

JOB SATISFACTION of MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS in
VIRGINIA

JoeAnn E. Newby

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Educational Administration

Glen I. Earthman, Co-Chairman
Patrick W. Carlton, Co-Chairman
Jane T. York
Stephen R. Parson
Robert R. Richards

Blacksburg, Virginia
February 1999

Key Words: Job Satisfaction, Middle School Principals

JOB SATISFACTION OF MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN VIRGINIA

by

JoeAnn E. Newby

Glenn I. Earthman and Patrick W. Carlton, Co-Chairmen

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to assess job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The primary question addressed by the study was: What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire? In addition to the primary question, three sub-questions were addressed by the study. They were: a) What is the general satisfaction level according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size? b) what is the satisfaction level for each of the 20 dimensions of the job measured by the MSQ? and c) what is the satisfaction level for the 20 dimensions of the job according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size?

One hundred eighty-eight middle school principals in Virginia selected from the 1997-98 Virginia Educational Directory were surveyed with the Individual Data Sheet and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Demographic data pertaining to gender, age, experience, degree, school location, and school size were collected through use of the Individual Data Sheet. The 1967 Long-Form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to measure job satisfaction. Using this instrument, the general satisfaction score for the respondents resulted in a

mean of 3.65 ($SD = .57$) indicating that these principals are “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with their jobs. According to the demographic variables, all general satisfaction scores were within the “Satisfied” range. The mean scores for the 20 dimensions ranged from “Slightly Satisfied” (2.00-2.99) to “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99). Compensation ranked the lowest in the hierarchy ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .94$), and Social Service ranked the highest ($M = 4.19$, $SD = .73$). Demographically, females were significantly more satisfied with Activity and Variety than males; younger and older principals were significantly more satisfied with Activity than middle aged principals; principals with educational specialist degrees were significantly more satisfied with Achievement than doctorate and masters principals; principals from suburban schools were significantly more satisfied with Compensation, Supervision, and Working Conditions than urban and rural principals, and principals at large schools were significantly more satisfied with General Satisfaction, Advancement, and Security than principals from small schools.

Recommendations for further research included: to conduct a study of principal satisfaction and student performance; conduct a comparative investigation of elementary, middle and secondary principal satisfaction; investigate principal satisfaction and school size, and study job satisfaction of principals using the interview technique or an open-ended survey instrument.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I give all the glory to God, the source of my strength, for granting me both the mental and physical endurance to complete this monumental task. Then, I would like to thank my entire family, especially my loving husband, John, for his love, patience, and understanding.

I would like to extend a very special thanks to Dr. Clarence Preston Penn for believing in me and for his continued support and encouragement throughout this process.

Special thanks to my co-workers Dr. Marion Wilkins, Rita Holmes, Frank Williams, Elaine Pearson, Edna Powell, George Fauntleroy; the entire staff of Surry Elementary School, and members of the PTA Executive Board for your assistance and encouragement.

To Dr. Glen Earthman, my advisor, and Dr. David Parks, my Tidewater coach, I extend special thanks and gratitude to you for your assistance, encouragement, and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE..... 1

 Introduction..... 1

 Statement of the Problem..... 3

 Research Questions..... 3

 The Purpose..... 4

 Significance of the Study..... 4

 Definitions of Key Terms..... 5

 Limitations of the Study..... 6

 Organization of the Study..... 6

CHAPTER TWO..... 7

 Review of the Literature..... 7

 Defining Job Satisfaction..... 7

 Measurement of Job Satisfaction..... 10

 Job Satisfaction Studies..... 14

 Job Satisfaction and Demographic Variables..... 21

CHAPTER THREE..... 32

 Methodology..... 32

 Design of the Study..... 32

 The Population..... 32

 Instrumentation..... 33

 Data Collection Procedures..... 39

Data Analysis.....	40
CHAPTER FOUR.....	43
MSQ Scale Analysis	43
Demographic Analysis.....	54
Analyses of Research Questions.....	55
CHAPTER FIVE.....	108
Summary of Findings.....	108
Conclusions.....	117
Discussion.....	118
Recommendations.....	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	126
APPENDIX A Individual Data Sheet.....	132
APPENDIX B Range of Scores for MSQ Scale.....	135
VITA.....	147

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1	Comparative Job Facets	13
2	Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	56
3	General Satisfaction and Demographics	58
5	Rank Order of MSQ Dimensions	60
6	Ability Utilization	63
7	Achievement	65
9	Activity	68
11	Advancement	70
13	Authority	73
14	Creativity	75
15	Compensation	77
17	Co-Worker	80
18	Independence	81
19	Supervision (Human Relations)	83
21	Moral Values	86
22	School Policies	88
23	Recognition	90
24	Responsibility	92
25	Security	94
27	Social Service	96
28	Social Status	98

29	Supervision (Technical)	101
31	Variety	104
33	Working Conditions	106

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Schultz (1982) defined job satisfaction as “the psychological disposition of people toward their work -- and this involves a collection of numerous attitudes or feelings” (p.287). Thus, job satisfaction or dissatisfaction depends on a large number of factors ranging from where employees have to eat their lunch to the sense of self fulfillment they may receive from doing their jobs. Usually, job satisfaction involves a delineation of those factors that an employee perceives to either foster a positive attitude about work, or a negative attitude about work. Herzberg (1973) found that “job attitudes are a powerful force and are functionally related to the productivity, stability, and adjustment of the industrial working force” (p. 96). Also, “the positive effects of high attitudes are more potent than the negative effects of low attitudes” (Herzberg, 1973, p. 96). Thus, a delineation of the factors that produce a positive attitude about work is important to the improvement of job performance.

Studies on job satisfaction in the United States began to emerge in the early 1900's (Hoppock, 1935). During this period, industrial psychologists conducted an array of studies on industry workers in an attempt to study employee behavior at work and to determine the extent of job satisfaction. Subsequently, the findings from these studies produced data relevant to specific job factors and to the employee perceptions of these factors. Managers have found these findings useful when dealing with motivation issues.

Although studies of industry workers provide meaningful data on job satisfaction, it is perhaps misleading to assume that findings pertaining to this population can be generalized for all people in all occupations (Hoppock, 1935). People differ in the extent to which they report job satisfaction, and the explanation for these differences lies in the nature of the jobs which various employees perform. For this reason, researchers began investigating other occupations in order to bring more diverse findings to the literature.

Consequently, beginning in the mid-nineteen-sixties and continuing, investigations were being conducted on various positions in the field of education. Job satisfaction of teachers (Sergiovanni, 1967); supervisors (Lawrence, 1979); elementary principals (Ward, 1977; Villines, 1987; Freeman, 1990; Dupree, 1991); secondary principals (Watson, 1991); guidance counselors (Kirk, 1990); and superintendents (Manning, 1976; Penn, 1985) were some of the positions that were studied in the state of Virginia and other states across the country. Findings from the literature conclude that when results are compared across these various positions, there are similarities as well as differences in how people in the field of education perceive their jobs. Additionally, throughout the literature, studies reveal that variables pertaining to school demographics and personal data (e.g., size of school, age, tenure, and gender) influence these perceptions.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to investigate three areas of job satisfaction. First, the study investigated the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Second, the researcher sought to determine which of the twenty dimensions of the job assessed on the MSQ the principals identified as contributing to job satisfaction. Last, the study determined the influence of the variables gender, age, education, experience, school location, and school size on the principals' general satisfaction level, and their satisfaction with the twenty dimensions of the job.

Research Questions

The questions that guided the study were:

1. What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?
 - a) What is the General Satisfaction level according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size?
 - a) What is the satisfaction level of each of the twenty dimensions of the job as measured by the MSQ?
 - b) What is the satisfaction level for each of the twenty dimensions of the MSQ according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size?

- c) What is the satisfaction level for each of the twenty dimensions of the MSQ according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size?

The Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Secondary purposes were: to identify the satisfaction levels of the principals according to the demographic variables: gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size; to determine principal satisfaction levels for each of the twenty dimensions of the job; and to assess the satisfaction for the twenty dimensions according to the demographic variables.

Significance of the Study

Research devoted solely to the study of middle school principals is very scarce and the study of job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia has yet to be conducted. Therefore, a study to assess the job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was conducted.

It was anticipated that the results of this study would (a) contribute to a larger body of literature on principal satisfaction; (b) help to establish a foundation for the study of principal job satisfaction; (c) assist graduate schools of education, state and local policy makers, state and local boards of education, and

superintendents in identifying strategies for making decisions which affect middle school principals, and (d) assist principals who complete the survey in clarifying their attitudes about their jobs.

Definitions of Key Terms

Definitions specific to the purposes of this study are presented in this section of the study.

Principal. “The individual identified as the chief building level administrator” (Long, 1989, p. 12).

Middle School. “A school that builds upon the elementary school program for younger children and in turn is built upon by the high school’s program for adolescence... not extending below grade 4 or above grade 8” (Long, 1989, p. 12).

Satisfaction. “An individual’s positive affective evaluation of the target environment; result of an individual’s requirements being fulfilled by the target environment; a pleasant affective state; the individual’s appraisal of the extent to which his or her requirements are fulfilled by the environment” (Lofquist & Dawis, 1991, p. 27).

Limitations of the Study

There were certain limitations in the study. These limitations are the following:

1. The study was limited to a survey of middle school principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia who were willing to participate in the study. Because of this limitation, it was not possible to make generalizations about middle school principals not employed in the state of Virginia.
2. The study was also limited to the respondents' responses on twenty given dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One is the introductory chapter and includes the statement of the problem and the guiding questions, the purposes of the study, the significance of the study, definitions of key terms, and limitations of the study. Chapter Two contains the review of related literature on job satisfaction, a review of the measurements of job satisfaction, and a review of the research pertaining to satisfaction and demographic variables. Chapter Three describes the methodology. Chapter Four reports the analysis of data and Chapter Five includes the summary, conclusions, and the recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter summarizes the findings of literature related to job satisfaction. The chapter is divided into three major sections: 1) a discussion of various definitions of job satisfaction, theories explaining the cause of satisfaction, and measures of satisfaction; 2) a summary of satisfaction studies on principal and other positions within the field of education, and 3) a discussion of the demographic variables that influence job satisfaction.

Defining Job Satisfaction

A review of satisfaction literature reflects one area in which there seems to be some general agreement among researchers. The area of agreement is the definition of job satisfaction. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) define it as “the feelings the worker has about his job” (p. 6). These feelings were based on the individual’s perceptions of the differences between what was expected as a fair return and what was actually experienced.

Lock (1969) defined total job satisfaction as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job achieving or facilitating one’s values” (p. 316). He also claimed that job satisfaction was a function of what a person wanted from a job and what he perceived it as offering. Lawler (1973) also

explained job satisfaction in terms of the difference between what people thought they should receive and what they perceived that they actually did receive.

Schultz (1982) defined job satisfaction as “ the psychological disposition of people toward their work – and this involves a collection of numerous attitudes or feelings” (p. 287).

Lofquist and Dawis (1991) defined satisfaction as “an individual’s positive affective evaluation of the target environment; result of an individual’s requirements being fulfilled by the target environment; a pleasant affective state; the individual’s appraisal of the extent to which his or her requirements are fulfilled by the environment” (p. 27).

There has been much less agreement on the part of researchers as to what causes job satisfaction. Various theories on job satisfaction have been developed, presented, and ultimately have been either supported or questioned by others in the field. Traditional theories have contended that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction share a single continuum; certain job factors create feelings of satisfaction when they are present and feelings of dissatisfaction when they are absent.

Traditionalists have claimed that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors have the capacity to create satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Intrinsic factors include recognition, achievement, responsibility, and advancement. Extrinsic factors of the job include salary, working conditions, supervision, and administrative policies (Finley, 1991). Robert Hoppock (1935) and Abraham Maslow (1954) are two prominent traditionalists throughout the literature promoting this line of thought.

In Hoppock's study, he concluded that if the presence of a certain variable led to satisfaction, then its absence led to dissatisfaction. Thus, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction shared the same continuum. Midway between satisfaction and dissatisfaction was a feeling of neutrality in which the individual was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Maslow (1954) theorized job satisfaction as a hierarchy of needs in which he categorized human needs into five orders. The lowest order consisted of the basic physiological needs such as water, food, and shelter. The second order consisted of physical and financial security. The third order consisted of social needs which included belonging, love, and acceptance of others. The fourth order consisted of self-esteem and recognition by peers. The fifth and highest order of needs consisted of self-actualization; which included self-development, autonomy, and self-direction. According to Maslow, needs at one level had to be met before the next level could become a motivator.

Herzberg (1959), in his study using 203 randomly selected accountants and engineers, refuted the concept of a single continuum between the satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Herzberg contended that job satisfiers were those aspects of work which were intrinsic to the employee and tended to promote feelings of happiness in the worker. The dissatisfiers were those aspects of work which were extrinsic and focused on the environment of the work (Herzberg, 1959). He further concluded that there probably were two continua present, one including those factors that caused satisfaction or lack of satisfaction, and a second which included

factors that caused dissatisfaction or a condition of no dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959).

Because discrepancy existed between the thought of the traditionalists and Herzberg, researchers continue to explore various methods to assess the cause of job satisfaction. Robbins (1988) suggests this is important to do because a link may exist between job performance and satisfaction.

Measurement Of Job Satisfaction

Much of the lack of success in constructing a theoretical basis for the study of job satisfaction may be due to the inability of researchers to agree on a common assessment device. After the analysis of nine operational definitions of job satisfaction, Wanous and Lawler (1972) concluded that , “As far as the measurement of satisfaction is concerned, the data suggest that there is no best way to measure it” (p. 104). Barrett (1972) stated that one major problem confronting industrial psychology was the lack of standardized measurements. O’Conner, Peters, and Gordon (1978) argued that legitimate reasons such as the need to measure specific facets of satisfaction or the extended length of a published scale may drive researchers to develop their own measures. They concluded that a commonly used measure must be developed.

An extensive review of the literature indicated the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1959) as a prominent model for identifying the satisfiers or intrinsic factors and the dissatisfiers or extrinsic factors of the job. There is recurring support for the Two-Factor Theory as it relates to

school administrators. Herzberg used a semi-structured interview in his study whereby workers were asked to report a time when they felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their jobs. If the worker described an exceptionally good experience which occurred within a short-range sequence of events, from one day to several weeks, they were asked to relate a bad experience which had occurred within a long-range sequence of events, from several weeks to several years (Herzberg, 1959). If a long-range sequence of events had been reported relative to the good feeling, the respondents were asked to give short-range incidents for the bad feeling. The analyses showed that humans have two different categories of needs which are essentially independent of each other and affect behavior in different ways (Herzberg, 1959).

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI), developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), is the most used and researched measure of job satisfaction (Muchinsky, 1990). The JDI measures five facets of job satisfaction. Each facet is measured using words or short phrases to determine if the word or phrase matches the respondent's assessment of the job satisfaction of that particular facet. The total score on the JDI is supposed to measure total job satisfaction; however, it is now hypothesized that total job satisfaction is more than the sum of facets satisfaction (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983). The developers of the JDI counter this charge by indicating that the main objective and accomplishment of the JDI is in measuring the satisfaction of the individual facets and not in measuring overall job satisfaction.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was developed by Weiss, Dawis, English, and Lofquist (1967) to measure the individual's satisfaction with twenty different aspects of the work environment and is the second most popular measure of job satisfaction. The MSQ is based on the following rationale: a) employees have a set of expectations concerning their work environments that are derived from their histories, individual abilities, and interests; b) employees have a set of work attitudes that emerge from the fulfillment of those expectations, and c) these attitudes make up employees' evaluation of their work environment or job satisfaction.

The MSQ is available in both a long form and a short form. The long form contains 100 items which measure twenty job facets and the responses can be converted to respondent's satisfaction on each of the facets. The short form uses the same response format but contains twenty items and only measures intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. Both forms can be used to report a measure of general job satisfaction.

Table 1, on the following page, shows a comparison of the facets that are measured on each of the three forms of measurement described above.

TABLE 1

Comparative Job Facets

Herzberg Two-Factor Model	Job Descriptive Index	Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
Advancement	Promotion	Advancement
Interpersonal Relations	Co-workers	Co-workers
Salary	Pay	Compensation
Supervision	Supervision	Supervision Human Relations
Work Itself	Work Itself	
Achievement		Achievement
Recognition		Recognition
Responsibility		Responsibility
Company Policies		Company Policies
Security		Security
Status		Status
Personal Life		
Possibility of Growth		
		Ability Utilization
		Activity
		Authority
		Creativity
		Independence
		Moral Values
		Social Service
		Variety
		Working Conditions
		Technical Supervision

Studies in Education Where the Herzberg
Two-Factor Model, the JDI, and the MSQ Were Used

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory was applied to numerous investigations to test its validity and the degree to which the conclusions could be generalized to other diverse populations. In 1976, Manning conducted a study concerning the job satisfaction of Virginia's superintendents. A stratified sample including thirty superintendents were interviewed and Manning noted the following: The motivators of Virginia superintendents were achievement, recognition, responsibility, possibility of growth, and interpersonal relations--school board. The hygiene factors of Virginia superintendents were school district policy and administration, working conditions, interpersonal relations--teachers, interpersonal relations--community, and work itself. The results of this study indicated four of the six Herzberg motivator factors (66 percent) as motivator factors for these superintendents. It also appeared that three of the ten Herzberg hygiene factors (30 percent) were actually identified as hygiene factors by the superintendents. The Herzberg model was a better measure of motivation factors for the superintendents in Virginia than it was a measure of the hygiene factors.

A study of job satisfaction of elementary principals in Virginia was conducted by Charles Ward in 1977. Thirty-six principals were included in the sample and were interviewed using the Herzberg instrument. The following findings were revealed concerning elementary principals in Virginia: The motivators, achievement, recognition, and work itself were identified by

elementary principals as motivators with achievement and recognition being significant. They also identified the hygiene factors of interpersonal relations--teachers as a motivator. Included in the findings were the hygiene factors of working conditions and interpersonal relations--central office staff being identified as hygiene factors. Other hygiene factors identified as hygiene factors for elementary principals in Virginia were supervision by superiors, school district policy and administration, interpersonal relations--community, interpersonal relations--school board and job security. Two hygiene factors, status and personal life, were not identified as either hygiene factors or as motivators. The findings from this study show that elementary principals in Virginia identified three of the six Herzberg motivators (50 percent) as job satisfiers and five of the ten hygiene factors (50 percent) as dissatisfiers. Thus, the Herzberg model was not a valid measure of job satisfaction for Virginia elementary principals.

Also in 1977, Wainwright conducted a study concerning job satisfaction of Virginia high school principals employing the Herzberg semi-structured technique. Interviews were taped and were analyzed using modified Herzberg criteria. Wainwright concluded that the following were hygiene factors for high school principals in the state of Virginia: legal implications, busing, integration, and school district policy and administration. Achievement and recognition for achievement were the significant motivators of Virginia high school principals. Thus, two of Herzberg's motivators were identified as motivators for high school principals in Virginia and one hygiene factor was identified as a dissatisfier.

