10* | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.12* | 0.15* | -0.02 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.63 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.02 | 0.84 | 0.91 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.60 |
| | N | 528 | 541 | 538 | 537 | 537 | 539 | 536 | 536 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 539 | 540 |

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Summary

The objective of this quantitative study is to determine the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship through the examination of their causes as identified by practicing principals. The results showed that the principals were satisfied for the 34 out of the 35 items in the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey. Principals were not satisfied was on their salary compared to that of people with similar training in other professions. In addition, the Pearson's correlation test results showed that there is a significant correlation between the demographic data on the principals on age, race, gender, self-report about principalship success or challenge, type of school, years of experience, and academic credentials; and the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship.

In the next chapter, an overview of the study, the reasons and rational for its undertaking, a highlight of the findings, some implications for consideration, and recommendations for action and future study will be presented.

Chapter Five: Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship through a survey of practicing principals using the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey (Wood, 1976). It explored the leadership behaviors of principals and the motivation of principals utilizing Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation as a framework for analysis. The study was driven by showcasing the challenges of the principalship in the face of a declining pool of qualified individuals willing to take on the role. Given that the school principal is charged with the care and stewardship of teaching and learning in a school, the researcher hoped that data gleaned from this study might help in supporting novice principals, provide information for aspiring principals about the challenges of the principalship, and help show that many of the challenges of the principalship are universal.

Recent research has devoted much attention to the principalship in the area of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction impacts the intrinsic motivation needed to be a successful principal, and given what research has found as the critical role that principals play in school improvement and student academic achievement, it is worthwhile to explore levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among principals. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation has been established as a standard in exploring job satisfaction. It provides a lens through which job satisfaction in the principalship might be analyzed, continuing the convention of using practicing principals of varying levels of experience to offer insight into

the principalship. This study sought to add to the body of leadership studies that explores job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the principalship.

This study used a descriptive research methodological design as described by Merriam and Simpson (2000): describing the facts and characteristics of a given phenomenon, population, or area of interest; identifying observations of current conditions and practice; conducting evaluation of observations; and comparing experience between groups with similar problems to assist in future planning and decision making. In this instance, the phenomenon of interest was how practicing principals might express job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. The descriptive research methodology employed to collect data was an established survey from the field, the Adapted Wood Faculty Survey. It is designed to measure characteristics that describe relevant phenomena of workplace practice in job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction pertinent to this study.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the findings of this study, some speculative commentary follows.

- Principals at lower school levels (elementary) had higher job satisfaction than middle and high school principals.
- Principals at schools that are in suburban areas had higher job satisfaction than principals in rural areas.

- Race/ethnicity had a significant positive relationship with the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship, meaning that for respondents to this survey satisfaction levels did not seem to vary along race/ethnicity. For instance, African-American respondents were as satisfied as their Caucasian and other race/ethnicity categories.
- Female principals had higher job satisfaction than male principals.
- Principals who are older had higher job satisfaction than younger principals.
- Principals who had greater total years of experience as an educator prior to their first administrative job have higher job satisfaction than less experienced principals. This item was intended to capture data from respondents whose pathway to the principalship might not have been the traditional route through the assistant principalship, hence the reference ‘educator.’ For example, the teacher or counselor who rises to the principalship, or the district administrator who moves into the principalship.
- Principals that have greater total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to their first principalship had higher job satisfaction than principals with less experience as assistant principals.
- Principals that had greater total years of experience as a principal in their current job had higher job satisfaction than principals with less tenure in their current position.
- Principals that had greater total years of experience as a principal had higher job satisfaction than their less experienced peers.

- Principals that had higher degrees had higher job satisfaction.
- Principals leading larger schools had higher job satisfaction than did principals leading smaller schools.
- Principals who plan to remain in the profession had higher job satisfaction.

If this research project is to be taken at face value, what respondents report as dissatisfying about the principalship is, in general, not enough to compel them to leave the principalship. Somewhat surprisingly to the author, practitioners are not lining up to exit the role or counting down the days until the end. Respondents, for the most part, were satisfied with aspects of the principalship despite its documented challenges. Not surprisingly, it appears that most respondents have found a way to deal with these challenges given the high satisfaction levels reported correlated across the demographic variables measured. This may suggest that, as Gawlick (2008) found, respondents have developed an attitude toward the principalship that allows practitioners to spend time on the essential aspects of the principalship rather than being overwhelmed by its inherent challenges.