A 1985 study utilizing the Herzberg model to identify the satisfiers and dissatisfiers of black school administrators in Virginia was conducted by Penn. The findings from this study showed that black school administrators in Virginia identified achievement, recognition, work itself, and responsibility as significant motivators and school district policy and administration as a significant hygiene factor. Further findings indicated that black administrators identified the Herzberg motivator, advancement, as a hygiene factor more often than as a motivator. The hygiene factor, interpersonal relations--school board, was mentioned equally as many times as a motivator as it was mentioned as a hygiene factor (Penn, 1985). Black administrators in Virginia seemed to perceive four of Herzberg's motivators as motivators and only one hygiene factor as a dissatisfier. The Herzberg model was a better measure of the motivators than the hygiene factors.

Elementary school principals in South Carolina and North Carolina were studied by Dupree (1989) and Freeman (1990), respectively. Both studies reported similar findings that are consistent with elementary principals in Virginia. Elementary principals in South and North Carolina indicated greatest amount of weight on the motivator factors responsibility (means = 4.59 & 4.70), work itself (means = 4.72 & 4.80), and achievement (means = 4.56 & 4.65). These findings were similar to those found by Herzberg; these factors were three of the key motivating factors.

Rasmussen (1990), applied the Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Theory to study job satisfaction factors as perceived by middle school principals employed in either Los Angeles or Orange County, California. The conclusions reached from

this study offered support of Herzberg as it related to middle school principals. The motivators were identified more frequently as contributing to satisfaction than were the hygiene factors. The hygiene factors were identified more frequently as contributing to job dissatisfaction than were the motivators.

In summary, the four Virginia studies completed by Manning, Ward, Wainwright, and Penn consistently supported the Herzberg motivators achievement and recognition as job satisfiers for Virginia administrators and the Herzberg hygiene factor, company policy and administration as a dissatisfier. The other hygiene-motivator factors were inconsistently mentioned by Virginia administrators and gave little support to Herzberg. Studies conducted in other states show consistent support of Herzberg. Consequently, the Herzberg studies identified various intrinsic and extrinsic facets of the job; however, these studies fail to note whether or not the administrators were actually satisfied with their jobs. These conclusions warrant a need for optional methods to study job satisfaction of school administrators.

The Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) was the instrument used to measure job satisfaction of 266 secondary female principals throughout the United States. The study was conducted in 1984 by Fansher and Buxton. These researchers noted that the 266 female principals in the study had a total mean JDI score of 183.77. Thirty-seven percent of the principals scored above the 200 on the JDI, and 15 percent scored above 225. An individual respondent would have a score of 270 if all items were marked in the satisfied direction. Thus, the overall level of job satisfaction appeared to be quite high for

the total sample, in fact, higher than the norms of a sample of nearly 2,000 male and more than 600 female workers in other occupations.

The five sub-areas revealed satisfaction and dissatisfaction factors for these female principals. Respondents scored highest satisfaction in supervision (mean = 44.62), co-worker ranked second (\underline{M} = 43.39), work ranked third (\underline{M} = 39.23), pay ranked fourth (\underline{M} = 32.51), and promotion ranked fifth (\underline{M} = 24.01) (Fansher & Buxton, 1984).

A second study employing the JDI was conducted in 1989 by Ashton to assess the job satisfaction of middle school principals in Connecticut. Ashton's investigation revealed two sub-areas, work on the present job and present pay, as the two independent variables that predicted job satisfaction. The first and strongest predictor, work on the present job, explained 31.87 percent of the variance in the dependent variable of job satisfaction. The second predictor, present pay, accounted for an additional 3.63 percent of the variance. Both predictors were statistically significant at the .05 alpha level with p values of .000 and .046, respectively. The job in general scale, a measure of overall job satisfaction, had the highest mean score of the sub-areas of the JDI. The study noted that 9.2 percent of the respondents rated job in general a perfect score (54), and 34 percent assigned a rating of 50 or above. These scores appear to indicate that Connecticut middle school principals were at least reasonably satisfied with their jobs (Ashton, 1989).

Using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), Kirk (1990) explored the job satisfaction of elementary school counselors in Virginia. The

results of the study indicated that 82.04 percent of the population were satisfied with their jobs while 11.35 percent were very satisfied. Six percent and .37 percent of the respondents rated themselves as dissatisfied and very dissatisfied, respectively. Kirk concluded that the majority of the school counselors in Virginia were satisfied with their jobs. Kirk further reported that the principals indicated that they were satisfied with all 20 sub-factors measured on the MSQ. Satisfaction with social service and creativity ranked the highest on the hierarchy and at the lower end were school system policies and practices, advancement, and compensation (Kirk, 1990).

Adcock (1991) used the MSQ to study the job satisfaction of superintendents in the state of Arkansas and found that they were also highly satisfied with their positions. The overall mean level of job satisfaction of the superintendents surveyed, as defined by the MSQ, was 83.22 percent.

Lehman (1991) found the overall satisfaction level of middle school principals in Indiana to be high as measured by the MSQ. On a continuum of zero to one hundred, these principals scored slightly over seventy. Although this score was considered high, it was found to be lower in comparison to other white collar workers found in the Minnesota Satisfaction Manual (Weiss, Dawis, English, & Lofquist, 1967).

Torres (1992), explored the work values and job satisfaction of minority professionals in community colleges and technical institutes in Texas who aspired to advance in leadership positions. The sample consisted of 59 Black and Hispanic educators who participated in the Leadership Development Program at Texas A &

M University. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire long form was used to measure satisfaction. The population reported being satisfied with the activity ($M = 21.6$; $SD = 6.8$) and social service ($M = 21.7$; $SD = 3.2$) aspects of their work. The total mean MSQ score was 73.7 which was less than the average for employed non-disabled adults ($M = 77.86$) (Torres, 1992).

The long form MSQ was one of the instruments used by Sutter (1996) to determine if predictors of Ohio secondary assistant principals' level of job and career satisfaction could be found. Survey results of the statistical analyses suggested the following about Ohio secondary assistant principals' level of job satisfaction: 1) assistant principals who believed they were accomplishing much on the job reported a higher level of satisfaction compared to assistant principals who believed they were accomplishing less; 2) assistant principals who believed there would be opportunities for advancement within their current school systems were found to have significantly higher ($p = 0.01$) levels of job satisfaction compared to those who believed opportunities for advancement did not exist; 3) assistant principals who felt their talents and skills were being utilized on their job had a higher level of job satisfaction compared to the assistant principals who believed that their talents and skills were not utilized; and 4) assistant principals who wanted to become school principals were found to have significantly higher ($p = 0.01$) levels of job satisfaction compared to assistant principals who wanted to remain assistant principals for the remainder of their careers (Sutter, 1996).

Studies employing either the Job Descriptive Index or the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire indicated that respondents in various positions in

education express satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs differently.

However, all respondents regardless of educational position, indicated overall satisfaction with their jobs.

Satisfaction and Demographic Variables

Demographic variables have been examined in a number of studies to determine their effects on the overall level of job satisfaction as well as satisfaction with various aspects of the job experienced by workers in various positions.

Age. The impact of the aging worker on organizations has become an increasingly important research area for several reasons: The Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1967, which prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of age in the 40 - 70 - year-old group, fear that social security benefits cannot be relied on, aging of World War II baby-boomers cohorts, longer life spans, uncertain economic conditions, and the recent state-by-state move to band forced retirement at the age of 70 years (Wright & Hamilton, 1978).

The general findings reported by Herzberg et al, (1957) on the relationship between job satisfaction and age show that job satisfaction started high, declined, and then started to improve again with increasing age in a U-shaped curve. These results were substantiated in a recent study by Kacmar and Ferris (1989). Their study resulted in a U-shaped curvilinear association between age and job satisfaction for the factors measured on the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). These included satisfaction with pay, promotions, supervision, and coworker.

One important consideration as the work force grows older is ‘why’ job satisfaction varies with age. Herzberg (1957), suggested that job satisfaction increased with age because the individual comes to adjust to his/her work and life situation. Job satisfaction might tend to increase as workers grow older because the extrinsic rewards of work tend to increase with age. There might also be a positive relationship between age and job opportunities since the upper levels of administration are usually not open to young men and women. Another factor contributing to the age-job satisfaction relationship might be the expectation that as one’s age increases, so does one’s prestige and confidence, and these feelings contribute to a greater level of job satisfaction.

Similar conclusions were reached by Wright & Hamilton (1978) who addressed three possible explanations for the recurring conclusion that older workers are more satisfied than younger workers. First, they hypothesized that the ‘now generation’ of workers subscribe to a set of post-material values that contradict the demands of the industrial system and cause greater work discontent. The authors termed it was, “A Cohort Explanation: The Lordstown Hypothesis” and was based on the generation gap theme of the late 1960’s. The new values of this generation include a willingness to question authority, a loosening of bourgeois or material standards, and a belief in fulfillment through ones work. Wright and Hamilton argued that these values are ill suited for an industrial and economic system that requires deference to authority and responsiveness to the traditional rewards of income, promotion, and job security. It is therefore

concluded that the contradiction between the needs of the system and the values of new workers account for the greater dissatisfaction of the young.

The second explanation for more satisfied older workers hypothesized by Wright and Hamilton (1978) states that the standards of the old are systemically eroded by their years in the system such that they learn to be satisfied with less. This concept was termed “An Aging Explanation: The ‘Grinding Down’ Hypothesis”. The argument is that people are ground down by their years in the system. Each generation enters its productive adult life imbued with high hopes and expectations, but these early standards are lowered as their attainment becomes progressively more difficult. Thus, older workers are more satisfied than younger workers because over the years older workers have learned to be satisfied with less.

A third explanation for high satisfaction of older people is “A Life Cycle Explanation: The ‘Job Change’ Hypothesis” which simply means that older workers have better jobs. They would have better jobs because in a normal career line one starts at the bottom and moves up. This movement correlates with the life cycle. In Wright and Hamilton’s study of age satisfaction of white males, the results showed that satisfaction increased with age and is explained by the third hypothesis.

Kalleberg & Loscocco (1983) offer an explanation regarding the decline in satisfaction in the middle ages. They explained that this difference relies on the assumption that conflicts regarding the meaning of life, work, and family generally occur and require resolution. Since identity is questioned during the mid-life

transition period, the authors would expect these conflicts to affect satisfaction with the roles that are prominent in an individual's identity structure. The questioning and conflict which characterize the mid-life transition should focus on the job only if the work role is important. Workers with different overall levels of work salience should exhibit different patterns of age variation in satisfaction (Kelleberg & Loscocco, 1983).

Contrary to findings from the larger body of studies in the age-satisfaction literature, Saleh and Otis (1964) divided their subject into five age groups and the results showed that level of job satisfaction increased for groups from age periods A to B, B to C, and C to D, but that it declined in E, the terminal period. Likewise, Dinham (1996) concluded that there was no significant relationship between age and teacher satisfaction ($F_{6,526} = .497, p = .81$). However, older teachers were somewhat more likely to report larger drops in satisfaction ($F_{6,526} = 1.799, p = .097$) than were younger teachers.

Still another small body of research contended that age as an explanatory variable for job satisfaction is questionable. The work of White and Spector (1987) suggested that the effects of age on job satisfaction were indirectly acting through other variables. They hypothesized that six variables accounted for the age-satisfaction relationship. Age would add nothing to job satisfaction regression when job congruence, internal locus of control, organizational level, organizational tenure, position tenure, and salary were entered in the equation. Results of the study indicated that job satisfaction had a positive linear relation with age ($r = .19, p < .001$). The researchers found that satisfaction and age were both related to

congruence, work locus of control, salary, and organizational tenure. When all of these measures were entered together in the multiple regression equation, each made a significant contribution to the predictor of satisfaction-- except age. Thus the effects of age were indirect, acting through the other variables. Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmar (1992) found that tenure was a more stable predictor of job satisfaction than chronological age.

Studies continue to validate the fact that job satisfaction varies with age. Researchers continue to explore this relationship in an attempt to address the needs of various populations in various positions within the work force.

Gender. One view of job satisfaction holds that women are satisfied with jobs in which they can interact with others in a supportive and cooperative way, even though the jobs may be only minimally demanding and challenging. The basis for this view is that women are socialized into values, attitudes, and behaviors that are communal in nature; whereas men's socialization reflects agentic values and behaviors. A communal orientation involves a concern for others, selflessness, and a desire to be at one with others, whereas an agentic orientation is manifested in self-assertion, self-expansion, and the urge to master (Bakan, 1966; Eagly, 1987). Gruneberg (1979) concluded that female workers were less concerned with career aspects and more concerned with social aspects of the job.

There seemed to be some inconsistencies in satisfaction differences of males and females as reported in studies completed by Vaughn-Wiles (1987) and Patitu (1991). Women administrators in Vaughn-Wiles' study ranked work itself, responsibility, possibility of growth, and peer relationships as contributing most to

job satisfaction while men in Patitu reported high mean scores with opportunities for promotion. Fansher and Buxton (1984) reported female principals scored high on promotion. Consistent with these studies, Connecticut male principals scored overall satisfaction significantly higher than women ($M = 46.941$ versus 42.250 ; T value greater than 1.67 ; $p .05$), and women in Fansher and Buxton (1984) also ranked overall satisfaction as being high.

The general consensus concerning gender differences in job satisfaction is that there is little practical significance between the two sexes. Hulin and Smith (1964) indicated the differences in job satisfaction by sex are negligible when the factors of pay, tenure, and education are controlled statistically.

Education. The relationship between education and job satisfaction is distinctly non-linear (Quinn, 1974). The assumption is that the higher one's educational level, the greater are one's chances of securing a desired and presumably satisfying job; however, there is not a direct correlation between an incremental increase in education and an incremental increase in job satisfaction.

A 1975 study by Gordon and Arvey indicated that satisfaction with the work itself did not vary in its relationship to the amount of formal education. Instead, the data collected revealed that the more highly educated members of the work force were less satisfied with the prevalent way the organization was being managed than were the less educated. One explanation for the lower satisfaction of better educated individuals might be that they were more aware of what constituted effective and ineffective management techniques (Gordon & Arvey, 1975).

Recently, the analyses of academic and career administrators' perceptions of their functioning in management and leadership capacities concluded that Ph.D.'s were more satisfied than non-Ph.D.'s (Schonwetter, 1993). Furthermore, the author pointed out that education and experience may be directly related to the availability of occupational opportunities; therefore, these individuals are the most likely to have achieved the highest administrative positions. Other analyses from this study show that older administrators tend to hold the greatest number of Ph.D.'s (65 percent), whereas the youngest administrators exhibit the highest frequencies of B.A.'s (50 percent). Individuals occupying higher administrative positions have higher levels of personal control compared to middle management positions. Thus, educational achievement and experience may be synonymous with career position, and career position may be indicative of job satisfaction, so that higher educational backgrounds or greater experience may predict higher administrative positions that lead to feelings of job satisfaction (Schonwetter, 1993).

Tenure. Findings from the study of elementary principals in Virginia appear to indicate that principals who had six years or more of service had a stronger feeling regarding inter-personal relationship with teachers than did principals who had five or fewer years of experience (Ward, 1977).

A comparative study of new and experienced principals' job satisfaction found the overall mean score for the inexperienced principals to be 12.64 and the overall mean for experienced principals to be 11.93. A T-test analysis indicated no significant difference between these mean scores ($p = .01$). Results further

indicated that new and experienced principals were generally satisfied with their jobs in terms of authority and expectations. New principals were somewhat more satisfied that the job gave them the opportunity to do their best. The level of satisfaction for both groups fell between "somewhat dissatisfied" and "somewhat satisfied" on the question of whether working conditions enabled principals to be effective (Bogotch and Reidlinger, 1991).

Cytrynbaum and Crites's (1988) model of job satisfaction and life stages found satisfaction to be highest at entry to the profession when initial expectations are high. Satisfaction drops sharply as early barriers are encountered; then satisfaction recovers strongly as confidence and success build. The authors concluded that in the final stage, satisfaction tapers off after one's career becomes established.

Dinham and Scott (1996) found no relationship between length of service as a teacher and self ratings of satisfaction ($F_{6,516} = -1.079, p = .37$). However, a significant association emerged between length of service and changes to satisfaction ($F_{6,516} = 2.384, p = .028$). Teachers who reported decreased satisfaction since commencing teaching had, on the average, significantly longer periods of service.

Tenure is an important topic deserving further study. Unlike related demographic variables such as age or sex, tenure has been judged a legal and defensible basis for disbursing organizational rewards and making staffing decisions (Gordan and Johnson, 1982).

School Size. One of the controversies surrounding school size is that

school size affects the quality of interpersonal relationships one experiences in the school setting. Specifically, Barker (1986) summarized one of the advantages of small schools is that relationships between students, teachers, administrators, and school board members tend to be closer. In as much as the factor interpersonal relations is identified by Herzberg and the authors of the MSQ as being a measure of satisfaction, school size needs to be examined for a possible influence on principal job satisfaction.

School size was one of the three variables having a greater predictor of overall satisfaction for secondary female principals in the United States as measured by the JDI. Larger school enrollment shared by the other variables accounted for 0.13091268 percent of the variation in job satisfaction of these principals (Fansher and Buxton, 1984). Additionally school size was one of three determinants of job satisfaction in the sub-area promotion. The three variables together had a R-Square of 0.16996600 and accounted for this percent of variation in the sub-area promotion (Fansher and Buxton, 1984).

Sparkes and McIntire (1987) reported evidence to support the notion that organizational factors are an important determinant of job satisfaction. After surveying 416 principals in Newfoundland and Labrador, they stated that principals of small schools in small communities have both physical and psychological needs that are not being met. They also stated that principals in smaller schools reported lower levels of overall and facet satisfaction. Their findings suggest that there are external or organizational factors that greatly influence the principal's job satisfaction.

Finley noted that Tennessee's high school principals expressed significant difference in total satisfaction scores and student enrollment. The Scheffe post-hoc procedure revealed that principals with 1,301 or more students and principals with 1,001 -1,300 students had significantly higher scores than principals with 401-700 students ($F=3.74$; $p < .05$).

Middle school principals in Indiana were studied by comparing the overall level of job satisfaction of principals from small and large schools as measured by the MSQ (Lehman, 1991). The principals of both large and small schools cited social service as the highest mean satisfaction score (20.14 and 19.867, respectively). In small schools this factor was followed by independence with creativity and ability utilization tied with a mean score of 19.286. Principals of large schools ranked variety and achievement as the second and third highest reinforcers of job satisfaction. All of the highest ranking facets of both groups were intrinsic. There was a small difference of .247 between the total satisfaction scores of both samples with the principals of larger schools achieving a slightly higher mean score. Lehman also concluded that variations did exist between small and large schools among the facets identified as least satisfying. Principals in small schools cited compensation as the least satisfying factor ($M = 13.600$). In large schools, principals most often categorized independence as the least satisfying factor ($M = 14.533$). Although there were variations between specific factors and job satisfaction of principals from small and large schools, the author found no evidence to suggest that a significant difference existed.

School Location. Finley (1991) noted significant difference between school

location and overall job satisfaction of high school principals in Tennessee. The Scheffe post-hoc test showed that principals whose schools were located in urban/inner city or urban/suburban locations scored significantly higher than principals whose schools were located in rural locations ($F=5.52$; $p<.05$).