From the author's perspective, this was slightly skewed from what was found overwhelmingly in the research: if the research was to be taken at face value, then those currently in the principalship cannot wait to relieve themselves of the role and qualified candidates do not desire to take on its frustrations. Cushing, Kerrins, and Johnstone (2003) asserted this dramatically as stated in an earlier chapter as did Daresh (2004) in his follow-up to the 1998 study on the principalship by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1998). Among the respondents, it was surprising to note such high levels of

satisfaction given the challenges inherent to the principalship uncovered by the author in the research for this study.

A high percentage of the respondents self-reported being successful. On most indicators on the satisfaction continuum, the respondents seemed mostly satisfied. On most indicators on the dissatisfaction continuum, respondents only seemed dissatisfied with salary. Most of the respondents were Caucasian, female, experienced, elementary principals working in suburban, moderately sized schools. Perhaps something, the author wonders, unique to these particular demographic characteristics speaks to their correlation with high satisfaction levels in the principalship. The answer to that may be beyond the scope of this current study but may open the door to future study.

Regarding high satisfaction levels finding correlation with elementary level principals working in moderately sized, suburban schools, perhaps these elements for respondents to this survey represent just the right mix of balancing academic, community, and resource issues typically faced by school principals. Couple these elements with the set of demographics related to gender, race/ethnicity and age of respondents, perhaps—again—the author has happened on an ideal mix of factors that correlate with high levels of job satisfaction. Any one of these demographics might represent its own study, well beyond the scope of this current study, but the questions cannot go unasked:

- What about the principalship for these respondents creates common satisfaction across race/ethnicity?

- What is it about the experience of female principals in this data set that gives them the edge in satisfaction levels over the male principals in the data set? (Or, is it simply that there are more female principals at the elementary level in this data set than at other levels?)

For respondents to this survey, principals who were more senior in age as well as principals who reported a higher number of years of experience leading up and through their current principalship reported high levels of job satisfaction. These findings alone may suggest that experience may mean a great deal in connection to high job satisfaction in the principalship. Furthermore, this correlated to the demographics of those respondents who possessed higher degrees and who stated that they planned to remain in the profession, may reveal a population of practitioners who are intensely motivated in their pursuit of success in the principalship. If an individual pursues advanced degrees successfully, the author infers that such an individual has accomplished something distinctive, a possible indicator of strong intrinsic motivation, an element previously correlated with success in the principalship. Furthermore, an individual who self-reports that they plan to remain in the profession, more than likely, has developed a disposition about the principalship to get through its challenges.

Consequently, it was not so surprising that these factors are correlated with high satisfaction. One can infer that the longer an individual interacts with a set of challenging circumstances, the greater the likelihood that such an individual might either develop a disposition favorable to overcoming the challenges or, at least, rationalize its difficulties away.

Discussion

The author's assumptions aside, this research study proved to be situated in existing research between job satisfaction in the principalship and the use of Herzberg's Two Factor Theory as a framework for analysis in educational settings. Sergiovanni (1967) first established the tradition of using Herzberg's framework in an education setting while DuFour (1986) expanded the tradition to include the principalship. It is within the scope of the work of the latter in which this study attempts to follow in applying Herzberg's framework to educational leadership.

Job satisfaction in the principalship has been a focus of study in leadership research. Penguilly (2010) found that districts will continue to struggle to find candidates so long as challenges of the principalship persist. Success in the principalship is contingent upon finding a way to navigate its complexity. Penguilly's (2010) research suggests improving satisfaction levels of practitioners by identifying what contributes to high satisfaction is an effort that rewards itself. The current study worked in this vein by asking currently practicing principals to uncover these challenges.

Similarly, Oliver (2003) found that where experience and high job satisfaction are positively correlated in the assistant principalship such candidates going into the principalship report high satisfaction levels. The current study uncovered similar findings in survey responses from the currently practicing principals in the respondent data set. Total years of experience seemed to matter a great deal to respondents as correlated with reports of high satisfaction levels. Furthermore, most respondents to the current study reported they

were satisfied by factors related to achievement and growth than external factors like salary, as similarly found by Elise and Sodoma (1999, 2005) in their initial and follow-up studies of principals.

Having sought to position the current study within the tradition of research in leadership studies on the principalship, it appears to have found success in finding common discoveries in looking at job satisfaction in the principalship and in the use of Herzberg's framework as theoretical model.