A striking dissimilarity between the suburban and urban principal satisfaction was observed by Derlin and Schneider (1994). Specifically, the factor pay was the least heavily weighted item in the third factor of the suburban principal model and was negatively weighted (-.50). In contrast, pay was the most heavily weighted item in the first factor for urban principals (.74). This discrepancy in factor location and weighting indicated that personal compensation is perceived differently in different educational setting (Derlin and Schneider, 1994).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Chapter three contains the methods and procedures that were utilized to identify job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia. The chapter contains a discussion of the design of the study, a description of the population, a description of the research instrument, and the methods that were used to collect and analyze data.

Design of the Study

The research design for this study was descriptive. Descriptive studies are primarily concerned with finding out “what is” (Borg & Gall, 1983). By conducting this study, the researcher found the following: (1) the general satisfaction level for middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, (2) the satisfaction level for each of the 20 dimensions of the job measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and (3) the satisfaction for each dimension according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, years of experience, school location, and school size.

The Population

The participants for this study were selected middle school principals in Virginia who were listed in the 1997-98 Virginia Educational Directory. All principals in the state were listed in the directory by one of these titles: Dr., Mrs.,

Ms., Miss, or Mr. The researcher identified the female principals by the titles: “Miss.”, “Ms.”, and “Mrs.” The male principals were identified by the titles “Mr.” and “Dr.” Because some males and females held the title “Dr.”, these principals were distinguished by their first names. Using these methods, 97 female principals were identified and all were asked to participate in this study. One hundred eighty-four male principals were identified and fifty percent were randomly selected by alphabetizing by last name and numbering the names from 1 to 184. All names listed by even numbers were selected, making a total of 92 male principals. In all, 188 middle school principals in Virginia were asked to complete the instruments.

Instrumentation

Individual data Sheet

The Individual Data Sheet (Appendix A) was used to gather information about selected characteristics of the respondents. Selection of the items for the Individual Data Sheet was based primarily on variables in the job satisfaction literature dealing with school principals. The selected variables and the definition for each are the following:

Gender: referred to the sex of the respondents. This variable was measured by asking respondents to select “male” or “female”.

Age: referred to the length of life for each respondent. Age was measured by asking the respondents to select the appropriate given age range.

Degree: referred to an academic title conferred by a college or university upon the completion of studies. Degree was measured by asking the principals to circle their highest degree from given options.

Years as middle school principal: referred to the number of years experience as a middle school principal or tenure. This variable was measured by asking the respondents to select from a range of given figures indicating number of years they had been a middle school principal.

School location: referred to the geographical location of the principals' schools. School location was measured by indicating "rural", "suburban", or "urban".

Rural referred to schools located in the country or in agricultural areas; suburban referred to school districts lying immediately outside a city or town; and urban referred to schools located in a city or town.

School size: referred to school enrollment. This variable was measured by asking respondents to select the range of figures indicating the number of students enrolled in the school.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Additionally, the 1967 Long-Form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was slightly modified and used to assess the population's general job satisfaction level and to delineate the 20 dimensions of the job that contribute to job satisfaction.

Description of the 1967 Long-Form MSQ

The MSQ was used primarily because it is a well-known instrument designed to measure job satisfaction. It is a gender neutral instrument that can be administered to either groups or to individuals. The instrument utilizes a 20-dimension Likert-type scale format and samples both intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcement dimensions with a total of 100 items. It is self-administering with directions for the respondent appearing on the first page of the questionnaire. Instructions for the rating scale are located at the top of each page. Although there is no time limit, completion of the MSQ is typically accomplished by a respondent within 15-20 minutes.

Response choices for each item appear in blocks of 20, with items that comprise a dimension appearing in 20 item intervals. The MSQ scales which represent the twenty dimensions of the job are described below.

1. Ability utilization - The chance to do something that makes use of abilities.
2. Achievement - The feeling of accomplishment one gets from the job.
3. Activity - Being able to keep busy all the time.
4. Advancement - The chances for advancement on this job.
5. Authority - The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company policies and practices (reworded to "School System Policies and Practices) - The way school system policies are implemented.

7. Compensation - Feelings about pay in contrast to the amount of work completed.
8. Coworkers - How one gets along with coworkers.
9. Creativity - The opportunity to try one's own methods.
10. Independence - The opportunity to work alone.
11. Moral values - The opportunity to do things that do not run counter to one's own conscience.
12. Recognition - Being recognized for a job well-done.
13. Responsibility - The freedom to implement one's judgment.
14. Security - The way a job provides for steady employment.
15. Social service - Being able to do things in service to others.
16. Social status - Having respect for the community.
17. Supervision--human relations - The relationship between supervisors and employees.
18. Supervision-technical - The technical quality of supervision.
19. Variety - The opportunity to do different things.
20. Working conditions - Physical aspects of one's work.

Development of the MSQ

The Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, better known as the Work Adjustment Project, began studying work adjustment problems relevant to vocational rehabilitation services in 1957. The development of instruments to assess the work adjustment potential of applicants for vocational rehabilitation , and the evaluation of work adjustment outcomes were its two main objectives.

These objectives are based on the Theory of Work Adjustment which uses the correspondence (or lack of it) between the work personality and the work environment as the principle reason for observed work outcomes (satisfactoriness, satisfaction, and tenure). Subsequently, work adjustment depends on how well an individual's abilities correspond to the ability requirements in work, and how well the individual's needs correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquest, 1967).

Thus, the MSQ was developed as a measure of one of the primary indicators of work adjustment. It was constructed to sample both extrinsic and intrinsic reinforcement dimensions. The MSQ was developed when the first instruments in the Work Adjustment Project (Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank, the Employee Attitude Scale, and 22 experimental items) resulted in adequate reliability but cumbersome scoring.

There were two versions of the long-form MSQ—a 1977 version and a 1967 version. The 1977 version, which was originally copyrighted in 1963, uses the following five response choices: *Very Satisfied*, *Satisfied*, “N” (*Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied*), *Dissatisfied*, and *Very Dissatisfied*. The authors utilized the instrument to collect normative data for 21 MSQ scales for 25 representative occupations including bookkeepers, laborers, typists, engineers, managers, and teachers. A “ceiling effect” obtained with the rating scale used in the 1977 version tends to result in most scale score distributions being markedly negatively skewed—most responses alternate between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied.” Therefore, a 1967 version was developed that adjusted for the ceiling

effect by using the following five response categories: *Not Satisfied, Slightly Satisfied, Satisfied, Very Satisfied, and Extremely Satisfied*. The revised rating scale resulted in distributions that tend to be more symmetrically distributed around the “Satisfied” category. Limited normative data are provided for the 1967 version; therefore, it is best used where normative data are not required (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist).

For this study, two wordings on the 1967 revised MSQ were modified; “company” was changed to “school system”, and “boss” was changed to “supervisor”. These modifications were done with approval from the Vocational Psychology Research at the University of Minnesota.

Long-Form MSQ Reliability

Data on the internal consistency reliability of the MSQ as estimated by the Hoyt’s analysis-of-variance method show reliability coefficients for 83 percent of the groups at .80 or larger and only 2.5 percent lower than .70. These data suggested that the MSQ scales have adequate internal consistency reliability.

For this study, Cronbach’s Alpha test of internal consistency was used to measure reliability for each of the 20 dimensions measured on the MSQ. The coefficient for each dimension was: Social Service, .96; Activity, .90; Moral Value, .75; Achievement, .90; Creativity, .92; Responsibility, .88; Variety, .86; Coworker, .90; Supervision Human Relations, .94; Security, .88; Authority, .89; Working Conditions, .95; Supervision Technical, .91; Status, .92; Policies, .93; Recognition, .94; Advancement, .95; Independence, .91; and, Compensation, .93. These coefficients ranged from .96 to .75 for the dimensions, and a coefficient of

.95 was obtained for the group on the MSQ. The score for this group was as large as scores obtained by 83 percent of the groups measured on the original testing of the MSQ.

MSQ Validity:

Evidence of concurrent validity of the MSQ was gathered from an examination of occupational group differences in satisfaction. Analysis of data for the 25 occupational groups (N=2,955) revealed that group differences were statistically significant at .001 level for both means and variances on all 20 dimensions of the MSQ. In assessing the meaningfulness of this differentiation, the authors examined the means and variances for each of the MSQ's 20 dimensions and found support for a frequent theme in the research literature on job satisfaction: professional groups are the most satisfied and unskilled groups the least satisfied (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1964).

Data Collection Procedures

The source of data for this research was the responses made by participants on the Individual Data Sheet and the MSQ. A letter of introduction, the instruments, the instructions and a self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to participants on March 24, 1998. Responses were requested within two weeks and those who had not responded within that time period were sent a postcard reminder. A telephone number was included on the postcard requesting principals to call if they had not received a packet of survey materials. Individuals who had responded by this time were thanked. Principals who had not responded within 7

days of the postcard reminder were sent a second mailing, and an immediate response was requested. The use of these procedures resulted in a response rate of 70 percent.

Data Analysis

The primary objectives of this study were (1) to assess the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, (2) to determine the dimensions of the job that the principals perceive as contributing to job satisfaction, and (3) to determine the influence of demographic variables on satisfaction. All scores on the Individual Data Sheets and the MSQ were entered in the SPSS data base, and data pertaining to the objectives of this study were generated accordingly:

Demographic Analysis:

The purpose for this analysis was to show the personal and educational characteristics of the principals who participated in the study. Data were gathered from scores on the Individual Data Sheet for the variables gender, age, degree, years as middle school principal, school location, and school size. The categories for each variable were assigned codes, and the codes were entered into the SPSS data base (i.e., for gender, male was assigned the code 1 and female was assigned 2). These scores indicated the number and percentage of principals who participated in the study. The numbers and percentages were disaggregated and tabulated by the six demographic variables.

Scale Analysis:

Next, computer generated data to assess the frequencies of response for each of the 5 response options on the MSQ Likert Scale were analyzed. The 5 options and the assigned weight for each were:

<u>Weight</u>	<u>Scale Option</u>
1	Not Satisfied (NS)
2	Slightly Satisfied (SS)
3	Satisfied (S)
4	Very Satisfied (VS)
5	Extremely Satisfied (ES)

Each of the 20 job dimensions was reported and the frequencies of response for each scale option were tallied and tabulated.

General Job Satisfaction Analysis:

The General Job Satisfaction score for each respondent was obtained by summing the scores for 20 specific items on the MSQ. Each item represented one of the 20 job dimensions. These items included the following numbers: 24, 25, 28, 30,35, 43, 51, 61, 66 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 82, 93, 96, 98, 99, and 100. Using the weighted scores described above, it was found that the mean general satisfaction score for the principals ranged from 1 to 5 (“Not Satisfied to “Extremely Satisfied”).

An analysis of the general satisfaction scores was also presented according to the six demographic variables selected for this study: gender, age, degree status, years of experience, school location, and school size. A mean general satisfaction score and the standard deviation were calculated and tabulated for

each demographic group by categories. These data show the degree of general satisfaction for each of the demographic groups. The analysis of variance test for significance was conducted and comparative scores were tabulated and presented.

Analysis of 20 Dimensions:

The 20 dimensions analyzed in this study were: Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Advancement, Authority, School policies, Compensation, Coworkers, Creativity, Independence, Moral Values, Recognition, Responsibility, Security, Social service, Social Status, Supervision Human Relations, Supervision Technical, Variety, and Working Conditions. There were 5 items on the MSQ in increments of 20 to assess satisfaction for each of the 20 dimensions. For example, Ability Utilization was the average of items 7, 27, 47, 67, and 87. The scores on the five items were averaged and a mean score and standard deviation for each dimension were computed for the principals.

Summary

Following the analytical procedures outlined on this and preceding pages, the researcher was able to show quantitative data that fulfilled the objectives for this research.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the analyses of data which were collected in the study of job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia. The satisfaction data were collected through the use of the 1967 Long-Form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Additionally, an Individual Data Sheet was used to collect responses pertaining to the demographic variables. The first part of this chapter reports the range of scores for the MSQ rating scale followed by a description of the population. The second part of the chapter presents the analyses for each of the research questions that guided the study. Each question is stated and is followed by a brief summary of the findings and the tabulated data.

MSQ Scale Analyses

The MSQ contained 100 items that measured 20 dimensions of the job in addition to General Job Satisfaction. The following 5-point Likert rating scale was applied to this study:

1	“Not Satisfied”	(1.00 - 1.99)
2	“Slightly Satisfied”	(2.00 - 2.99)
3	“Satisfied”	(3.00 - 3.99)
4	“Very Satisfied”	(4.00 - 4.99)
5	“Extremely Satisfied”	(5.00)

One hundred-twenty-seven middle school principals in Virginia completed the MSQ and the Individual Data Sheet (Appendix A). The frequency of responses for each rating on the Likert Scale is presented for each of the 20 dimensions and General Satisfaction. The responses are tabulated and presented in Tables 5B through 25B located in Appendix B. A summary of each table is discussed below.

Ability Utilization

Ability Utilization is the opportunity to do things on the job that make use of one's abilities. Data found in Table 5C show that the highest number of principals (55 out of 127 or 43.30 percent) selected "Very Satisfied" for this aspect of the job; the next highest number (39 out of 127 or 30.7 percent) selected "Satisfied", and the third highest number (22 out of 127 or 17.3 percent) chose "Extremely Satisfied" for this dimension of the job. The number next to the lowest (10 out of 127 or 7.8 percent) chose "Slightly Satisfied" for making use of their abilities, and the lowest number (1 out of 127 or .8 percent) selected "Not Satisfied". From this data it can be seen that the majority of the selections were between "Satisfied" and "Very Satisfied" for the opportunity to make use of their abilities.

Achievement:

Achievement is the feeling of accomplishment one gets from the job. Data in Table 6C show that the highest number of principals (65 out of 127 or 51.18 percent) selected "Very Satisfied" for this aspect of the job; the second highest number (40 out of 127 or 31.5 percent) selected "Satisfied", and the third highest number (14 out of 127 or 11.0 percent) selected "Very Satisfied" for

Achievement. The lowest number of principals (8 out of 127 or 6.3 percent) chose “Slightly Satisfied”, and none of the respondents selected “Not Satisfied” for Achievement. These data showed that the majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for the feeling of accomplishment the principals perceive from their jobs.

Activity

Activity refers to being able to keep busy all the time. Data found in Table 7C show that the highest number of principals (53 out of 127 or 41.73 percent) selected “Very Satisfied” with this dimension of the job; the second highest number (43 out of 127 or 33.8 percent) selected “Satisfied” for keeping busy, and the third highest number (25 out of 127 or 19.7 percent) chose “Extremely Satisfied”. The lowest number of principals (6 out of 127 or 4.7 percent) chose “Slightly Satisfied” for keeping busy, and none of the principals selected “Not Satisfied” for Activity. The data show that the majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for being able to keep busy on the job.

Advancement

Advancement is the chance to get ahead on the job. Data found in Table 8C show that the highest number of middle school principals in Virginia (69 out of 127 or 54.3 percent) chose “Satisfied” for this aspect of the job; the second highest number of respondents (29 out of 127 or 22.8 percent) chose “Slightly Satisfied”, and the third highest number of principals (17 out of 127 or 13.4 percent) selected “Very Satisfied” for chances to advance. Next to the lowest number of principals chose “Extremely Satisfied” for Advancement, and the lowest number (4 out of

127 or 3.1 percent) chose “Not Satisfied” for the opportunity to get ahead on the job. The majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for the advancement opportunities in their positions.

Authority

Authority is the opportunity to tell other people what to do. The frequencies of responses found in Table 9C show that the highest number of principals (72 out of 127 or 56.7 percent) selected “Satisfied” for this dimension; the second highest number (33 out of 127 or 26.0 percent) selected “Very Satisfied”, and the third highest number of principals (16 out of 127 or 12.6 percent) chose “Slightly Satisfied”. The lowest number of principals (6 out of 127 or 4.7 percent) chose “Extremely Satisfied” for telling others what to do, and none of the principals chose “Not Satisfied” about having authority. These data indicate that the majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for telling other people what to do.

Compensation

Compensation is the pay for the amount of work that is done. The data in Table 10C show that the highest number of middle school principals in Virginia (53 out of 127 or 41.7 percent) chose “Satisfied” for their pay; the second highest number of principals (39 out of 127 or 30.7 percent) chose “Slightly Satisfied”, and the third highest number (20 out of 127 or 15.74 percent) selected “Not Satisfied” for their compensation. Next to the lowest number of principals (13 out of 127 or 10.2 percent) selected “Very Satisfied”, and the lowest number (2 out of 127 or 1.6 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied” for their pay. These data show

that the majority of the principals' selections were between "Satisfied" and "Not Satisfied" for the pay they received for the amount of work they do.

Co-worker

Co-worker is defined as the way people on the job get along with each other. Data found in Table 11-C show that the highest number of principals (49 out of 127 or 38.6 percent) selected "Satisfied"; the second highest number of principals (45 out of 127 or 35.4 percent) selected "Very Satisfied", and the third highest number (21 out of 127 or 16.5 percent) selected "Slightly Satisfied" for this aspect of the job. Next to the lowest number (10 out of 127 or 7.9 percent) selected "Extremely Satisfied", and the lowest number of principals (2 out of 127 or 1.6 percent) selected "Not Satisfied" for Co-worker. The majority of the principals' selections were between "Satisfied" and "Very Satisfied" for the way co-workers get along on the job.

Creativity

Creativity is defined as the chance to try one's own methods of doing the job. The data found in Table 12C show that the highest number of middle school principals (59 out of 127 or 46.5 percent) chose "Very Satisfied" for this aspect of the job; the second highest number (44 out of 127 or 34.6 percent) chose "Satisfied", and the third highest number of principals (13 out of 127 or 10.2 percent) chose "Extremely Satisfied" for being able to try their own methods of doing the job. The lowest number of principals (11 out of 127 or 8.7 percent) selected "Slightly Satisfied", and none of the principals selected "Not Satisfied".

The majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for Creativity.

Supervision (Human Relations)

Supervision (human relations) refers to the way the principals’ supervisors supervise other school employees. The frequency of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ scale are found in Table 13C. The highest number of principals (45 out of 127 or 35.4 percent) chose “Very Satisfied”; the second highest number (36 out of 127 or 28.3 percent) selected “Satisfied”, and the third highest number of principals (27 out of 127 or 21.3 percent) selected “Slightly satisfied” for supervision. Next to the lowest number of principals (17 out of 127 or 13. Percent) chose “Extremely Satisfied” and the lowest number (2 out of 127 or 1.6 percent) chose “Not Satisfied” with supervision of employees. The majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for Supervision.

Independence

Independence is defined as the chance to work alone on the job. The frequency of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ scale are found in Table 14C. The highest number of middle school principals (67 out of 127 or 52.8 percent) selected “Satisfied” for this aspect of the job; the second highest number (24 out of 127 or 18.9 percent) selected “Very Satisfied”, and the third highest number (21 out of 127 or 16.5 percent) chose “Slightly Satisfied” for the chance to work alone on the job. Next to the lowest number of principals (8 out of 127 or 6.3 percent) selected “Not Satisfied”, and the lowest number (3 out

of 127 or 2.4 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied” for this dimension of the job. These data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “Satisfied” and “Slightly Satisfied” for the chance to work alone on the job.

Moral Values

Moral value means being able to do things that do not go against one’s conscience. The ratings for the MSQ scale found on Table 15C show that the highest number of principals (59 out of 127 or 46.6 percent) selected “Very Satisfied”; the second highest number (47 out of 127 or 37 percent) selected “Satisfied”, and the third highest number (17 out of 127 or 13.4 percent) chose “Extremely Satisfied” for this aspect of the job. The lowest number (4 out of 127 or 3.1 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”, and none of the principals selected “Not Satisfied” for Moral Values. The majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for this dimension of the job.

School Policies

School policies refers to the way school policies are put into practice. Data presented in Table 16C show that the highest number of middle school principals (60 out of 127 or 47.2 percent) selected “Satisfied” for school policies. The next highest number of principals (29 out of 127 or 22.8 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”, and the third highest number (28 out of 127 or 22 percent) chose “Very Satisfied” for school policies. Next to the lowest number of principals (7 out of 127 or 5.5 percent) chose “Extremely Satisfied” for this aspect of the job, and the lowest number (3 out of 127 or 2.4 percent) selected “Not Satisfied” with school

policies. For this dimension, the majority selected between “Satisfied” and “Slightly Satisfied” for school policies.

Recognition

Recognition is defined as the praise one gets for doing a good job. The frequencies of responses for this dimension are located in Table 17C. It can be seen that the highest number of principals (58 out of 127 or 45.7 percent) selected “Satisfied”; the second highest number (31 out of 127 or 24.4 percent) chose “Very Satisfied”, and the third highest number (25 out of 127 or 19.7 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”. Next to the lowest number (7 out of 127 or 5.5 percent) chose “Not Satisfied”, and the lowest number (6 out of 127 or 4.7 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied”. The majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for the praise they get for doing a good job.

Responsibility

Responsibility is defined as the freedom to use one’s own judgment. Data pertaining to the frequency of responses for Responsibility are found in Table 18C. Data show that the highest number of principals (59 out of 127 or 46.4 percent) selected “Very Satisfied” for this aspect of the job; the second highest number (44 out of 127 or 36.6 percent) indicated “Satisfied” and, the third highest number (13 out of 127 or 10.2 percent) indicated “Slightly Satisfied”. On the low end, the lowest number (11 out of 127 or 8.7 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied”, and none of the principals selected “Not Satisfied”. From this data, it can be noted that

the majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” concerning the freedom of the principals to use their own judgment.

Security

Security is the way the job provides for steady employment. Data pertained to the frequency of responses for this dimension are found in Table 19C. The data show that the highest number of principals (59 out of 127 or 46.4 percent) selected “Satisfied”; the second highest number (39 out of 127 or 30.7 percent) selected “Very Satisfied”, and the third highest number (16 out of 127 or 12.6 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”. At the low end, next to the lowest number (9 out of 127 or 7.1 percent) indicated “Extremely Satisfied”, and the lowest number of principals (4 out of 127 or 3.1 percent) chose “Not Satisfied”. The majority of the respondents selected between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” concerning job security.

Social Service

Social Service refers to the chance to do things for other people. Data pertaining to the frequency of responses for this dimension can be found in Table 20C. The data show that the highest number of principals (51 out of 127 or 40.1 percent) chose “Very Satisfied”; the second highest number of principals (40 out of 127 or 31.5 percent) selected “Satisfied”, and the third highest number (35 out of 127 or 27.6 percent) chose “Extremely Satisfied”. The lowest number (1 out of 127 or .8 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”, and none of the principals selected “Not Satisfied”. Therefore, the majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for the chance to do things for other people.

Social Status

Social status refers to the chance to be “somebody” in the community. Data pertaining to the frequency of responses for Social Status are found in Table 21C. The data show that the highest number (70 out of 127 or 55.1 percent) selected “Satisfied” for this dimension; the second highest number (28 out of 127 or 22 percent) selected “Very Satisfied”, and the third highest number (17 out of 127 or 13.4 percent) chose “Slightly Satisfied”. At the lower end, the second lowest number (7 out of 127 or 5.5 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied”, and the lowest number (5 out of 127 or 3.9 percent) chose “Not Satisfied”. Thus, the majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for Social Status.

Supervision Technical

Supervision Technical refers to the competence of the principals’ supervisors in making decisions. Frequencies of responses for this dimension of the job are located in Table 22C. These data show that the highest number of principals (50 out of 127 or 39.4 percent) selected “Satisfied” for this dimension; the second highest number (39 out of 127 or 30.7 percent) selected “Very Satisfied, and the third highest number (27 out of 127 or 21.3 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”. At the low end, next to the lowest number of principals (9 out of 127 or 7.1 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied”, and the lowest number (2 out of 127 or 1.6 percent) selected “Not Satisfied”. It was noted that a majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for Supervision Technical.

Variety

Variety refers to the chance to do different things from time to time. Data pertaining to the frequencies of response for this dimension are located in Table 23C. Data show that the highest number of principals (60 out of 127 or 47.2 percent) selected “Satisfied” for this dimension; the second highest number (53 out of 127 or 41.7 percent) selected “Very Satisfied”, and the third highest number (9 out of 127 or 7.1 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied”. The lowest number (5 out of 127 or 3.9 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”, and none of the principals selected “Not Satisfied”. These data show that a majority of the respondents selected “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for the chance to do different things on the job.

Working Conditions

Working conditions refers to the physical surroundings (heating, lighting, ventilation, etc.) on the job. Data pertaining to Working Condition are located in Table 24C. These data show that the highest number of principals (47 out of 127 or 37 percent) chose “Satisfied”; the second highest number (40 out of 127 or 31.5 percent) chose “Very Satisfied”, and the third highest number (21 out of 127 or 16.5 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”. At the low end, next to the lowest number (15 out of 127 or 11.8 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied”, and the lowest number (4 out of 127 or 3.1 percent) selected “Not Satisfied”. These responses showed that the majority of the principals selected “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for the physical conditions of the work environment.

General Satisfaction

General Satisfaction refers to the overall perception of the job. Data on Table 25C showed the frequency of responses for General Satisfaction. The highest number of principals (70 out of 127 or 55.1 percent) selected “Satisfied”; the second highest number (35 out of 127 or 27.6 percent) selected “Very Satisfied, and the third highest number of principals (21 out of 127 or 16.5 percent) selected “Slightly Satisfied”. The lowest number (1 out of 127 or .8 percent) selected “Extremely Satisfied”, and none of the principals selected “Not Satisfied”. The majority of the selections were between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” for their overall level of satisfaction.

Demographic Analyses

A total of 188 questionnaires were mailed to selected middle school principals in Virginia with a response rate of 70 percent ($N = 132$). Two respondents did not wish to complete the questionnaire, 2 respondents had relocated, and 1 respondent had retired; therefore, a usable response rate of 68 percent ($N=127$) was obtained and employed in the analysis.

Table 2 presents the description of the population for the study by showing each demographic variable with the number (N) and percentage of respondents in each category. For gender, there were slightly more males than females, and for age, over 80 percent of the respondents were between 36 and 55 years. As far as education was concerned, the majority of the respondents held a masters degree, and a little over a fifth of them held the doctorate. The largest number of respondents had been a middle school principal for 1-3 years, and over 60 percent

of principals had been in their jobs six years or less. The table also shows that the largest number of principals was from suburban and rural schools. Finally, the schools of these principals ranged in size from less than 400 students to over 1,000 students with over 20 percent falling in each of the following categories: 401-600, 801-1000, and greater than 1,000 students (see Table 2).

Analyses of Research Questions

Question 1: What was the General Satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

A measure of General Satisfaction was determined by calculating a mean score for item numbers 24, 25, 28, 30, 35, 43, 51, 61, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 82, 93, 96, 98, 99, and 100. The calculated mean (M) for the respondents was 3.65

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. <u>Gender</u>		
Male	67	52.8
Female	60	47.2
Total	127	100.0
2. <u>Age</u>		
Younger than 35	4	3.1
36 - 45	30	23.6
46 - 55	82	64.6
Older than 55	10	7.9
Missing	1	.8
Total	127	100.0
3. <u>Degree Status</u>		
Masters	92	72.4
Ed. Specialist	8	6.3
Doctorate	26	20.5
Missing	1	.8
Total	127	100.0
4. <u>Yrs. As Mid. Sch. Principal</u>		
1-3	51	40.2
4-6	29	22.8
7-9	25	19.7
10 or more	21	16.5
Missing	1	.8
Total	127	100.0
5. <u>School Location</u>		
Rural	45	35.4
Suburban	59	46.5
Urban	22	17.3
Missing	1	.8
Total	127	100.0
6. <u>School size</u>		
400 students or less	13	10.2
401 - 600 students	32	25.2
601 - 800 students	22	17.3
801 - 1,000 students	27	21.3
> 1,000 students	32	25.2
Missing	1	.8
Total	127	100.0

with a standard deviation (SD) of .57 (N = 127). Therefore, the mean for the respondents fell within the “Satisfied” range (3.00-3.99) on the scale (1= “Not Satisfied”, to 5= “Extremely Satisfied”) that was used for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Sub-Question a.: What was the General Satisfaction level according to the demographic variables?

The number of respondents (N), the mean (M) General Satisfaction score, and the standard deviation (SD) for groups disaggregated by demographic variables are shown in Table 3.

The highest General Satisfaction scores were observed for female principals (M = 3.74, SD = .61), principals younger than 35 (M = 3.91, SD = .67), principals with an education specialist degree (M = 3.91, SD = .38), principals having 4-6 years experience as a middle school principal (M = 3.69, SD = .58), principals from suburban schools (M = 3.72, SD = .59), and principals with 801 - 1,000 students (M = 3.83, SD = .65). All of the highest scores fell within the “Satisfied” range (3.00-3.99) on the MSQ scale.

The lowest General Satisfaction mean scores were observed for male principals (M = 3.56, SD = .52), principals ages 46-55 (M = 3.57, SD = .57), principals with masters degrees (M = 3.61, SD = .58), principals with 7-9 years experience as a middle school principal (M = 3.46, SD = .47), principals located in rural schools (M = 3.53, SD = .54), and principals with 400 students or less

Table 3

General Satisfaction and Demographics

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.56	.52		
Female	60	3.74	.61		
Total	127	3.64	3.40	3.38	.07
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.91	.67		
36 - 45	30	3.68	.56		
46 - 55	82	3.57	.57		
Older than 55	10	3.90	.42		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.64	.56	1.44	.24
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.61	.58		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.91	.38		
Doctorate	26	3.66	.55		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.64	.56	1.06	.35
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.68	.59		
4 - 6	29	3.69	.58		
7 - 9	25	3.46	.47		
10 or more	21	3.65	.59		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.64	.56	1.04	.38
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.53	.54		
Suburban	59	3.72	.59		
Urban	22	3.63	.52		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.64	.56	1.36	.26
<u>School Size</u>					
400 or less	13	3.32	.38		
401 - 600	32	3.52	.57		
601 - 800	22	3.50	.52		
801 - 1,000	27	3.83	.65		
>1,000	32	3.82	.49		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.64	.56	3.62	.008

Table 4
Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for General Satisfaction and School Size

(I) Size	(J) Size	Difference (I-J)	<u>p</u> .
400 students or less	401-600	-.19	.88
	601-800	-.17	.94
	801-1,000	-.50	.12
	> 1,000	-.50	.11
401-600	601-800	.02	1.00
	801-1,000	-.31	.32
	>1,000	-.30	.29
601-800	400 students or less	.17	.94
	801-1,000	-.33	.34
	> 1,000	-.31	.32
801-1,000	> 1,000	.004	1.00

(M = 3.32, SD = .38). All of the lowest scores fell within the “Satisfied” range (3.00-3.99) on the MSQ scale (see Table 3).

The analysis of variance reports indicated statistically significant differences between means for school size (p = .008). Generally, principals from large schools were more satisfied in their positions than principals from smaller schools. However, the Scheffe post hoc test indicated no significant differences between groups (see Table 4).

Sub-Question b.: What was the satisfaction level for each of the 20 dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

A mean score for each of the 20 dimensions was calculated and then ranked from the highest mean to the lowest mean. The three top ranking dimensions were Social Service, Activity, and Moral Value. The principals were “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) about doing things for others, keeping busy, and being able to do things on the job that did not go against their conscience. Compensation ranked at the bottom of the hierarchy. Principals were only “Slightly Satisfied” (2.00-2.99) satisfied with the pay they got for the amount of work they do. For the remaining dimensions, the principals were “Satisfied”.

Table 5
Rank Order of MSQ Dimension

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Social Service	127	4.19	.73
Activity	127	4.06	.77
Moral Value	127	4.05	.68
Achievement	127	3.99	.73
Ability	127	3.94	.79
Creativity	127	3.93	.76
Responsibility	127	3.90	.70
Variety	127	3.90	.66
Coworker	127	3.67	.76
Supervision (HR)*	127	3.66	.91
Security	127	3.59	.81
Authority	127	3.58	.65
Working Conditions	127	3.57	.96
Supervision (Technical)	127	3.54	.82
Status	127	3.38	.77
Policies	127	3.38	.80
Recognition	127	3.28	.87
Advancement	127	3.26	.81
Independence	123	3.21	.82
Compensation	127	2.83	.94

*HR (Human Relations)

Sub-Question c. - What was the satisfaction level for each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree status, years as middle school principal, school location, and school size?

To answer this question, satisfaction scores for each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ were analyzed according to the independent variables, gender, age, degree status, years as middle school principal, school location, and school size. The results were tabulated and can be seen in Tables 6-33. Each table shows the demographic variables, the number (N) of respondents for each group, the mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) for each group. An analysis of variance was conducted and each table also shows the F Ratio (F) and significance value (p) for each variable. Scheffe post hoc analyses follow each table to specifically identify the groups that differ.

Ability Utilization

Table 6 shows satisfaction with the utilization of the principal's ability by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest satisfaction scores for this dimension were observed for female principals (M = 4.05, SD = .79); principals who are older than 55 (M = 4.28, SD = .45); principals holding an education specialist degree (M = 4.35, SD = .64); principals with 4 - 6 years experience as a middle school principal (M = 4.09, SD = .88); principal located in suburban schools (M = 3.95, SD = .84); and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students (M = 4.14, SD = .58). All of the mean scores were between 3.61 and 4.35, indicating that the responding principals were

“Satisfied” (3.00 - 3.99) to “Very Satisfied” (4.00 to 4.99) with the opportunities in their positions to use their abilities.

The lowest satisfaction scores for Ability Utilization were observed for male principals (\underline{M} = 3.84, \underline{SD} = .78), principals who were in age group 46-55 (\underline{M} = 3.87, \underline{SD} = .84), principals holding a masters degree (\underline{M} = 3.85, \underline{SD} = .82), principals with 7-9 years experience as a middle school principal (\underline{M} = 3.62, \underline{SD} = .78) principals located in urban schools (\underline{M} = 3.90, \underline{SD} = .79), and principals with 400 students or less (\underline{M} = 3.61, \underline{SD} = .74). All of the lowest satisfaction scores fell within the “Satisfied” range (3.00 to 3.99).

The analysis of variance indicated no significant differences in satisfaction with the utilization of ability and gender, age, degree, experience, school location, or school size (see Table 6).

Achievement

Table 7 shows satisfaction with the principals’ feeling of accomplishment by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest satisfaction scores for this dimension were observed for female middle school principals (\underline{M} = 4.07, \underline{SD} = .75), principals who were older than 55 (\underline{M} = 4.50, \underline{SD} = .39), principals holding an education specialist degree

Table 6

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Ability Utilization

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.84	.78		
Female	60	4.05	.79		
Total	127	3.94	.79	.23	.14
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.20	.54		
36 - 45	30	3.96	.75		
46 - 55	82	3.87	.84		
Older than 55	10	4.28	.45		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.93	.79	.98	.40
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.85	.82		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.35	.64		
Doctorate	26	4.09	.64		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.93	.79	.15	.12
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.97	.74		
4 - 6	29	4.08	.88		
7 - 9	25	3.61	.78		
10 or more	21	4.00	.71		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.93	.79	1.88	.14
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.94	.73		
Suburban	59	3.95	.84		
Urban	22	3.90	.79		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.93	.79	.03	.97
<u>School Size</u>					
400 Students or less	13	3.61	.74		
401 - 600	32	3.82	.84		
601 - 800	22	3.95	.80		
801 - 1,000	27	3.98	.91		
>1,000	32	4.14	.58		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.93	.79	.301	.27

($\underline{M} = 4.55$, $\underline{SD} = .50$), principals with 4-6 years experience ($\underline{M} = 4.55$, $\underline{SD} = .50$), principals who are located at suburban schools ($\underline{M} = 4.03$, $\underline{SD} = .74$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 4.18$, $\underline{SD} = .58$). All of the highest mean scores were between 4.55 and 4.03 indicating that the responding principals were “Very Satisfied” (4.00 - 4.99) with the accomplishment they are making as a middle school principal in Virginia.

The lowest Achievement scores were observed for male middle school principals ($\underline{M} = 3.91$, $\underline{SD} = .70$), principals age 46 - 55 years ($\underline{M} = 3.90$, $\underline{SD} = .76$), principals holding a masters degree ($\underline{M} = 3.91$, $\underline{SD} = .74$), principals with 7-9 years experience as middle school principal ($\underline{M} = 3.74$, $\underline{SD} = .79$), principals located at urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.87$, $\underline{SD} = .76$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($\underline{M} = 3.69$, $\underline{SD} = .53$). All of the lowest satisfaction Achievement scores rated within the “Satisfied” range (3.00 - 3.99).

The analysis of variance indicated a statistically significant difference between means for degree status ($p = .04$) (Table 7). The post hoc Scheffe analysis shows that the means between the masters principals and the educational specialist principals differ significantly ($p = .05$). Principals who had obtained an educational specialist degree appeared to have been significantly more satisfied about the achievement they were making than those principals who hold a masters degree (see Table 8).

Table 7

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Achievement

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.91	.70		
Female	60	4.07	.75		
Total	127	4.00	.73	1.55	.22
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.25	.53		
36 - 45	30	4.01	.67		
46 - 55	82	3.90	.76		
Older than 55	10	4.50	.39		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.98	.72	2.38	.07
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.91	.74		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.55	.50		
Doctorate	26	4.07	.65		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.98	.72	.28	.04*
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.97	.69		
4 - 6	29	4.12	.74		
7 -9	25	3.74	.79		
10 or More	21	4.10	.68		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.98	.72	1.46	.23
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.97	.69		
Suburban	59	4.03	.74		
Urban	22	3.87	.76		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.98	.72	.40	.67
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.69	.53		
401 - 600	32	3.86	.79		
601 - 800	22	3.85	.81		
801 - 1,000	27	4.14	.74		
>1,000	32	4.18	.58		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.98	.72	1.87	.12

* $p < .05$

Table 8

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Achievement and Degree

(I) Current Degree	(J) Current Degree	(I-J) Difference	p
Masters	ED Specialist	-.64	.05*
	Doctorate	-.16	.59
ED Specialist	Doctorate	.48	.25

* p = .05

Activity

The principals satisfaction with keeping busy all the time is reported by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. These scores are shown in Table 9. The highest satisfaction score for this dimension was noted for female middle school principals ($\underline{M} = 4.22$, $\underline{SD} = .70$), principals who were younger than 35 and older than 55 ($\underline{M} = 4.50$, $\underline{SD} = .62$ and $.73$, respectively), principals with an education specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 4.50$, $\underline{SD} = .61$), principals who have been a middle school principal 10 or more years ($\underline{M} = 4.13$, $\underline{SD} = .69$), principals located at suburban schools ($\underline{M} = 4.13$, $\underline{SD} = .73$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 4.28$, $\underline{SD} = .70$). All of the mean scores fell between 4.50 and 4.13 indicating that the respondents were “Very Satisfied” (4.00 - 4.99) about being able to keep busy all the time.