Implications

This study offers implications for leadership practice and research. For practice, implications resonate for motivation about the work of the principalship, about the possible model or view of the principalship as a community leader, and about the kind of disposition that best advantages practitioners with accomplishing the critical aspects of the principalship. For research, implications resonate for the continued use of Herzberg's Two Factor Theory to educational leadership inquiries—in particular, the use of the Adapted Wood Faculty Survey to the principalship.

Self-development is the essential starting point for leadership improvement. However, principals need to learn how to do this without becoming overwhelmed, autocratic, or too heavily reliant on positional power. This study may suggest that successful principals—those that report high job satisfaction—develop an attitude toward analysis, planning, setting priorities, delegating, concentrating and finishing tasks, an attitude that allows them to spend time on the important aspects of the principalship such as supporting

constructive relationships among stakeholders, supervising what is good for teaching and learning, and managing the resources of the school to sustain these endeavors (Gawlick, 2008).

According to Herzberg, individuals are not content with the satisfaction of lower-order needs at work; for example, attaining a minimum salary or safe and pleasant working conditions. Rather, individuals look for the gratification of higher-level psychological needs having to do with achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, and the nature of the work itself. Herzberg proposed a two-factor theory of motivation, based on the notion that the presence of a certain set of job characteristics or incentives leads to worker satisfaction, whereas a different set of job characteristics leads to worker dissatisfaction. Thus, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not on a continuum, with one increasing as the other diminishes, but are independent phenomena (Herzberg, 1959). This theory suggests that to improve job attitudes and productivity, administrators must recognize and attend to both sets of characteristics and not assume that an increase in satisfaction leads to a decrease in dissatisfaction. The researcher posited that the same idea applies to the principalship.

The Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey used for this study includes elements and items used by Herzberg in his Two-Factor Theory and is an “instrument suitable for use in measuring the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction” (Wood, 1976, p. 56). It provided a framework to explore job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction correlated to a range of demographic variables.

For the relationship between the demographic data of gender and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, male principals had higher job satisfaction in four aspects of the principalship (of observing teacher's growth and success over a period of time, participation in in-service education, types and levels of in-service education, and personal relationships on the job). Female principals had higher satisfaction in two areas -of the number of hours worked each week and their work schedule compared to that of colleagues. For the relationship between the demographic data of age and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship, principals who are older had higher job satisfaction than did younger principals. For the relationship between the demographic data of total years of experience as an educator prior to first administrative job and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, principals that have greater total years of experience as an educator prior to their first administrative job have higher job satisfaction. For the relationship between the demographic data of total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to their first principalship and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship, principals that have greater total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to their first principalship have higher job satisfaction than their less administratively experienced peers. For the relationship between the demographic data of total years of experience as principal in current job and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, principals that have greater total years of experience as principal in current job have higher job satisfaction than their less experienced peers. For the relationship between the demographic data of total years of experience as a principal and job satisfaction and job

dissatisfaction in principalship, principals that have greater total years of experience as principal have higher job satisfaction.

With respect to the correlation between the demographic data of highest degree attained and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship, principals that have higher degrees have higher job satisfaction. The association between the demographic data of school size and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in principalship, principals leading larger schools have higher job satisfaction than principals in smaller schools. For the connection between the demographic data of 'I plan to remain in the profession or to leave the profession' and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship, principals that plan to remain in the profession have higher job satisfaction. This study shows that principals were satisfied in 34 out of the 35 items on the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Survey.

The one item of the 35 item the Adapted Wood Faculty Job Survey wherein the principals were not satisfied was on their salary compared to those of people with similar training in other professions. However, in general, this study shows that the principals were satisfied with their job as principals.

The principalship is one of the most critical roles in supporting student achievement (*U.S. News & World Report*, 2003). Fewer people are lining up to take on the principalship, so it is worthwhile to explore what works in the principalship and what does not (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003). It has been established that the support to principals engaged in this critical work has been inconsistent, contributing to the challenges faced by principals (Daresh, 2004).