The lowest satisfaction scores for activity were observed for male middle school principals ($\underline{M} = 3.91$, $\underline{SD} = .70$), principals between the age 46 - 55 ($\underline{M} = 3.94$, $\underline{SD} = .70$), principals with a masters degree ($\underline{M} = 4.01$, $\underline{SD} = .72$),

principals who had been a middle school principal for 7 - 9 years ($\underline{M} = 3.92$, $\underline{SD} = .73$); principals from urban schools ($M = 3.86$, $SD = .80$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($M = 3.72$, $SD = .62$). Thus, the scores ranged between 4.01 and 3.72 (“Very Satisfied” 4.00 - 4.99 and “Satisfied” 3.00 - 3.99). Even the lowest scores show that the responding principals were satisfied about keeping busy all the time (see Table 9).

Analysis of variance indicate statistically significant differences for gender ($p = .02$), age ($p = .05$), and school size ($p = .03$). Females appeared more satisfied about their activity levels than males. Younger and older principals seemed more satisfied than the middle groups, and principals from large schools were more satisfied with activity than principals from small schools. The Scheffe post hoc analyses do not indicate significant differences for any of these group comparisons (see Table 10).

Advancement

Table 11 shows satisfaction scores for the principals’ opportunity for advancement by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest satisfaction scores for this dimension were observed for Female principals ($\underline{M} = 3.36$, $\underline{SD} = .90$), principals younger than 35 ($\underline{M} = 3.55$, $\underline{SD} = 1.27$), principals holding an educational specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 3.35$, $\underline{SD} = .50$), principals with 1-3 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.36$, $\underline{SD} = .75$), principals located in urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.37$, $\underline{SD} = .57$), and principals from schools with 801-1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.48$, $\underline{SD} = .98$). Therefore, all of the highest scores

Table 9
Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Activity

<u>Variable</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.91	.70		
Female	60	4.22	.70		
Total	127	4.06	.72	6.08	.02*
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.50	.62		
36 - 45	30	4.14	.69		
46 - 55	82	3.94	.70		
Older than 55	10	4.50	.73		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.73	2.77	.05*
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	4.01	.72		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.50	.61		
Doctorate	26	4.04	.69		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.71	1.73	.18
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	4.04	.72		
4 - 6	29	4.12	.73		
7 -9	25	3.92	.73		
10 or More	21	4.13	.69		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.71	.47	.70
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	4.04	.64		
Suburban	59	4.13	.73		
Urban	22	3.86	.80		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.71	1.08	.34
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.72	.62		
401 - 600	32	3.88	.67		
601 - 800	22	3.93	.76		
801 - 1,000	27	4.24	.70		
>1,000	32	4.28	.70		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.71	2.76	.03*

* $p < .05$

Table 10

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Activity , Age and School Size

(I) age	(J) age	Difference (I-J)	p
Younger than 35	36-45	.36	.82
	46-55	.56	.49
	Older than 55	.00	1.00
36-45	46-55	.20	.62
	Older than 55	-.36	.58
46-55	Older than 55	-.56	.13
(I) Size	(J) Size	Difference (I-J)	p
400 students or less	401-600	-.15	.98
	601-800	-.21	.95
	801-1,000	-.51	.32
	> 1,000	-.56	.21
401-600	601-800	-.05	1.00
	801-1,000	-.36	.42
	> 1,000	-.41	.25
601-800	801-1,000	-.31	.68
	> 1,000	-.35	.51
801-1,000	> 1,000	-.04	1.00

were between 3.55 and 3.35 indicating that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with opportunities for advancement on the job.

The lowest scores for advancement were reported for male principals ($\underline{M} = 3.17$, $\underline{SD} = .72$), principals older than 55 ($\underline{M} = 2.98$, $\underline{SD} = 1.19$), principals holding a doctorate degree ($\underline{M} = 3.22$, $\underline{SD} = .81$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.13$, $\underline{SD} = 1.02$), principals from rural schools ($\underline{M} = 3.03$, $\underline{SD} = .86$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less

Table 11
Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Advancement

<u>Variable</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.17	.72		
Female	60	3.36	.90		
Total	127	3.26	.81	1.82	.18
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.55	1.27		
36 - 45	30	3.21	.81		
46 - 55	82	3.27	.73		
Older than 55	10	2.98	1.19		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.24	.80	.60	.62
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.24	.83		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.35	.50		
Doctorate	26	3.22	.81		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.24	.80	.08	.92
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.36	.75		
4 - 6	29	3.21	.76		
7 -9	25	3.14	.75		
10 or More	21	3.13	1.02		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.24	.80	.68	.56
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.03	.86		
Suburban	59	3.36	.81		
Urban	22	3.37	.57		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.24	.80	2.58	.08
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	2.72	.61		
401 - 600	32	3.30	.61		
601 - 800	22	2.91	.88		
801 - 1,000	27	3.48	.98		
>1,000	32	3.42	.67		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.24	.80	3.54	.009*

* $p < .01$

Table 12
Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Advancement and School Size

(I) Size	(J) Size	Difference (I-J)	<u>p.</u>
400 students or less	401-600	-.58	.27
	601-800	-.21	.97
	801-1,000	-.76	.08
	>1,000	-.70	.12
401-600	601-800	.38	.55
	801-1,000	-.18	.94
	> 1,000	-.12	.98
601-800	801-1,000	-.56	.19
	> 1,000	-.49	.26
801-1,000	601-800	.56	.19

(M = 2.72, SD = .61). The lowest scores for advancement were between 2.72 and 3.22 indicating that the responding principals felt “Somewhat Satisfied” (2.00-2.99) to “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) about opportunities for advancement (see Table 11).

The analysis of variance indicated a statistically significant difference only for school size ($p = .009$). Although principals from larger schools were more satisfied with opportunities for advancement than principals from small schools, post hoc tests do not indicate that the means differ significantly (see Table 12).

Authority

Table 13 shows satisfaction with the principals’ opportunity to tell others what to do. These scores are reported by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores are seen for female principals

($\underline{M} = 3.64$, $\underline{SD} = .86$), principals older than 55 ($\underline{M} = 3.82$, $\underline{SD} = .48$), principals holding an educational specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 3.83$, $\underline{SD} = .74$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.67$, $\underline{SD} = .63$), principals from rural schools ($\underline{M} = 3.59$, $\underline{SD} = .63$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.72$, $\underline{SD} = .57$). All of these scores were between 3.83 and 3.59 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) about the opportunity to tell others what to do.

The lowest scores for authority were observed for female principals ($\underline{M} = 3.53$, $\underline{SD} = 3.58$), principals younger than 35 ($\underline{M} = 3.63$, $\underline{SD} = .57$), principals with a masters degree ($\underline{M} = 3.53$, $\underline{SD} = .66$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.44$, $\underline{SD} = .39$), principals located in urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.48$, $\underline{SD} = .55$), and principals from schools with 401-600 students ($\underline{M} = 3.34$, $\underline{SD} = .61$). All of the mean scores were between 3.34 and 3.63 indicating that the lowest scores also fell within the “Satisfied” range .

The analysis of variance indicated no significant differences between scores for authority and gender, age, degree, experience, school location or school size (see Table 13).

Creativity

Table 14 shows principal satisfaction with the opportunity to try his or her own ideas for getting the job done. These scores are reported by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were

Table 13

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Authority

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.53	3.58		
Female	60	3.64	.86		
Total	127	3.58	.65	.98	.32
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.63	.57		
36 - 45	30	3.64	.74		
46 - 55	82	3.51	.62		
Older than 55	10	3.82	.48		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.57	.64	.84	.47
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.53	.66		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.83	.74		
Doctorate	26	3.63	.52		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.57	.64	.91	.40
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.59	.62		
4 - 6	29	3.58	.83		
7 - 9	25	3.44	.39		
10 or More	21	3.67	.63		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.57	.64	.53	.67
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.59	.63		
Suburban	59	3.59	.64		
Urban	22	3.48	.55		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.57	.64	.30	.74
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.44	.44		
401 - 600	32	3.34	.61		
601 - 800	22	3.68	.68		
801 - 1,000	27	3.64	.74		
>1,000	32	3.72	.57		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.57	.64	1.91	.11

noted for female principals ($\underline{M} = 4.04$, $\underline{SD} = .81$), principals older than 55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 4.26$, $\underline{SD} = .65$), principals with an educational specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 4.40$, $\underline{SD} = .52$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 4.00$, $\underline{SD} = .89$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 4.09$, $\underline{SD} = .65$). All of the scores were between 4.00 and 4.40 indicating that the principals were “Very Satisfied” (4.00 - 4.99) about the opportunity to be creative in their position.

The lowest scores were observed for male principals ($\underline{M} = 3.84$, $\underline{SD} = .71$), principals 46-55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.85$, $\underline{SD} = .80$), principals with a masters degree ($\underline{M} = 3.88$, $\underline{SD} = .78$), principals with 7-9 years of experience ($\underline{M} = 3.73$, $\underline{SD} = .63$), principals located in rural schools ($\underline{M} = 3.90$, $\underline{SD} = .77$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($\underline{M} = 3.50$, $\underline{SD} = .74$). All of the scores were within the “Satisfied” range (3.00-3.99) on the MSQ.

The analysis of variance reports indicated no significant differences between means for creativity and variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size (see Table 14).

Compensation

Table 15 shows principals’ satisfaction with the pay they receive for the amount of work they do. These scores are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were noted for female principals ($\underline{M}=2.85$, $\underline{SD} = 1.03$), principals 36-45 years of age ($\underline{M} = 2.90$, $\underline{SD} = .94$), principals with doctorate degrees ($\underline{M} = 3.10$, $\underline{SD} = .74$), principals

Table 14

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Creativity

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.84	.71		
Female	60	4.04	.81		
Total	127	3.93	.76	2.18	.14
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.15	.76		
36 - 45	30	4.00	.69		
46 - 55	82	3.85	.80		
Older than 55	10	4.26	.65		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.92	.76	1.16	.33
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.88	.78		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.40	.52		
Doctorate	26	3.93	.72		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.92	.76	1.72	.18
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.95	.76		
4 - 6	29	4.00	.79		
7 - 9	25	3.73	.63		
10 or More	21	4.00	.89		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.92	.76	.73	.54
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.90	.77		
Suburban	59	3.91	.76		
Urban	22	4.02	.78		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.92	.76	.20	.82
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.49	.74		
401 - 600	32	3.95	.78		
601 - 800	22	3.74	.73		
801 - 1,000	27	4.06	.84		
>1,000	32	4.09	.65		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.92	.76	2.01	.10

with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 2.94, \underline{SD} = 1.02$), principals from suburban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.29, \underline{SD} = .89$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.07, \underline{SD} = .75$). All of the mean scores were between 3.29 and 2.94 indicating that the responding principals were between “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) and “Somewhat Satisfied” (2.00-2.99) about their pay.

The lowest scores were observed for male principals ($\underline{M} = 2.82, \underline{SD} = .86$), principals older than 55 ($\underline{M} = 2.64, \underline{SD} = .94$), principals with masters degrees ($\underline{M} = 2.73, \underline{SD} = .96$), principals with 1-3 years experience ($\underline{M} = 2.76, \underline{SD} = .93$), principals from rural schools ($\underline{M} = 2.39, \underline{SD} = .89$), and principals from schools with 601-800 students ($\underline{M} = 2.57, \underline{SD} = .82$). All scores were between 2.82 and 2.39 indicating that the responding principals were “Somewhat Satisfied” (2.00-2.99) with the pay they get for the amount of work they do (see Table 15).

The analysis of variance indicated a statistically significant difference between means for school location ($p = .00$). Scheffe Post Hoc test indicated a significant difference is between means of rural and suburban principals. Rural principals were significantly less satisfied with their pay than suburban principals (see Table 16).

Co-worker

Table 17 shows principals satisfaction with the way their co-workers get along with each other. These scores are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were observed for

Table 15

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Compensation

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	2.82	.86		
Female	60	2.85	1.03		
Total	127	2.83	.94	.04	.85
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	2.85	.77		
36 - 45	30	2.91	.94		
46 - 55	82	2.81	.94		
Older than 55	10	2.64	.94		
Missing	1				
Total	127	2.82	.93	.21	.89
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	2.73	.96		
Ed. Specialist	8	2.88	1.07		
Doctorate	26	3.10	.74		
Missing	1				
Total	127	2.82	.93	1.63	.20
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	2.76	.93		
4 - 6	29	2.86	1.00		
7 - 9	25	2.79	.79		
10 or More	21	2.94	1.02		
Missing	1				
Total	127	2.82	.93	.19	.90
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	2.39	.89		
Suburban	59	3.29	.89		
Urban	22	2.87	.79		
Missing	1				
Total	127	2.82	.93	9.16	.00*
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	2.76	.83		
401 - 600	32	2.61	.98		
601 - 800	22	2.57	.82		
801 - 1,000	27	3.00	1.12		
>1,000	32	3.07	.75		
Missing	1				
Total	127	2.82	.93	1.65	.17

* $p < .01$

Table 16

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Compensation and School Location

(I) School Location	(J) School Location	Difference (I-J)	p
Rural	Suburban	-.74	.00*
	Urban	-.48	.11
Suburban	Urban	.26	.50

- $p < .01$

female principals ($\underline{M} = 3.73$, $\underline{SD} = .84$), principals older than 55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.97$, $\underline{SD} = .72$), principals with an educational specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 4.03$, $\underline{SD} = .47$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.72$, $\underline{SD} = .85$), principals located in suburban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.72$, $\underline{SD} = .84$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students. All of the scores were between 3.72 and 4.03 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) to “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) with the way their coworkers get along with each other.

The lowest scores for coworkers were observed for male principals ($\underline{M} = 3.62$, $\underline{SD} = .69$), principals 46-55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.59$, $\underline{SD} = .77$), principals with a doctorate degree ($\underline{M} = 3.52$, $\underline{SD} = .82$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.47$, $\underline{SD} = .66$), principals located in urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.50$, $\underline{SD} = .53$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less to 600 students ($\underline{M} = 3.58$, $\underline{SD} = .59$ and $.72$). All scores were between 3.47 and 3.62 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the way their coworkers get along with each other.

The analysis of variance reports indicated no significant difference between means for coworker and gender, age, degree, experience, school location or school size (see Table 17).

Independence

Table 18 shows principal satisfaction with the chance to work alone in their position by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest mean scores were observed for male principals ($\underline{M} = 3.21$, $\underline{SD} = .84$), principals who were younger than 35 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.85$, $\underline{SD} = .87$), principals with an educational specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 3.38$, $\underline{SD} = .85$), principals with 10 or more years experience as a middle school principal ($\underline{M} = 3.33$, $\underline{SD} = .86$), principals located in rural schools ($\underline{M} = 3.30$, $\underline{SD} = .88$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.39$, $\underline{SD} = .82$). All of the mean scores were between 3.21 and 3.85 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the opportunity to work alone.

The lowest scores were observed for female principals ($\underline{M} = 3.20$, $\underline{SD} = .81$), principals 46-55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.08$, $\underline{SD} = .82$), principals with a masters degree ($\underline{M} = 3.17$, $\underline{SD} = .83$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.02$, $\underline{SD} = .80$), principals from urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.07$, $\underline{SD} = .51$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($\underline{M} = 2.96$, $\underline{SD} = .50$). All mean scores were between 2.96 and 3.20 indicating that the principals were “Somewhat Satisfied” (2.00-2.99) to “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) about the opportunity to be alone on the job.

Table 17

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Co-worker

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.62	.69		
Female	60	3.73	.84		
Total	127	3.67	.76	.72	.40
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.60	1.14		
36 - 45	30	3.77	.67		
46 - 55	82	3.59	.77		
Older than 55	10	3.97	.72		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.66	.76	1.05	.36
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.67	.76		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.03	.47		
Doctorate	26	3.52	.82		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.66	.76	1.36	.26
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.71	.70		
4 - 6	29	3.69	.88		
7 - 9	25	3.47	.66		
10 or More	21	3.72	.85		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.66	.76	.66	.58
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.67	.75		
Suburban	59	3.72	.84		
Urban	22	3.50	.53		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.66	.76	.66	.52
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.58	.60		
401 - 600	32	3.58	.72		
601 - 800	22	3.62	.91		
801 - 1,000	27	3.67	.84		
> 1,000	32	3.80	.69		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.66	.76	.41	.80

Table 18
Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Independence

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	64	3.21	.84		
Female	59	3.20	.81		
Total	123	3.21	.82	.01	.94
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.85	.87		
36 - 45	29	3.35	.80		
46 - 55	79	3.08	.82		
Older than 55	10	3.54	.79		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.21	.83	2.29	.08
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	89	3.17	.83		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.38	.85		
Doctorate	25	3.30	.84		
Missing	5				
Total	127	3.21	.83	.37	.69
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	49	3.30	.82		
4 - 6	28	3.14	.85		
7 - 9	25	3.02	.80		
10 or More	20	3.33	.86		
Missing	5				
Total	127	3.21	.83	.85	.47
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	44	3.30	.88		
Suburban	57	3.19	.88		
Urban	21	3.07	.51		
Missing	5				
Total	127	3.21	.83	.58	.56
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	2.96	.50		
401 - 600	32	3.23	.92		
601 - 800	20	3.07	1.03		
801 - 1,000	26	3.19	.67		
>1,000	31	3.39	.82		
Missing	5				
Total	127	3.21	.83	.82	.51

The analysis of variance reports indicated no significant difference between means for gender, age, degree, experience, school location, school size and Independence (see Table 18).

Supervision (Human Relations)

Table 19 shows principal satisfaction with the way their supervisor supervises others. The mean scores are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were shown for female principals ($\underline{M} = 3.82$, $\underline{SD} = .97$), principals who were younger than 35 years of age ($\underline{M} = 4.15$, $\underline{SD} = .87$), principals holding an education specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 3.93$, $\underline{SD} = .58$), principals with 1-3 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.75$, $\underline{SD} = .93$), principals from suburban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.75$, $\underline{SD} = .87$), and principals from schools with 801-1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.97$, $\underline{SD} = .77$). All scores were between 3.75 and 4.15 indicating that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) to “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) about the way others are supervised.

The lowest scores for supervision of other people were seen for male principals ($\underline{M} = 3.52$, $\underline{SD} = .83$), principals 46-55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.52$, $\underline{SD} = .88$), principals holding a masters degree ($\underline{M} = 3.63$, $\underline{SD} = .93$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.54$, $\underline{SD} = .85$), principals from urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.38$, $\underline{SD} = .87$), and principals from schools with 601-800 students

Table 19

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Supervision (Human Relations)

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.52	.83		
Female	60	3.82	.97		
Total	127	3.66	.91	3.45	.07
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.15	.87		
36 - 45	30	3.81	.83		
46 - 55	82	3.52	.88		
Older than 55	10	4.02	1.14		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.65	.90	1.89	.14
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.63	.93		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.93	.58		
Doctorate	26	3.65	.91		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.65	.90	.40	.67
<u>Yrs. As Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.75	.93		
4 - 6	29	3.61	.93		
7 - 9	25	3.54	.85		
10 or More	21	3.59	.91		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.65	.90	.39	.76
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.47	.95		
Suburban	59	3.75	.87		
Urban	22	3.38	.87		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.65	.90	1.36	.26
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.48	.79		
401 - 600	32	3.38	.89		
601 - 800	22	3.35	1.00		
801 - 1,000	27	3.97	.77		
>1,000	32	3.93	.87		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.65	.90	3.35	.012*

* $p < .05$

Table 20

Scheffe: Supervision (Human Relations)

(I) Size	(J) Size	Difference (I-J)	p.
400 students or less	401-600	.11	1.00
	601-800	.14	1.00
	801-1,000	-.49	.60
	>1,000	-.45	.66
401-600	601-800	.02	1.00
	801-1,000	-.60	.15
	>1,000	-.56	.17
601-800	801-1,000	-.63	.19
	>1,000	-.59	.21
801-1,000	>1,000	.04	1.00

(M = 3.35, SD = 1.00). All scores were from 3.35 to 3.63 indicating that responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the way their supervisor supervises others (see Table 19).

The analysis of variance indicated a significant difference between means for school size ($p = .012$). Scheffe Post Hoc test indicated no significant difference between groups (see Table 20).

Moral Values

Table 21 shows principals’ satisfaction with being able to do things in their position that do not go against their conscience. Data were reported by the principals’ gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest mean scores were shown for females (M = 4.17, SD = .66), principals older than 55 years of age (M = 4.46, SD = .42), principals with an education specialist degree (M = 4.25, SD = .48), principals with 4-6 years experience (M =

4.26, $SD = .69$), principals from suburban schools ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .67$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($M = 4.21$, $SD = .65$). All scores were between 4.10 and 4.46 meaning that all of the principals were “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) that they are able to do things in their position that do not go against their moral values.

The lowest scores were shown for male principals ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .69$), principals 46-55 years of age ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .68$), principals holding a doctorate degree ($M = 4.01$, $SD = .66$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($M = 3.86$, $SD = .70$), principals from rural schools ($M = 3.96$, $SD = .71$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($M = 3.60$, $SD = .54$). These scores were between 3.60 and 4.01 meaning that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) to “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) with moral value.

The analysis of variance indicated no significant difference between means for moral values and gender, age, degree, experience, school location, or school size.

School Policies

Table 22 shows principal satisfaction for the way school policies are implemented. Mean satisfaction scores for school policies are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were observed for female principals ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .86$); principals who

Table 21

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Moral Value

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.95	.69		
Female	60	4.17	.66		
Total	127	4.05	.68	3.16	.08
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.45	.50		
36 - 45	30	4.00	.72		
46 - 55	82	3.99	.68		
Older than 55	10	4.46	.42		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.68	1.99	.12
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	4.04	.70		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.25	.48		
Doctorate	26	4.01	.66		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.68	.40	.67
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.98	.70		
4 - 6	29	4.26	.69		
7 - 9	25	3.86	.70		
10 or More	21	4.12	.52		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.68	1.82	.15
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.96	.71		
Suburban	59	4.10	.67		
Urban	22	4.08	.62		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.68	.53	.59
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.60	.54		
401 - 600	32	4.03	.70		
601 - 800	22	4.06	.65		
801 - 1,000	27	4.06	.72		
>1,000	32	4.21	.65		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.05	.68	1.97	.10

were younger than 35 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.50$, $\underline{SD} = 1.05$), principals with an education specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 3.63$, $\underline{SD} = .56$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.37$, $\underline{SD} = 1.01$), principals located in suburban and urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.46$; $\underline{SD} = .86$ and $.55$), and principals from schools with 801-1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.68$, $\underline{SD} = .80$). All scores were between 3.37 and 3.68 meaning that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the way school policies were implemented in their school systems.

The lowest scores for the implementation of school policies were seen for male principals ($\underline{M} = 3.31$, $\underline{SD} = .74$), principals 46-55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.33$, $\underline{SD} = .77$), principals with a doctorate degree ($\underline{M} = 3.21$, $\underline{SD} = .90$); principals with 7-9 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.30$, $\underline{SD} = .65$), principals located in rural schools ($\underline{M} = 3.20$, $\underline{SD} = .81$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($\underline{M} = 3.10$, $\underline{SD} = .65$). All scores were between 3.10 and 3.33 meaning that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the way policies are implemented.

The analysis of variance indicated no significant difference for school policies and gender, age, degree, experience, school location, or school size (see Table 22).

Recognition

Table 23 shows the principals’ satisfaction for the praise they get for doing a good job. The mean scores are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were obtained by female principals ($\underline{M} = 3.41$, $\underline{SD} = .90$), principals who are younger than 35 years of age

Table 22

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: School Policies

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.31	.74		
Female	60	3.46	.86		
Total	127	3.38	.80	1.10	.30
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.50	1.05		
36 - 45	30	3.42	.77		
46 - 55	82	3.33	.77		
Older than 55	10	3.44	1.07		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.80	.15	.93
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	98	3.39	.78		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.63	.56		
Doctorate	26	3.21	.90		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.80	.98	.38
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.44	.72		
4 - 6	29	3.31	.90		
7 - 9	25	3.30	.65		
10 or More	21	3.37	1.01		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.80	.25	.86
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.20	.81		
Suburban	59	3.46	.86		
Urban	22	3.46	.55		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.80	1.57	.21
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.10	.65		
401 - 600	32	3.23	.77		
601 - 800	22	3.22	.78		
801 - 1,000	27	3.68	.80		
>1,000	32	3.46	.84		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.80	2.03	.10

(\underline{M} = 3.60, \underline{SD} = .49), principals with an education specialist degree (\underline{M} = 3.53, \underline{SD} = .67), principals with 1-3 years experience (\underline{M} = 3.43, \underline{SD} = .71), principals from urban schools (\underline{M} = 3.35, \underline{SD} = .85), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students (\underline{M} = 3.51, \underline{SD} = .73). All scores were between 3.35 and 3.60 indicating that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the praise they get for doing a good job.

The low recognition scores were observed for male principals (\underline{M} = 3.16, \underline{SD} = .83), principals who were older than 55 (\underline{M} = 3.06, \underline{SD} = .89), principals with masters degrees (\underline{M} = 3.24, \underline{SD} = .86), principals with 10 or more years experience (\underline{M} = 3.02, \underline{SD} = 1.02), principals from rural schools (\underline{M} = 3.24, \underline{SD} = .87), and principals from schools with 400 students or less (\underline{M} = 2.92, \underline{SD} = .62). All scores were between 2.92 and 3.24 indicating that the principals were “Somewhat Satisfied” (2.00-2.99) to “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) about the praise they get for doing a good job.

The analysis of variance reports indicated no significant difference between means for recognition and gender, age, degree, experience, school location, or school size (see Table 23).

Responsibility

Table 24 shows satisfaction with the freedom the principals have to use their own judgment by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest mean scores for responsibility were observed for female

Table 23

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Recognition

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.16	.83		
Female	60	3.41	.90		
Total	127	3.28	.87	2.81	.10
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.60	.49		
36 - 45	30	3.53	.79		
46 - 55	82	3.18	.88		
Older than 55	10	3.06	.89		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.26	.86	1.63	.19
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.24	.86		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.53	.67		
Doctorate	26	3.26	.92		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.26	.86	.39	.68
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.43	.71		
4 - 6	29	3.34	.92		
7 - 9	25	3.04	.88		
10 or More	21	3.02	1.02		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.26	.86	1.86	.14
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.24	.87		
Suburban	59	3.26	.87		
Urban	22	3.35	.85		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.26	.86	.12	.88
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	2.92	.62		
401 - 600	32	3.16	.88		
601 - 800	22	3.08	.83		
801 - 1,000	27	3.42	1.03		
>1,000	32	3.51	.73		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.26	.86	1.79	.14

principals ($M = 3.99$, $SD = .74$), principals older than 55 years of age ($M = 4.22$, $SD = .36$), principals with an education specialist degree ($M = 4.33$, $SD = .49$), principals with 4-6 years experience ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .77$), principals from suburban schools ($M = 3.93$, $SD = .70$); and principals from schools with 801-1,000 students. All of the scores were between 3.93 and 4.33 indicating that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) to “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) about the freedom they have to use their own judgment.

The lowest responsibility scores were observed for male principals ($M = 3.81$, $SD = .65$), principals 46-55 years of age ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .73$), principals with masters degrees ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .72$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .53$), principals located at urban schools ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .62$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .63$). All scores were between 3.54 and 3.85 indicating that the principals with low scores were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) about the freedom they have to use their own judgment.

The analysis of variance indicated no significant differences between scores for responsibility and gender, age, degree, experience, school location, or school size (see Table 24).

Security

Table 25 shows principal satisfaction with the security that their positions provide. These scores are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were observed for female principals

Table 24

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Responsibility

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.81	.65		
Female	60	3.99	.74		
Total	127	3.90	.70	2.03	.16
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.00	.71		
36 - 45	30	3.93	.67		
46 - 55	82	3.83	.73		
Older than 55	10	4.22	.36		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.69	1.04	.38
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.83	.72		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.33	.49		
Doctorate	26	3.95	.62		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.69	2.00	.14
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.89	.70		
4 - 6	29	4.00	.77		
7 - 9	25	3.70	.53		
10 or More	21	3.96	.72		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.69	.98	.41
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.86	.73		
Suburban	59	3.93	.70		
Urban	22	3.85	.63		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.69	.19	.83
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.54	.63		
401 - 600	32	3.74	.77		
601 - 800	22	3.81	.73		
801 - 1,000	27	4.11	.69		
>1,000	32	4.04	.53		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.69	2.38	.06

($M = 3.64$, $SD = .81$), principals older than 55 years of age ($M = 4.12$, $SD = .49$), principals with an education specialist degree ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .45$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .84$), principals from suburban schools ($M = 3.74$, $SD = .84$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .69$). All scores were between 3.64 and 4.12 meaning that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) to “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) about their job security.

The lowest satisfaction scores for security were seen for male principals ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .81$), principals 46-55 years of age ($M = 3.49$, $SD = .83$), principals with doctorate degrees ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .66$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($M = 3.48$, $SD = .75$), principals from rural schools ($M = 3.38$, $SD = .81$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .72$). All of the low scores were between 3.17 and 3.49 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the job security this position provides (see Table 25).

The analysis of variance indicated no significant difference between security and gender, age, degree, experience or school location. However, there was a significant difference between security and school size ($p = .02$), although post hoc tests do not show that these groups differ significantly (see Table 26).

Social Service

Table 27 shows principal satisfaction with the opportunities their position allows them to be able to do things for others. These scores are shown by gender,

Table 25

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Security

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.54	.81		
Female	60	3.64	.81		
Total	127	3.59	.81	.46	.50
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.95	.72		
36 - 45	30	3.59	.76		
46 - 55	82	3.49	.83		
Older than 55	10	4.12	.49		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.58	.80	2.21	.09
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.58	.86		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.83	.45		
Doctorate	26	3.51	.66		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.58	.80	.48	.62
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.57	.80		
4 - 6	29	3.54	.84		
7 - 9	25	3.48	.75		
10 or More	21	3.75	.84		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.58	.80	.46	.71
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.38	.81		
Suburban	59	3.74	.84		
Urban	22	3.55	.59		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.58	.80	2.64	.08
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.17	.72		
401 - 600	32	3.31	.77		
601 - 800	22	3.59	.90		
801 - 1,000	27	3.76	.79		
>1,000	32	3.85	.69		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.58	.80	3.21	.02*

* $p < .05$

Table 26

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests: Security

(I) Size	(J) Size	Difference (I-J)	<u>p.</u>
400 students or less	401-600	-.15	.99
	601-800	-.43	.65
	801-1,000	-.59	.28
	>1,000	-.68	.13
401-600	601-800	-.28	.79
	801-1,000	-.44	.32
	>1,000	-.54	.11
601-800	801-1,000	-.16	.97
	>1,000	-.26	.83
801-1,000	>1,000	-.09	.99

age, degree, experience, school location and school size. The highest satisfaction scores for this dimension were observed for male principals ($\underline{M} = 4.21$, $\underline{SD} = .70$), principals older than 55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 4.50$, $\underline{SD} = .80$), principals with educational specialist degrees ($\underline{M} = 4.68$, $\underline{SD} = .40$), principals with 4-6 years experience ($\underline{M} = 4.48$, $\underline{SD} = .62$), principals from suburban schools ($\underline{M} = 4.24$, $\underline{SD} = .75$), and principals from schools with 801-1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 4.29$, $\underline{SD} = .81$). All scores were between 4.21 and 4.68 indicating that the principals were “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) with the opportunities they have to be of service to others.

Table 27

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Social Service

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	4.21	.70		
Female	60	4.17	.77		
Total	127	4.19	.73	.11	.75
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.25	.50		
36 - 45	30	4.21	.71		
46 - 55	82	4.14	.74		
Older than 55	10	4.50	.80		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.19	.73	.73	.54
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	4.12	.72		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.68	.40		
Doctorate	26	4.28	.79		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.19	.73	2.47	.09
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	4.11	.75		
4 - 6	29	4.48	.62		
7 - 9	25	3.98	.68		
10 or More	21	4.22	.80		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.19	.73	2.56	.06
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	4.14	.69		
Suburban	59	4.24	.75		
Urban	22	4.14	.77		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.19	.73	.28	.76
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.79	.52		
401 - 600	32	4.20	.71		
601 - 800	22	4.07	.77		
801 - 1,000	27	4.29	.81		
>1,000	32	4.33	.70		
Missing	1				
Total	127	4.19	.73	1.60	.18

The lowest scores for social service (although not very low—3.79 - 4.12) were observed for female principals ($\underline{M} = 4.17$, $\underline{SD} = .77$), principals 46-55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 4.14$, $\underline{SD} = .74$), principals with masters degrees ($\underline{M} = 4.12$, $\underline{SD} = .72$), principals with 7-9 years experience ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .68$), principals from urban schools ($\underline{M} = 4.14$, $\underline{SD} = .77$); and principals from school with 400 students or less ($\underline{M} = 3.79$, $\underline{SD} = .52$). All scores were between 3.79 and 4.12 meaning that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) and “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) about the opportunity to do things for others.

The analysis of variance indicated no significant differences for social service and gender, age, experience, school location, or school size (see Table 27).

Social Status

Table 28 shows principals’ satisfaction with the opportunity to be “somebody” in the community by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores for this dimension were observed for female principals ($\underline{M} = 3.44$, $\underline{SD} = .73$), principals younger than 35 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.94$, $\underline{SD} = .60$), principals with masters degrees ($\underline{M} = 3.38$, $\underline{SD} = .80$), principals with 1-3 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.48$, $\underline{SD} = .67$), principals from urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.50$, $\underline{SD} = .51$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.58$, $\underline{SD} = .53$). All scores were between 3.38 and 3.94 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the opportunity to be “somebody” in the community.

The lowest scores for social status were observed for male principals

Table 28

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Social Status

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.32	.80		
Female	60	3.44	.73		
Total	127	3.38	.77	.83	.36
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.94	.60		
36 - 45	30	3.53	.79		
46 - 55	82	3.28	.74		
Older than 55	10	3.34	.81		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.76	1.57	.20
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.38	.80		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.35	.68		
Doctorate	26	3.28	.62		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.76	.43	.65
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.48	.68		
4 - 6	29	3.43	.95		
7 - 9	25	3.13	.64		
10 or More	21	3.27	.76		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.76	1.42	.24
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.33	.88		
Suburban	59	3.34	.74		
Urban	22	3.50	.51		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.76	.42	.66
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.03	.49		
401 - 600	32	3.19	.78		
601 - 800	22	3.38	.90		
801 - 1,000	27	3.49	.97		
>1,000	32	3.58	.53		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.37	.76	1.95	.11

(\underline{M} = 3.32, \underline{SD} = .80), principals 46-55 years of age (\underline{M} = 3.28, \underline{SD} = .74), principals with doctorate degrees (\underline{M} = 3.28, \underline{SD} = .62), principals with 7-9 years experience (\underline{M} = 3.13, \underline{SD} = .64), principals from rural schools (\underline{M} = 3.33, \underline{SD} = .88), and principals from schools with 400 students or less (\underline{M} = 3.03, \underline{SD} = .49). All scores were between 3.03 and 3.33 indicating that the responding principals with the lowest scores were also “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the opportunity to be “somebody” in the community.

The analysis of variance report indicated no significant differences between social status and gender, age, degree, experience, school location, or school size (see Table 28).

Supervision (Technical)

Table 29 shows principals’ satisfaction for the competence of their supervisor to supervise others. The scores for this dimension are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were observed for female principals (\underline{M} = 3.65, \underline{SD} = .88), principals older than 55 (\underline{M} = 3.80, \underline{SD} = .92), principals with education specialist degrees (\underline{M} = 3.80, \underline{SD} = .45), principals with 1-3 years experience (\underline{M} = 3.64, \underline{SD} = .85), principals from urban schools (\underline{M} = 3.70, \underline{SD} = .71), and principals from schools with 801-1,000 students (\underline{M} = 3.89, \underline{SD} = .68). All scores were between 3.64 and 3.89 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the competence of their supervisor to supervise others.

The lowest satisfaction scores for supervision were observed for male principals (\underline{M} = 3.45, \underline{SD} = .75), principals 46-55 years of age, (\underline{M} = 3.46,

SD = .78), principals with doctorate degrees (M = 3.43, SD = .86), principals with 7-9 years experience (M = 3.32, SD = .87), principals from rural schools (M = 3.27, SD = .83), and principals from schools with 400 students or less (M = 3.13, SD = .73). All low scores were between 3.13 and 3.46 indicating that responding principals with the lowest scores were also “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the competence of their supervisor to supervise others.

The analysis of variance indicated no significant differences for gender, age, experience, or degree. However there were significant differences for school location and school size ($p = .03$ and $.00$, respectively). Scheffe post hoc analyses indicated a significant difference between rural and suburban principals, suburban principals were more satisfied with supervision than rural principals. Also, two groups in school size differ on satisfaction with supervision and those in larger groups tend to be more satisfied with the competence of their supervisors to supervise others (see Tables 29 and 30).