Nevertheless, above all, principals have to be community leaders with strong interpersonal skills to enable them to effectively communicate with a wide range of stakeholders for the benefit of students while maintaining the physical plant, instilling learning standards, ensuring the health, safety, and well-being of students and adults in the school, and meeting local, state, and federal demands (NASSP, 2007). Principals must be active to ensure students meet standards (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). This study shows that the motivation to do well in the principalship comes from the individual's motivation about the work. Elements that contribute to dissatisfaction must be acknowledged and addressed to mitigate the shortfall of qualified candidates for the principalship and stem the flow of individuals leaving the principalship. Too little attention has been focused on the conditions under which principals must work to lead effective schools (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003).

So, the implications of this study for leadership practice and research are clear. For practice, motivation about the work of the principalship must be intrinsic, understanding the realities of the principalship are key, and adapting a disposition accordingly that best affords practitioners with a perspective for accomplishing the critical aspects of the principalship is fundamental. For research, Herzberg's Two Factor Theory offers a ready framework to make the challenges and strengths of the principalship explicit, and the Adapted Wood Faculty Survey is a proven tool and could be useful to meeting that aim.

With the realization that the difficulties inherent in the principalship are not going away, there continues to be a need for more qualified principals. In addition, there is a need

to support currently practicing principals. This study may suggest that principals who report being satisfied state that the motivation for accomplishing good schools must be intrinsic given the burdens of the position. This study may suggest that the challenges and demands of the principalship can be explained using Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation as a framework (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003).

Recommendations

Based on the analysis of the data, review of the findings, conclusions, and implications of this study, recommendations for future study and action are presented.

For Future Study

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory identifies job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as separate continuums. Continued exploration into the particular aspects of the principalship that contributes to dissatisfaction as identified along this continuum could potentially mitigate their impact. Doing so would have the effect of removing barriers to success for practitioners in the principalship. Therefore, future research should be dedicated to identifying factors reported as dissatisfying in the principalship by individuals in the role.

Furthermore, one of the limitations of this study concerned access to principals. It could be assumed that the very challenges identified through this study that make the principalship a difficult one kept many potential respondents from choosing to participate. The inverse may then be true as well: those who were able to have developed a constructive disposition toward the principalship's inherent challenges were more likely to not see

choosing to participate in this study as a wieldy endeavor. This may offer a significant lens through which data from the respondents might be viewed. Given the scope, scale and voluntary nature of this study, those with a positive, well-adjusted disposition may likely participate while those who might be overwhelmed by the challenges of the principalship may choose not to participate. Of course, this is speculative, which raises another door for future study. As useful as the Adapted Wood Faculty Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Survey proved to be in its alignment with Herzberg's Two Factory Theory framework, it became a challenge to infer the reasons undergirding the correlations uncovered. Perhaps an annual survey of principal working conditions might bring to light some context for some of these correlations. For example, why does the data show a correlation between highest degree and high job satisfaction? Or, why does the data show an association of higher job satisfaction for principals leading larger schools than smaller schools? Why is salary dissatisfying? These answers to these questions may be forthcoming with future study utilizing different survey tools. Therefore, more research encompassing all practicing principals might yield significant data missed by this study.

For Practice

As a state, North Carolina surveys its teachers as to working conditions in an effort to continually improve schools. There is no such attention to principals. If the same kind of annual survey were administered to principals fueled along the same research lines of Herzberg's Two Factory Theory, then the state would bring to light elements contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. This could further aid the state in

its efforts to continually improve schools, given the importance of the principalship to schools. Principals work to ensure students meet standards (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). Too little attention, however, is focused on principal working conditions. Human resource directors and superintendents identify these as reasons there are supposedly not enough qualified individuals applying for principal positions (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003). It would then be worthwhile for the state to invest in such a survey, given that principals are critical to facilitating the direction of schools (NASSP, 2007).

Conclusion

In sum, with respect to recommendations for future study and action, further research be conducted to determine the degrees of dissatisfaction in the principalship; that further research be conducted encompassing all practicing principals in North Carolina rather than a select few; that further research be conducted to further explore how each of the demographic variables impact job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship in North Carolina; and that at an appropriate level within the NC Department of Public Instruction and in coordination with other school districts across the state, an annual survey of practicing principals be conducted to monitor job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

This quantitative study surveyed principals in an effort to identify sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the principalship. Their responses were examined for trends utilizing Herzberg's Two Factor Theory as a framework. Overall, this study found that most respondents were satisfied with the principalship and were only dissatisfied with salary.