Variety

Table 31 shows principals’ satisfaction with their opportunities to do different things in their position. The scores for this dimension are presented by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores were observed for female principals (M = 4.06, SD = .61), principals older

Table 29

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Supervision (Technical)

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.45	.75		
Female	60	3.65	.88		
Total	127	3.54	.82	1.85	.18
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.70	1.14		
36 - 45	30	3.60	.83		
46 - 55	82	3.46	.78		
Older than 55	10	3.80	.92		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.53	.81	.67	.57
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.54	.83		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.80	.45		
Doctorate	26	3.43	.86		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.53	.81	.63	.53
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.64	.85		
4 - 6	29	3.54	.77		
7 - 9	25	3.32	.87		
10 or More	21	3.50	.71		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.53	.81	.89	.45
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.27	.83		
Suburban	59	3.66	.80		
Urban	22	3.70	.71		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.53	.81	3.67	.03*
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.13	.73		
401 - 600	32	3.29	.80		
601 - 800	27	3.20	.76		
801 - 1,000	27	3.89	.68		
>1,000	32	3.85	.79		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.53	.81	5.69	.00**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 30

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Supervision and School Location and Size

(I) School Location	(J) School Location	Difference	p
Rural	Suburban	-.39	.05
	Urban	-.43	.13
Suburban	Urban	-.03	.98
Urban	Rural	.21	.13
(I) Size	(J) Size	Difference	p
400 students or less	401-600	-.16	.98
	601-800	-.06	1.00
	801-1,000	-.76	.08
	> 1,000	-.73	.08
401-600	601-800	.09	1.00
	801-1,000	-.60	.07
	> 1,000	-.56	.07
601-800	801-1,000	-.67	.05*
	>1,000	-.66	.05*
801-1,000	> 1,000	.03	1.00

* p < .05

than 55 years of age ($\underline{M} = 4.28$, $\underline{SD} = .53$), principals with the educational specialist degree ($\underline{M} = 4.33$, $\underline{SD} = .45$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.97$, $\underline{SD} = .68$), principals located in rural schools ($\underline{M} = 3.94$, $\underline{SD} = .65$); and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students

(\underline{M} = 4.14, \underline{SD} = .54). All scores were between 3.94 and 4.33 indicating that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) and “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) with doing different things in their position.

The lowest scores for variety were observed for male principals (\underline{M} = 3.75, \underline{SD} = .68), principals 46-55 years of age (\underline{M} = 3.83, \underline{SD} = .67), principals with masters degrees (\underline{M} = 3.82, \underline{SD} = .67), principals with 7-9 years experience (\underline{M} = 3.82, \underline{SD} = .59), principals located at urban schools (\underline{M} = 3.70, \underline{SD} = .68), and principals from schools with 401-600 students (\underline{M} = 3.69, \underline{SD} = .69). All of the lowest scores were between 3.69 and 3.83 indicating that principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with doing different things.

Analysis of variance indicated no significant differences for variety and age, degree, experience, or school location. There were significant differences found between variety and the variables gender and school size; female principals were more satisfied with being able to do different things than were male principals and no groups in school size differed significantly (see Tables 31 and 32).

Working Conditions

Table 33 shows principals’ satisfaction with the working conditions of their schools by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size. The highest scores for this dimension were reported for female principals (\underline{M} = 3.58, \underline{SD} = 1.06), principals older than 55 years of age (\underline{M} = 4.04, \underline{SD} = 1.01), principals

Table 31
Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Variety

<u>Variable</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.75	.68		
Female	60	4.06	.61		
Total	127	3.90	.66	7.30	.008*
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	4.15	.57		
36 - 45	30	3.87	.66		
46 - 55	82	3.83	.67		
Older than 55	10	4.28	.53		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.66	1.62	.19
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.82	.67		
Ed. Specialist	8	4.33	.45		
Doctorate	26	3.98	.64		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.66	2.48	.09
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.91	.59		
4 - 6	29	3.85	.81		
7 - 9	25	3.82	.59		
10 or More	21	3.97	.68		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.66	.26	.86
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.94	.65		
Suburban	59	3.92	.65		
Urban	22	3.70	.68		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.66	1.13	.33
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.75	.61		
401 - 600	32	3.69	.69		
601 - 800	22	3.71	.70		
801 - 1,000	27	4.04	.65		
>1,000	32	4.14	.54		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.89	.66	2.92	.02*

* $p < .05$

Table 32

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Variety and School Size

(I) Size	(J) Size	Difference	p
400 students or less	401-600	.06	1.00
	601-800	.03	1.00
	801-1,000	-.30	.78
	>.1,000	-.39	.50
401-600	601-800	-.02	1.00
	801-1,000	-.35	.36
	> 1,000	-.45	.10
601-800	801-1,000	-.32	.54
	>1,000	-.42	.23
801-1,000	> 1,000	-.09	.99

with doctorate degrees ($\underline{M} = 3.74$, $\underline{SD} = .87$), principals with 10 or more years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.72$, $\underline{SD} = .85$), principals from suburban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.80$, $\underline{SD} = .89$), and principals from schools with greater than 1,000 students ($\underline{M} = 3.75$, $\underline{SD} = .82$). All scores were between 3.58 and 4.04 indicating that the principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) and “Very Satisfied” (4.00-4.99) with the working conditions of their schools.

Table 33

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimension: Working Conditions

Variable	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	67	3.56	.87		
Female	60	3.58	1.06		
Total	127	3.57	.96	.02	.89
<u>Age</u>					
Younger than 35	4	3.05	1.33		
36 - 45	30	3.73	1.08		
46 - 55	82	3.47	.88		
Older than 55	10	4.04	1.01		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.56	.95	1.83	.15
<u>Degree Status</u>					
Masters	92	3.53	.99		
Ed. Specialist	8	3.35	.75		
Doctorate	26	3.74	.87		
Total	126	3.56	.95	.70	.50
<u>Yrs. as Mid Sch. Prin.</u>					
1 - 3	51	3.46	1.06		
4 - 6	29	3.63	.93		
7 - 9	25	3.56	.86		
10 or More	21	3.72	.85		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.59	.95	.46	.73
<u>School Location</u>					
Rural	45	3.39	1.00		
Suburban	59	3.80	.89		
Urban	22	3.26	.89		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.56	.95	3.90	.02*
<u>School Size</u>					
400 students or less	13	3.30	1.06		
401 - 600	32	3.36	1.02		
601 - 800	22	3.67	1.05		
801 - 1,000	27	3.61	.88		
>1,000	32	3.75	.82		
Missing	1				
Total	127	3.56	.95	.98	.42

* p < .05

Table 34
Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Working Conditions and School Location

(I) School Location	(J) School Location	Difference	p
Rural	Suburban	-.42	.08
	Urban	.12	.88
Suburban	Urban	.54	.07

The lowest working condition scores were observed for male principals ($\underline{M} = 3.56$, $\underline{SD} = .87$), principals younger than 35 years of age ($\underline{M} = 3.05$, $\underline{SD} = 1.33$), principals with education specialist degrees ($\underline{M} = 3.35$, $\underline{SD} = .75$), principals with 1-3 years experience ($\underline{M} = 3.46$, $\underline{SD} = 1.06$), principals located at urban schools ($\underline{M} = 3.26$, $\underline{SD} = .89$), and principals from schools with 400 students or less ($\underline{M} = 3.30$, $\underline{SD} = 1.06$). All low scores were between 3.05 and 3.56 indicating that the responding principals were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with the working conditions of their schools.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to assess job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia. General satisfaction and satisfaction with twenty dimensions of the job were also assessed in relation to certain demographic variables. The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of the findings, the conclusions, and recommendations as they pertained to the purposes of the study. The first part of the chapter contains a discussion of the summary of the findings, the second part includes conclusions and observations, and the final part contains the recommendations.

Summary of Findings

Descriptive Findings: Levels of Satisfaction

There was one major question and three sub-questions that guided this study, and each question will be presented on the following pages followed by a summary of the findings for each question. The primary question was:

What was the General satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

According to the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the general satisfaction data resulted in a mean satisfaction score of 3.65 ($SD = .57$). This score indicated that middle school principals in Virginia were “Satisfied” (3.00-3.99) with their positions.

The first sub-question was:

What was the General Satisfaction level according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size?

Gender: male and female principals scored 3.56 (SD = .52) and 3.74 (SD = .61), respectively. In general, this indicated that both male and female principals were satisfied with their position as middle school principals; however, females were more satisfied than males. Similar conclusions were also reported by Fansher and Buxton (1984).

Age: data collected for this study showed that the mean score for all age groups were between 3.57 (SD = .57) and 3.91 (SD = .61) meaning that overall, all principals regardless of age were satisfied being a middle school principal. However, the youngest group obtained the highest mean, and then general satisfaction began to decline as principals reached the middle age groups. After age 55, satisfaction started to increase again, but not to the level of the youngest principals. These findings showed a U-shaped curvilinear association between age and satisfaction similar to those findings reported by Herzberg (1957). Contrary to the findings of other researchers (Wright & Hamilton, 1978; Fansher & Buxton, 1984; Finley, 1991; and Schonwetter, 1993) who found that the oldest worker were the most satisfied, in this study the younger principals were the most satisfied.

Degree Status: actually, all of the respondents in these categories scored between 3.61 (SD = .58) and 3.91 (SD = .38) indicating that principals, regardless of their level of education, were satisfied with their jobs. Although all were

satisfied, some were more satisfied than others. Those with educational specialist degrees obtained a higher mean than those with masters and doctoral degrees. Basically, satisfaction increased from the masters level to the education specialist level where it peaked and then dropped at the doctorate level, thus forming a U-shaped curvilinear association between degree status and satisfaction. These findings are contrary to findings reported in the existing small body of literature which report that the most highly educated employees were the most satisfied because they had secured desirable positions (Quinn, 1974). Because those with educational specialist degrees reported higher scores than those with doctorates, a possible explanation is that those with doctorates are aspiring for higher positions in education.

Experience: the respondents' mean scores according to their years of experience were between 3.46 ($SD = .47$) and 3.69 ($SD = .58$) indicating that regardless of experience, these principals were satisfied with their positions. It is important to note that satisfaction declined after 4-6 years experience and then increased after 10 or more years of experience. These findings were congruent with those reported by Cytrynbaum and Crites (1988), whose explanation for the drop related to the presence of barriers encountered on the job. Moreover, their explanation for the resurgence of satisfaction was based upon the confidence and success that were achieved over the course of the subjects careers.

School Location: principals in rural, suburban, and urban schools scored between 3.53 ($SD = .54$) and 3.63 ($SD = .52$) indicating that principals located in these areas of Virginia were satisfied with their jobs. Suburban principals,

however, appeared to be more satisfied than urban and rural principals, and rural principals appeared to be the least satisfied. Finley (1991) reached the same conclusion about secondary principals in Tennessee where rural principals tended to be the least satisfied group.

School Size: principals in these categories obtained means between 3.32 ($SD = .38$) and 3.82 ($SD = .49$) meaning that principals located in the various school sizes were satisfied with their positions. The results showed that satisfaction increased significantly with school size - - the larger the school, the greater the satisfaction level. Therefore, a positive linear association occurred between school size and satisfaction. Similar results were reached by Finley (1991) and Sparkes and McIntire (1987).

The second sub-question was:

What was the satisfaction level for the 20 dimensions of the job measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

The mean scores for the 20 dimensions were ranked from the highest to the lowest and the hierarchy showed that middle school principals in Virginia were very satisfied to be able to be of service to others, to keep busy most of the time, and being able to do things that did not go against their conscience. At the very bottom of the hierarchy was compensation; principals were less than satisfied with the amount of pay they got for the amount of work they did. For the remaining 16 dimensions, principals were satisfied.

The third sub-question was:

What was the satisfaction level for each of the 20 dimensions according to the demographic variables gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school size?

Gender: as far as gender was concerned, women had high satisfaction (4.00 to 4.99) for 7 of the dimensions, and men had high satisfaction for 1 of the dimensions. Women felt that Ability Utilization, Activity, Achievement, Creativity, Moral Values, and Variety contributed to a high feeling of satisfaction. Furthermore, both men and women stated that Social Service created a sense of high satisfaction. Additionally, both men and women felt that Compensation contributed to a low level of satisfaction (2.00 to 2.99).

Age: principals in the various age categories were satisfied (3.00-3.99) with some of the dimensions and there were also dimensions where the principals expressed either a high level of satisfaction (4.00 to 4.99) or a low level of satisfaction (2.00 to 2.99). Middle school principals in the oldest age group expressed a high level of satisfaction for Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Creativity, Supervision (Human Relations), Moral Values, Responsibility, Security, Social Service, Variety, and Working Conditions. Likewise, the youngest principals indicated a high level of satisfaction with the same dimensions as the oldest principals; the one exception was Security. On the other hand, middle age principals did not express a high level of satisfaction for as many of the dimensions as did the youngest and oldest principals. Age group 36-45 expressed a high level of satisfaction for Activity, Creativity, and Social Service; and principals in age group 46-55 expressed a high level of satisfaction for Social Service. Regardless

of age, Social Service was the only dimension where all middle school principals in Virginia expressed a high level of satisfaction.

The dimension that the principals felt contributed least to their satisfaction , regardless of age, was Compensation. The oldest principals also felt that Advancement contributed to a lower level of satisfaction.

Degree: for the most part, middle school principals in the three degree categories felt satisfied with most dimensions of the job; however, they expressed either a high level of satisfaction (4.00 to 4.99) or low level of satisfaction (2.00 to 2.99) for several of the dimensions. Principals with doctoral degrees and those with educational specialist degrees expressed a high level of satisfaction for Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Creativity, Co-worker, Moral Value, Responsibility, Social Service, and Variety. Principals with doctoral degrees expressed a high level of satisfaction for Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Moral Value, and Social Service; and, the masters principals felt a high level of satisfaction for Activity, Moral Value, and Social Service. Activity, Moral Value, and Social Service were three dimensions that middle school principals, regardless of degree status, felt a high level of satisfaction.

Principals with masters and education specialist degrees felt that Compensation contributed to a lower degree of satisfaction as a middle school principal in Virginia.

Experience: those who had been middle school principals for various numbers of years felt that they were satisfied with most of the dimensions; however, there were areas where they also felt either a high level of satisfaction

(4.00 to 4.99) or a low level of satisfaction (2.00 to 2.99). Principals who had been middle school principals for 4-6 years felt a high level of satisfaction for Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Creativity, Moral Value, Responsibility, and Social Service. Likewise, principals with 10 or more years experience expressed high satisfaction for the same dimensions as those stated above, the only exception was Responsibility. Principals with 1-3 years experience expressed a high level of satisfaction only for Activity and Social Service. On the contrary, principals with 7-9 years experience did not find any of the dimensions to be of high satisfaction.

Regardless of the number of years as middle school principal, all respondents felt that compensation contributed to a low level of satisfaction.

School Location: Principals in this study were located in rural, suburban, and urban schools in Virginia. These principals felt satisfied with the majority of the dimensions measured on the MSQ. However, suburban principals expressed a high level of satisfaction for Achievement, Activity, Moral Value, and Social Service. Urban principals were more than satisfied with Creativity, Moral Value, and Social Service; and, rural principals were more than satisfied about Activity and Social Service. Social Service was the only dimension on which middle school principals in all areas of Virginia expressed a high level of satisfaction.

Rural and urban principals felt less than satisfied (2.00-2.99) about Compensation while suburban principals were satisfied (3.00-3.99) with their Compensation.

School Size: although middle school principals in various school sizes were also satisfied with many of the dimensions measured by the MSQ, there were several dimensions for which they had high satisfaction (4.00 to 4.99) or low satisfaction (2.00 to 2.99). Data indicated that principals from schools with 801 to greater than 1,000 students expressed a high level of satisfaction for Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Creativity, Moral Values, Responsibility, Social Service, and Variety. Principals from schools with 401-800 students felt a high level of satisfaction for Moral Values and Social Service. Principals from the smallest schools, 400 students or less, did not express a high level of satisfaction for any of the dimensions.

Principals from the smallest schools expressed low satisfaction (2.00-2.99) for Advancement, Compensation, Independence, and Recognition. Principals from schools with 400 to 800 students had low satisfaction for Compensation. Advancement was an area of low satisfaction for principals from schools with 601-800 students.

Overall: satisfaction with Social Service ranked the highest among middle school principals in Virginia. Social Service was also ranked high by middle school principals in Indiana (Lehman, 1991).

Compensation, for the most part, contributed to low satisfaction (2.00-2.99) for middle school principals in Virginia. Comparatively, middle school principals in California identified pay as contributing to low satisfaction (Rasmussen, 1991), and middle school principals in Connecticut's small schools cited pay as least satisfying (Lehman, 1991). Contrary to these findings, middle

school principals in Connecticut identified Compensation as a contributor to their satisfaction (Ashton, 1989). Nevertheless, a small body of research concurs that principals say that they need greater compensated for the responsibilities associated with their jobs.

Statistical Findings: Comparisons Among Groups

1. Generally, principals from larger schools exhibited higher overall satisfaction than principals from smaller schools.
2. Principals with education specialist degrees appeared to be significantly more satisfied with their achievement than principals with masters degrees.
3. Female principals were significantly more satisfied with keeping busy all the time than males.
4. Both younger and older principals were significantly more satisfied with keeping busy than middle aged principals.
5. Principals from larger schools were significantly more satisfied with opportunities for advancement than principals from small schools.
6. Suburban principals were significantly more satisfied with the amount of pay they received than principals from rural and urban schools.
7. Principals from large schools were significantly more satisfied with the way their supervisors supervised others than principals from small schools.

8. Principals from large schools were significantly more satisfied with the security their position provided than principals from small schools.
9. Principals from suburban schools were more satisfied with the competence of their supervisor to make decisions than principals from rural schools.
10. Principals from large schools were more satisfied with the competence of their supervisor to make decisions than principals from small schools.
11. Female principals were significantly more satisfied to do a variety of things on the job than male principals.
12. Suburban principals were more satisfied about the working conditions of their schools than principals from rural schools.

Conclusions

The primary purpose for this study was to assess the job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Considering this purpose, the findings revealed that overall, middle school principals were satisfied with their positions. The mean satisfaction score of 3.65 on a scale of 1.00 (not satisfied) to 5.00 (extremely satisfied) was the finding that supports this conclusion. In fact, this conclusion was not surprising, since the same conclusions were reached for middle school principals in Connecticut (Ashton, 1989), Indiana (Lehman, 1991), and California (Rusmussen, 1990).

Discussion

The questionnaire was mailed to 188 middle school principals across the state, and 132 responded; giving the study a response rate of just over 70 percent. This rate was fairly high in light of the fact that the number of responses was obtained without the added effort of (1) sending a pre-questionnaire letter, (2) a third mailing, nor (3) making any personal or telephone contacts. The willingness of the principals to participate was perhaps either indicative of their interest and enthusiasm for discerning their thoughts about their positions, or due to their desire to assist a fellow colleague. Whichever the reason, the responses from the principals revealed interesting findings concerning the job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia.

Overall, the responses indicated that the respondents in this study were satisfied with their positions. They also indicated that being of service to others was the highest contributor to their satisfaction. One can speculate that the reason for such high social service satisfaction was mainly because the school is considered a social system made up of students, teachers, support staff, paraprofessionals, specialists, volunteers, and administrators. The principal, who is the leader of this system, is constantly interacting with groups and individuals advising, recommending, praising, and encouraging others toward the attainment of school goals. Obviously, principals in this study deliver services to other people that create opportunities for others to derive satisfaction from the work that they perform. In return, principals derive satisfaction because they have created a sense of satisfaction for others.