Data from this investigation adds to the body of existing research on the principalship and offers implications for future study and practice. The clear implication of this investigation is a charge for superintendents, human resource directors and education agencies to aggressively look at the working conditions of principals. Something systemic needs to happen in order to capture the view from the field. There simply needs to be more information brought to light about the working conditions of principals, particularly in an era of high accountability. This study calls for a Principal Working Conditions Survey modeled after the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey to help accomplish this aim.

REFERENCES

- Adamowski, S., Bowles-Therriault, S., & Cavanna, A. (2007). *The autonomy gap: Barriers to effective school leadership* Thomas B. Fordham Foundation & Institute: Washington, DC.
- Alvy, H. B., & Robbins, P. (1998). *If I only knew: Success strategies for navigating the principalship*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Alzaidi, A. M. (2006). A qualitative study of job satisfaction among secondary school head teachers in the city of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. *ARECLS: Annual Review of Education, Communication, and Language Sciences, Vol. 5*, 161-185.
- Babbie, E. (1005). *The practice of social research* (7th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bassett-Jones, N., & Lloyd, G. (2005). Does Herzberg's motivation theory have staying power? *Journal of Management Development, 24*, 929-943.
- Carr, M. (2007). Smoothing ripples before they become waves. *Business Credit, 109*(10), 6-8.
- Collins, J. C. (2005). *Good to great and the social sectors: Why business thinking is not the answer. A monograph to accompany good to great: Why some companies make the leap--and others don't*. Boulder, CO: J. Collins.
- Cushing, K.S, Kerrins, J., & Johnstone, T. (May-June 2003). *Disappearing principals: What is the real reason behind the shortage of applicants for principal positions across the state and nation? It's the job, stupid!* [Retrieved] June 30, 2012, [from] http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0HUL/is_5_32/.

- Daresh, J. (2004). Mentoring school leaders: Professional promise or predictable problems? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 495-517.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Executive summary*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Deshields, O., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: Applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 19, 128-139.
- Dillman, D., Smyth, J. D. & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: the tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley and Sons.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 87(643), 43-65.
- Dufour, R. P. (1986). Must principals choose between teacher morale and an effective school? *NASSP Bulletin*, 70, 33-37.
- Eberlin, R., & Tatum, B. (2008). Making just decisions: Organizational justice, decision-making, and leadership. *Management Decision*, 46, 310-329.
- Else, D., & Sodoma, B. (1999). *Principal shortage and job satisfaction survey*. Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Gawlick, M. (2008). Breaking loose-principal autonomy in charter and public schools. *Educational Policy*, 22(6), 783-804.
- Gay, L. (1987). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Gaziel, H. (1986). Correlates of job satisfaction: A study of the two-factor theory in an educational setting. *The Journal of Psychology*, 120(6), 613-626.
- Gray, S. P., & Streshly, W. A. (2008). *From good schools to great schools: What their principals do well*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gross, S.J. (2006). *Leadership mentoring maintaining school improvement in turbulent times*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Grubb, W. N., & Flessa, J. (2006). "A job too big for one": Multiple principals and other non-traditional approaches to school leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(4), 518-559. doi:10.1177/0013161X06290641.
- Hansford, B., & Ehrich, L. (2006). The principalship: How significant is mentoring? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(1), 36-52.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hopkins, G. (2005). Faculty motivation: A view from the ivory tower. *Academic Leader*, 21, 4-5.
- Hsien-Wen, C., & Grier, L. (2008). Effect of personal values transformation on leadership behavior. *Total Quality Management*, 19(1-2), 67-77.

- Iacqua, J., Schumacher, P., & Li, H.C. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education, 1*(1), 51-61.
- Jacques, P., Garger, J., & Thomas, M. (2008). Assessing leader behaviors in project managers. *Management Research News, 31*, 4-11.
- Katt, J., & Condly, S. (2009). A preliminary study of classroom motivators and demotivators from a motivation-hygiene perspective. *Communication Education, 58*(2), 213-234.
- Koltoko-Rivera, M. (2006). Rediscovering the later version of Maslow's hierarchy of needs: Self-transcendence and opportunities for theory, research and unification. *Review of General Psychology, 10*, 302-317.
- Hertling, E. (2001) Retaining principals. *Eric Digest*. 147 EDO-EA-01-04.
- Lindner, J. R (01/01/2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education (1042-0541), 42* (4), 43.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370-396. doi:10.1037/h0054346.
- Merriam, S.B., & Simpson, E.L. (1995) *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults* (2d ed.). Malabar, FL: Kreiger.

- Miller, G. E. D. (2008). *A cross case analysis of mentee change in leadership behavior during a mentoring and coaching program in Virginia*. (Doctoral dissertation) Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, Richmond, VA.
- Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. L. (1983). Handling nonresponse issues. *Journal of Extension*, 21(5), 45-50.
- Monagan, C. F. (1981) *Job satisfaction of dietitians in the army medical specialist corps* (Doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University: Columbus, Ohio.
- Murphy, J. (2006). *Preparing school leaders: Defining a research and action agenda*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Murray, J P., Murray, J. I., & Summar, C. (2000). The propensity of community college chief academy officers to leave an institution. *Community College Review*, 28(22), 22-36.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2003). *NAESP fact sheet on the principalship shortage*. Retrieved December 2, 2006 from <http://www.naesp.org/contentLoad.do?contendl=1097>.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2008). *Leading learning communities: Standards for what principals should know and be able to do* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: NAESP.
- Nir, A. E., & Kranot, N. (2006). School principal's leadership style and teachers' efficacy. *Planning and Changing*, 37(3&4), 205-218.
- Oliver, R. (2003) Assistant principal job satisfaction and desire to become principals. *Education Leadership Review*, 4(2), 38-46.

- Oplatka, I., & Mimon, R. (2008) Women principals' conceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction: An alternative view? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(2), 135-153.
- Pengilly, M. (2010). *An examination of principal job satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation. University of California, Davis, CA.
- Pierson, M. (2008). *Job satisfaction of principals in urban high schools in New Jersey*. Doctoral dissertation. Capella University.
- Pijanowski, J. C., Hewitt, P.M., & Brady, K.P. (2009). Superintendent's perceptions of the principal shortage. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 93(2), 85-95.
- Raymer, A. N. (2006). *Principal leadership and school culture in public schools: Case studies of two piedmont North Carolina elementary schools*. Doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC.
- Richards, J. (2005). *Principal behaviors that encourage teachers' perceptions of teachers at three career stages*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, Apr 11-15, 2005).
- Riday, G. E., Bingham, R. D., & Harvey, T. R. (1984). Satisfaction of community college faculty: Exploding a myth. *Community College Review*, 12(46), 46-50.
- Rogers, J. (2005). Aspiring to leadership – identifying teacher-leaders. *Medical Teacher*, 27(7), 629-633.

- Saglam, A.C. (2007) Motivation of academics: An empirical assessment of Herzberg's theory. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 16(3), 260-274.
- Salant, P., & Dillman, D.A. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: Wiley.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5, 66-82.
- Shockley, R., Watlington, E., & Felsher, R. (2011) Lost at sea: Summary results of a meta-analysis of the efficacy of teacher induction and implications for administrative practice. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 8(3), 12-25.
- Sodoma, B. (2005). *Job satisfaction of Iowa public school principals*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA.
- Sodoma, B., & Else, D. (2009). Job satisfaction of Iowa public school principals. *The Rural Educator*, 31(1), 10-18.
- Ssesanga, K., & Garrett, R. (2005). Job satisfaction of university academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Education*, 50(1), 33-56.
- Stello, C. M. (April, 2011). *Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction: An integrative literature review*. Unpublished paper presented at The 2011 Student Research Conference: Exploring Opportunities in Research, Policy, and Practice, University of Minnesota Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development, Minneapolis, MN.
- Thach, L. (1995). Using electronic mail to conduct survey research. *Educational Technology*, 35(2), 27-31.

- Turner, C. S. (2006). *A study of job satisfaction with situational characteristics and occurrences among middle school principals in South Carolina*. Doctoral dissertation. South Carolina University, Columbia, SC.
- U. S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). *Occupational Outlook Handbook*. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos007.htm>.
- U. S. News & World Report. (2003). *Money and Business*. Retrieved September 16, 2007, from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/biztech/articles/030224/24Tracks.intro_2.htm
- Watson, S. C. (1998). A primer in survey research. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, Winter, 31-40.
- Wheelis, V. (2005). *The relationship between school performance scores and job satisfaction of principals in Louisiana*. Doctoral dissertation. Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA.
- Wood, O. R. (1973). *An analysis of faculty motivation to work in the North Carolina Community College System*. Doctoral dissertation. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Wood, O. R. (1976) Measuring job satisfaction of the community college staff. *Community College Review*, 3(56), 56-64.
- Young, P.G., Sheets, J.M., & Knight, D.D. (2005). *Mentoring principals frameworks, agendas, tips, and case stories for mentors and mentees*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

APPENDIX

Survey Cover Letter

[date]

Dear Colleague:

My name is Cory Hogans. I, like you, am a practicing principal. Please assist my research by completing an important 15-minute, online survey that measures the degree to which certain factors are important to having or maintaining job satisfaction in the principalship. In the next few days, an invitation to participate in this short survey will be emailed to you through a website surveying system called Survey Monkey.