On the other hand, overall satisfaction with compensation contributed least to the satisfaction of these principals. The reason for the low satisfaction was not explored in this study; however, principals may feel that their compensation is low compared to that of teachers. Virginia has a very active teacher association that has been a strong advocate for increased teacher salaries over the past decade. The attention given to teacher salaries has probably prompted school divisions across the state to raise salaries for teachers at a moderate rate while, perhaps, principal salaries continue to increase at a slower rate. The rate of increase has, maybe, caused the difference between teacher salaries and principal salaries to be a narrow one. Considering the responsibilities of the teacher and their pay versus the responsibilities of the principals and their pay, the small salary difference between the two may be creating some concern among principals to the extent that satisfaction is affected.

Findings in this study showed that principals in suburban schools were more satisfied with their compensation than principals at urban and rural schools. Suburban principals are probably more satisfied with compensation because their pay may be higher than principal pay in urban and rural schools. The socioeconomic status of the suburban community is higher than the other communities and results in more affluent school boards that are aware of the special training required or the contributions that principals make to the total educational program. Affluent board members in suburban localities may push for higher salaries for administrators because their own incomes may be within the same range as that of the principal; for board members tend to establish salaries

based on their own degree of affluence. Consequently, the inequity that exists in principal salaries from one locality to another has some effect on principal satisfaction.

In addition to compensation, supervision and working conditions also contributed to high satisfaction of suburban principals. The reasons for these findings may also be related to the socioeconomic status of the community. Suburban communities that are able and willing to pay for quality education usually attract and hire competent principals. Not only do they hire qualified principals, but they also provide modern facilities where students can be educated in environments that are comparable to the homes in which they live.

Findings pertaining to school size indicated that principals from large schools were highly satisfied with advancement, supervision, and security. The reasons for such high satisfactions are unclear, for they were not investigated in this study. However, it is not surprising that principals from large schools were more satisfied with advancement than principals from small schools. This is because principals from large schools are probably from large school districts where there are several layers in the hierarchy which provide for more advancement opportunities.

Principals from large schools also cite supervision (human relations and technical) as sources of satisfaction. The respondents think that their supervisors make competent decisions, and that their supervisors also supervise others appropriately. Proceeding on the assumption that large schools are located in large districts, it may be that supervisors of large schools have only supervisory

responsibilities. Because of this, they may be able to do the job more effectively; whereas, supervisors in small schools may “wear several hats”, and the supervisory responsibilities may be one shared among others.

Security was another area where principals from large schools felt a strong sense of satisfaction. It could be that respondents from large schools have administrators and school boards that have arranged for protection of principals from threats that could affect their productivity. Their administrators probably have developed and communicated sound contract terms, grievance procedures, dismissal procedures, and other policies that clearly delineate expectations for all. With these policies and procedures in place, principals may feel protected from arbitrary treatment to the extent that they are highly satisfied with the job security that their school system provides.

A final area of discussion is gender. Findings in this study concluded that females like to be busy doing a variety of different tasks, more so than males. The reason for the difference was unclear for it was not investigated in this study; however, one possibility is that female principal behavior may be associated with female teacher behavior. Most gender literature that say women stay in the classroom much longer than men before taking a principalship. If this is so, then women would have had a much longer period of time to operate at the unrelenting pace of a classroom teacher. Female principals are, therefore, more likely to exhibit the work behavior of a teacher. Another possibility for high activity and variety among female principals is that females generally prefer to be directly involved in all aspects of the school; therefore, they may delegate less than males.

It was also interesting to note that females scored higher (although not significantly higher) than males on 18 of the 20 job dimensions measured on the MSQ. This may indicate that females were more satisfied than males because many females may consider this position to be the highest step in their career ladder.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. A study of principal job satisfaction and student performance of Virginia schools should be conducted by the year 2003, after the implementation of the new standards for accrediting schools in Virginia. The new standards were designed to make principals more accountable for student performance. By 2003, schools where student performance meets state requirements will be accredited, and schools where students do not meet the requirements will not be accredited. The findings from such a study would compare principal satisfaction at accredited and unaccredited schools to determine the impact of the new standards on principal satisfaction.
2. A comparative study of elementary, middle, and secondary principal job satisfaction should be conducted to determine if one group is more or less satisfied than the other.
3. Studies on satisfaction and school size should be conducted to investigate the reason why principals at large schools are more satisfied with Advancement, Supervision, and job Security than principals at small schools.

4. A study of principal job satisfaction should be done using either the interview technique or an open-ended survey instrument. This method would allow respondents the opportunity to express ideas that maybe more closely related to the day-to-day tasks of the principal.

Recommendations for Practitioners

The following recommendations are based on the results of this study. It is hoped that state and local policy makers, superintendents, and school administrators will use these recommendations to initiate actions that will enhance the satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia. These recommendations are also useful for educators who provide principal training programs.

1. On the basis of the responses to the MSQ, it appears that middle school principals in Virginia are satisfied with their positions. State policy makers, school boards, and superintendents should put forth effort to either maintain this level of satisfaction or increase it to a higher level in order to promote positive perceptions for this important position. This can be done by increasing satisfaction for Recognition, Advancement, Independence, and Compensation in the following manners:
 - a) Satisfaction level for Recognition can be improved by recognizing principals when they successfully attain a school goal. Recognition can include public statements and awards, as well as private statements of praise and congratulations.

- b) The satisfaction level for Advancement can be improved by encouraging qualified principals to apply for principal positions in affluent and large schools.
- c) Independence or the opportunity to work alone, ranked next to the last dimension on the hierarchy. Usually, principals work extended hours in order to be alone to complete certain tasks. It is therefore recommended that training on time management be provided so that principals will be able to handle the workload within the regular school hours.
- d) Compensation ranked the lowest in the hierarchy for respondents in this study. School boards need to be sure that principal salaries are competitive across the state. Also, increasing pay needs to be considered in order to attract a qualified pool of applicants to replace principals who will be retiring in the next 10 years. According to the ages of respondents in this study, 72 percent of the principals are between the ages 46 and over 55; which means that quite a few principals will be retiring soon. A recent national study indicated that there is a shortage of qualified principal applicants due to dissatisfaction with principal compensation. Therefore, if compensation is not increased, superintendents and school boards will have difficulty replacing these principals who are approaching retirement.

2. For principals in this study, the greatest source of job satisfaction comes from the Social Service aspect of their jobs. Social service refers to being able to do things for others. Principals should be encouraged and commended for their leadership abilities in assisting others toward the attainment of school goals. The practices of these principals should be incorporated in principal training programs.
3. Activity and Moral Values were two aspects of the job that contributed to high satisfaction of the respondents in this study. It is encouraging for aspiring principals to know that principals find satisfaction in doing the many tasks associated with their jobs, and that these tasks and responsibilities do not conflict with their religious beliefs.

Bibliography

- Adcock, P. (1992). A comprehensive study concerning the job satisfaction of Arkansas school superintendents. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas.
- Bakan, D. (1966). the duality of human existence: An essay on psychology and religion. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Barker, B. O. (1986) The advantages of small schools. (Report No. RC 015-607). Las Cruces, NM. Eric Clearing House of Rural Education and Small Schools. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265-988).
- Barrett, G. V. (1972). Research models of the future for industrial and organizational psychology. Personnel Psychology, 25, 1-17.
- Bedeimx, A. G.; Ferris, G. R.; & Kacmar, M. K. (1992). Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 40, 33-48.
- Betz, E.; Weiss, D.; Dawis, R.; England, G.; & Lofquist, L. (1968). Seven years of research on work adjustment. Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Bogotch, I. E. & Riedlinger, B. (1991). Differences between new and experienced principals within an urban school system. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, KY. Nov. 13-15, 1991.
- Borg, W. R. & Crag, M. (1983). Educational Research. New Jersey, Longman, Inc.
- Bourne, B. (1982). Effects of aging on work satisfaction, performance, and motivation. Aging and Work, 5, 37-47.
- Cytrynbaum, S. & J. O. Crites (1988) "The utility of adult development theory in understanding career adjustment process" in M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hope, & B. S. Lawrence. Handbook of Career Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 66-88.
- Dawis, R.; Lofquist, L.; & W., David (1968). A theory of work adjustment. Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

- Derlin, R. & Schneider, G. T. (1994) Understanding job satisfaction principals and teachers, urban and suburban. Urban Education. vol. 29, No. 1, 63-88
- Dinham, S. & Scott, C. (1996). Teacher satisfaction, motivation, and health: Phase one of the Teacher 2000 Project. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, New York, NY.
- Dupree, M. B. (1989). Job satisfiers and dissatisfiers as perceived by public school elementary principals in South Carolina. Doctoral Dissertation, South Carolina State University, Orangeburg, SC.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987) Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fansher, T. A. & Buxton, T. H. (1984) A job satisfaction profile of the female secondary school principal in the United States. NASSP Bulletin.
- Finley, W. H. (1991). High school principal job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Freeman, Dallas M. (1990) Job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers as perceived by public elementary school principals in North Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, SC.
- Funderburg, D. L. & Kapes, J. T. (1997) Work values and job satisfaction of Arkansas business educators in secondary systems and community/technical colleges. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX).
- Gains, Judith S. (1984). The relationship between perceived sex role description and job satisfaction of female administrators in the field of education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Gordon, M. E. & Johnson, W. A. (1982) Seniority: A review of its legal and scientific standing. Personnel Psychology. 35, 255-280.
- Gruenberg, E. (1979). Understanding job satisfaction. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hall, S. E. (1977). The satisfiers and dissatisfiers of catholic elementary school principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Patterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). Job attitude: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper
- Hulin, C. L. (1964). Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48 88-92.
- Kacmar, Michele K. & Ferris Gerald R. (1989). Theoretical and methodological considerations in the age-job satisfaction relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology. vol. 74, no. 2, 201-207.
- Kalleberg, A. L. & Loscocco, K. A. (1983) Aging, values, and rewards: Explaining age differences in job satisfaction. American Sociological Review vol. 48, 78-90.
- Kirk, D. (1990). Job satisfaction among elementary school counselors in Virginia. Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Lawler, E. E. (1973). Motivation in Work Organizations. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Lawrence, M. H. (1979). The satisfaction and dissatisfaction of elementary school supervisors. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- Lehman, L. E. (1991). School size as a correlate of job satisfaction among middle level principals in Indiana. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, Terre haute, Indiana.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human performance , 1969, 4, 309-336.
- Lofquist, L. & Dawis, R. (1969). Adjustment to work. New York, Meredith Cooperation.
- Lofquist, L. & Dawis, R. (1991). Essentials of person environment correspondence counseling. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

- Long, F. A. (1989). Connecticut middle school principals job satisfaction with respect to selected motivators and hygienes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Manning, R. C. (1976). Sati,fiers and dissatisfiers of Virginia superintendent of schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- Marr, B. D. (1992). A survey of job satisfaction for administrative women in Michigan education today. Unpublished master's thesis, Central Michigan University
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, 50, 370-396.
- Mason, S. E. (1994) Gender differences in job satisfaction. The Journal of Social Psychology, 135 (2), 143-151.
- Metcalfe, E. L. (1992). Job satisfaction of the elementary and middle school principal. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.
- O’Conner, E. J. & Peters, L. H. (1978). The measurement of job satisfaction: Current practices and future considerations. Journal of Management , 4, 17-26.
- Penn, Clarence P. (1985). Satisfiers and dissatisfiers of selected black school administrators in Virginia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- Pinder, C. (1984). Work Motivation. Dallas: Scott Foresman and Company.
- Poole, B. W. (1993). A study of the relationship between gender and job satisfaction/ dissatisfaction, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco.
- Profit, A. C. (1991). The relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction of Appalachian principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

- Quinn, R. P. , Graham, L. S., & M. R. McCullough (1974). Job satisfaction: Is there a trend? Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor.
- Rasmussen, A. G. (1991). The Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory as it applies to middle school principals. University of LaVerne DAI - A 51/10, p. 3294.
- Robbins, S. P. (1988). Essentials of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ. Prince Hall.
- Saleh, Shoukry D. (1964). A study of attitude change in the retirement period. Journal of Applied Psychology. 48 310-12.
- Saleh, Shoukry D & Jay L. Otis (1964). Age and level of job satisfaction. Personnal Psychology. 17 (winter) 425-30.
- Scarpello, V. & Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job Satisfaction: Are all the parts there? Personnel Psychology. 36, 577-600.
- Schonwetter, D. J. 91993) Women academic and career administrators' role perceptions and occupational satisfaction: Implications for appointment and professional development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 16, 1993).
- Schultz, D. P. (1982). Psychology and industry today. New York: Macmillan
- Sergiovanna, T. (1966). Investigation of factors which affect job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.
- Smith, J. J. (1976). Job satisfaction of Connecticut public senior high school principals as related to school location and school size. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37/09A, 5517. (University Microfilms No. AAC7704297).
- Smith, P., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.
- Sparkes, R. L. & McIntire, W. G. (1987). Community and school size as factors in the job satisfaction of principals in Newfoundland and [,abradore. Journal of Rural and Small Schools. 2,3, 11-15.

- Sutter, M. (1996). What do we know about the job and career satisfaction of secondary school assistant principals? NASSP Bulletin, vol.80 n579 p 108-11.
- Vaughan-Wiles, G. (1987). The perceived satisfiers and dissatisfiers of women in educational administration in the Department of Defense Dependent Schools in Germany. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Villines, V. F. (1987) The relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction of elementary school principals. Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Wanous, J. P. & Lawler, E. E. (1972). Measurement of meaning of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 59, 95-105.
- Ward, C. S. (1977). Satisfiers and dissatisfiers of Virginia elementary principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- Watson, G.A. (1991). Job satisfaction of secondary- principals. Doctoral Dissertation, University of LaVerne, LaVerne, CA.
- Weiss, D.; Dawis, R.; Lofquist, L., & England, G. (1966). Instrumentation for the theory of work adjustment. Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Weiss, D.; Dawis, R.; England, G.; Lofquist, L. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

APPENDIX A

INDIVIDUAL DATA SHEET

INDIVIDUAL DATA SHEET

Directions: Please circle the appropriate letter to indicate your answer for each question.

1. What is your age?
 - a. **YOUNGER THAN 35**
 - b. **36 - 45**
 - c. **46 - 55**
 - d. **OLDER THAN 55**

2. What is your sex?
 - a. **MALE**
 - b. **FEMALE**

3. What is your current degree status?
 - a. **BACHELOR**
 - b. **MASTERS**
 - c. **EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST**
 - d. **DOCTORATE**

4. How Many years have you been a Middle school principal?
 - a. **1 - 3**
 - b. **4 - 6**
 - c. **7 - 9**
 - d. **10 OR MORE**

5. The area in which your school is located is best described as:
 - a. **RURAL**
 - b. **SUBURBAN**
 - c. **URBAN**

6. What is the size of your school?
 - a. **400 STUDENTS OR LESS**
 - b. **401 - 600 STUDENTS**
 - c. **601 - 800 STUDENTS**
 - d. **801 - 1,000 STUDENTS**
 - e. **GREATER THAN 1,000 STUDENTS**

APPENDIX B

Range of Scores for MSQ Scale

Tables B5 - B25

Table 5B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Ability Utilization

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	1	.8
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	10	7.8
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	39	30.7
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	55	43.30
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	22	17.3
Total	127	100.0

Table 6B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Achievement

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	8	6.3
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	40	31.5
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	65	51.18
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	14	11.0
Total	127	100.0

Table 7B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Activity

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	6	4.7
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	43	33.8
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	53	41.73
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	25	19.7
Total	127	100.0

Table 8B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Advancement

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	4	3.1
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	29	22.8
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	69	54.3
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	17	13.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	8	6.3
Total	127	100.0

Table 9B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Authority

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	16	12.6
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	72	56.7
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	33	26.0
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	6	4.7
Total	127	100.0

Table 10B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Compensation

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	20	15.74
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	39	30.7
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	53	41.7
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	13	10.2
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	2	1.6
Total	127	100.0

Table 11B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Coworker

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	2	1.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	21	16.5
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	49	38.6
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	45	35.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	10	7.9
Total	127	100.0

Table 12B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Creativity

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	.0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	11	8.7
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	44	34.6
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	59	46.5
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	13	10.2
Total	127	100.0

Table 13B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Supervision (Human Relations)

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	2	1.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	27	21.3
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	36	28.3
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	45	35.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	17	13.4
Total	127	100.0

Table 14B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Independence

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	8	6.3
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	21	16.5
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	67	52.8
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	24	18.9
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	3	2.4
Missing	4	3.1
Total	127	100.0

Table 15B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Moral Values

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	4	3.1
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	47	37.0
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	59	46.6
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	17	13.4
Total	127	100.0

Table 16B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: School Policies

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	3	2.4
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	29	22.8
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	60	47.2
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	28	22.0
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	7	5.5
Total	127	100.0

Table 17B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Recognition

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	7	5.5
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	25	19.7
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	58	45.7
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	31	24.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	6	4.7
Total	127	100.0

Table 18B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Responsibility

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	13	10.2
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	44	36.6
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	59	46.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	11	8.7
Total	127	100.0

Table 19B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Security

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	4	3.1
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	16	12.6
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	59	46.4
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	39	30.7
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	9	7.1
Total	127	100.0

Table 20B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Social Service

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	1	.8
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	40	31.5
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	51	40.1
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	35	27.6
Total	127	100.0

Table 21B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Social Status

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	5	3.9
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	17	13.4
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	70	55.1
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	28	22.0
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	7	5.5
Total	127	100.0

Table 22B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Supervision Technical

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	2	1.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	27	21.3
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	50	39.4
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	39	30.7
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	9	7.1
Total	127	100.0

Table 23B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Variety

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	5	3.9
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	60	47.2
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	53	41.7
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	9	7.1
Total	127	100.0

Table 24B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Working Conditions

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	4	3.1
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	21	16.5
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	47	37.0
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	40	31.5
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	15	11.8
Total	127	100.0

Table 25B

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: General Satisfaction

Scale	<u>f</u>	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 - 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 - 2.99)	21	16.5
Satisfied (3.00 - 3.99)	70	55.1
Very Satisfied (4.00 - 4.99)	35	27.6
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	1	.8
Total	127	100.0

VITA

JoeAnn Erquhart Newby was born in Surry County, Virginia and attended the Surry County Public Schools. In 1972, she received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Elementary Education from Saint Paul's College, Lawrenceville, Virginia. From 1985 until 1988, she matriculated to Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia where she earned the Master of Science Degree in Educational Administration. She later received a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies in Educational Administration from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia.

She was employed as a teacher in the Surry County Public Schools from 1972 until she was promoted to assistant principal of Surry Elementary in 1989. Since 1992, she has been employed as the principal of Surry Elementary School.

She is a member of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals, the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, and past member of the National Association of Female Executives. In the community, she served as past secretary for the American Cancer Society, past trustee for the Wakefield Foundation for the Arts, past president of Bacon's Castle Woman's Club, and a member and past clerk of Cypress Baptist Church.