As you are aware, the principalship is a complex role with a great many responsibilities, some of which there is little preparation for the novice principal. My research posits that most practitioners who have attained the principalship learn to be successful through trial and error experience and reflections on this experience. Various aspects of the principalship are the focus of this research. Please take a few minutes to answer the few questions that make up this survey. With sensitivity that I will be soliciting your opinions and comments about various aspects of the principalship, please know that the information you provide will be treated with confidentiality and used only by me under the supervision of my doctoral committee in conjunction with other responses from the same randomly selected group who participate. Your name will not be used or otherwise associated with any comment you make regardless of its tone.

Your immediate, candid, and professional contribution to this study is needed and greatly appreciated. I sincerely thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. As an education practitioner and doctoral student, it is my goal to pursue research that promises definitive forms of contribution to the field of leadership studies. This survey is designed with that goal in mind.

Respectfully,

Cory H. Hogans

Doctoral student
Educational Leadership Program
North Carolina State University

Principal Survey

Adapted Wood Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

Instructions

1. For each of the following items, circle the response that best represents your level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.
2. It is very important that all items have a response.

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Scale: 1=Very dissatisfied | 4=Slightly satisfied |
| 2=Moderately dissatisfied | 5=Moderately satisfied |
| 3=Slightly dissatisfied | 6=Very satisfied |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The actual achievement of work-related goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | The immediate results from your work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3 | The actual adoption of practices that you recommend. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | Personal goal attainment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5 | Observing teachers' growth and success over a period of time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6 | Opportunities for increased responsibility in education. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | Participation in in-service education. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8 | Types and levels of in-service education. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9 | Opportunities to grow professionally through formal education. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10 | Opportunities to attend professional conferences, workshops, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11 | Principal-teacher relationships. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12 | Professional relationships on the job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13 | Personal relationships on the job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14 | The extent to which administrative policies and procedures are actually followed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Demographics:

- A. How would you rate your current principalship to date?
 - a. I believe I am successfully meeting the challenges inherent to being a good principal in my current school setting.
 - b. I believe that I am still learning to meet the challenges inherent to being a good principal in my current school setting.
- B. Describe your school level:
 - a. Elementary
 - b. Middle
 - c. High
 - d. Alternative
 - e. Other: _____
- C. Describe your school surroundings:
 - a. Rural
 - b. Urban
 - c. Suburban
 - d. Other: _____
- D. Race/ethnicity:
 - a. African-American
 - b. Asian
 - c. Caucasian
 - d. Hispanic/Latino

- e. Other: _____
- E. Gender
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
- F. Age
 - a. 26-29
 - b. 30-39
 - c. 40-49
 - d. 50-59
 - e. 60 or older
- G. Total years of experience as an educator prior to first administrative job:
 - a. 3-5
 - b. 6-10
 - c. 11-15
 - d. 16-20
 - e. 21 or more
- H. Total years of experience as an assistant principal prior to first principalship
 - a. 0-5
 - b. 6-10
 - c. 11-15
 - d. 16-20
 - e. 21 or more
- I. Total years of experience as principal in current job

- a. 0-5
 - b. 6-10
 - c. 11-15
 - d. 16-20
 - e. 21 or more
- J. Total years of experience as a principal
- a. 0-5
 - b. 6-10
 - c. 11-15
 - d. 16-20
 - e. 21 or more
- K. Highest degree attained to date:
- a. Master's degree
 - b. Education Specialist
 - c. Doctorate
- L. Do you plan to remain in the profession or to leave the profession?
- a. I plan to leave the profession.
 - b. I plan to remain in the profession.
- M. Choose the range that best describes the size (total students) of your school:
- a. 50-200
 - b. 201-500
 - c. 501-1000
 - d. Over 1000