JOB SATISFACTION OF PUBLIC MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA:

REVISITED

Daniel L. Bowling

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 Leadership & Policy Studies

Dr. Travis Twiford, Chair
Dr. Rosalie Martin
Dr. JoeAnn E. Newby
Dr. John Schreck

January 19, 2007

Blacksburg, Virginia

Key Words: Job Satisfaction, Middle School Principals

JOB SATISFACTION OF PUBLIC MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA: REVISITED

by

Daniel L. Bowling

Chair: Dr. Travis Twiford
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to assess the satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and compare it to the earlier 1999 findings of Dr. JoeAnn Newby. The Long-Form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to determine the levels of job satisfaction for middle school principals in Virginia using twenty dimensions of the job and the following demographic variables: gender, age, experience, education, school location, school population, accreditation status, and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Specifically, this study sought to answer the following 5 questions: (1) What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in the state of Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)? (2) Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population what is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia? (3) What is the satisfaction level of each of the twenty dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)? (4) Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population, what is the satisfaction level of middle school principals for each of the twenty dimensions of

the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)? (5) Based on the demographic variables of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) have the Virginia Standards of Learning and No Child Left Behind legislation influenced the general job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia?

The 2006 Virginia Educational Directory was utilized to select the target population of 334 middle school principals. A mailing consisting of an Individual Information Sheet and the 1967 Long Form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was mailed to each principal. Demographic data pertaining to gender, age, degree, experience, school location, school population, accreditation status, and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) was collected and compared with the twenty dimensions of the MSQ. Statistical procedures including frequency charts, ANOVAs, and post hoc tests (Scheffe) were utilized to determine the statistical significance of the findings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Psychologists interested in work organizations have undertaken the majority of the research that has been conducted on job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). The hallmark of this research dates back over seventy-five years to the 1930s when the term "job satisfaction" was coined by vocational psychologists. Since that time, the term job satisfaction has been used to describe a person's attitude or orientation toward a job (Lawler, 1994). In addition, during this period, several notable researchers helped to move the field of job satisfaction research forward. Hoppock (1935) published a document entitled *Job Satisfaction* and Roethlisberger and Dickerson (1939) published the results of their Western Electric studies (Hawthorne Experiments). Although these studies ultimately failed to demonstrate a relationship between job satisfaction and performance, they do help to stress the importance of studying workers' feelings, attitudes, and beliefs (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). Specially, this attention to workers helped to improve productivity and gave rise to Human Resource Theory (Shafritz et al, 2005).

Over the proceeding decades, thousands of articles have been written about various aspects of job satisfaction (Spector, 1985). Much of this research is prized by vocational psychologists for both its humanistic and financial value to organizations. Lawler (1994) suggested that there is also a very practical reason for organizations to be concerned with job satisfaction. According to Lawler, satisfaction is related to absenteeism and turnover. Both are very costly and impact on an organizations' effectiveness. Lawler further stated that if organizations can identify what factors are

causing these undesirable traits, only then can they change job satisfaction and improve the organization's productivity (Lawler, 1994). Hackman and Oldham (1975) concluded that people are motivated by the intrinsic value that they find in doing job tasks. When people find their work to be enjoyable and meaningful, workers will report liking their jobs and will be motivated to perform their jobs well. Conversely, dissatisfaction can lead to counterproductive behavior on the part of the worker. These counterproductive behaviors can manifest themselves in the forms of absenteeism, turnover, burnout, aggressive behavior, sabotage, and theft (Spector, 1997). In addition, job dissatisfaction can impact overall life satisfaction and affect the emotional well being of the employee (Jex & Gudanowski, 1992).

Schools have been under increasing pressure from state and federal governments to show improvement in student learning. Federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation and state education laws requiring high stakes testing have put schools under the microscope. Federal and state governments are applying pressure to local school systems to improve students' test performance in an attempt to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Due to this wave of accountability, the role of the school principal has been forced to undergo substantial change. According to Pierson and Rodrick (1991), the school principal was once seen as a mere paper pusher and building level manager, one who simply helped facilitate the daily operation of the school. This type of principal, like the dinosaur, has come and gone. In an effort to improve the performance of schools, the responsibilities of the principal have expanded to include school finance, special education, curriculum development, instructional leadership, moral and character education, student discipline, supervision of extracurricular activities and athletic events,

as well as numerous other areas that occur in the daily operation of a school (Goodwin, Cunningham, & Childress, 2003). The increased responsibilities and pressure to perform have transformed an already difficult job into an enormous challenge.

School principals are under constant stress that manifests itself emotionally, cognitively, and physically (Whan & Thomas, 1996). The challenges brought on by the NCLB legislation and its high stakes testing components have had a direct impact on the amount of stress that has been added to the job of principals (Whitaker, 2000). As a result of high stress, extensive time commitments, lack of parent and community support, low salaries, negative view of media, and a general lack of respect, principal vacancies are becoming more common and are difficult to fill with qualified candidates (Kennedy, 2000). The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) reported a 50 percent turnover in principals across the United States through the year 2005 and estimates that another 40 percent will turn over by the year 2010 (Kurtz, 2000).

Educational Research Service (1999) conducted a study for the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), which indicated that half of the school districts surveyed reported a shortage of qualified applicants for principal vacancies. The study indicated that the shortage of qualified candidates occurred in rural, urban, and suburban school districts and among elementary, middle, and high school levels. Whitaker (2000) interviewed superintendents across the United States in an attempt to identify reasons why educators were not entering into the role of principal. The position's time commitment, high stakes testing, school report cards, increased violence, lack of respect

for public educators, job insecurity, and overall job pressure were mentioned as just some of the factors influencing an individual's decision to enter the field.

Job satisfaction has also been identified to have implications for organizations specifically in the areas of job retention and selection (Young, 1984). School divisions are organizations; as such they must be concerned with the job satisfaction of their employees, including the school principal. When principals find themselves dissatisfied with their positions, it can impact job performance and seep into their personal lives. Young (1984) reported that job satisfaction is related to both the quantity and quality of life experienced by a person. Job dissatisfaction has also been linked to both mental and physical health problems (Kornhauser, 1965; Palmore, 1969). Faced with a potential shortage of qualified principal candidates and retention of those qualified principals, school systems must closely examine the role of the principal. Serious attention must be given to what particular facets of the job principals find both satisfying and dissatisfying. This knowledge could help the leaders of school districts make specific changes influencing the level of job satisfaction and the quality of life for principals. Lawler (1994) stated it best, "one measure of the quality of life is job satisfaction (p. 62)."

Statement of the Problem

Since Newby (1999) conducted her study on the job satisfaction of public middle school principals in Virginia, much has changed surrounding the job. Few would argue that in June 1995, when Virginia instituted the Standards of Learning and its mandatory testing component, that the level of stress and responsibilities increased significantly for principals across the state. Shortly thereafter, the federal government raised the accountability bar by enacting the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The

NCLB legislation increased the stakes to perform by requiring schools to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets and tying a school's accreditation status to students' test performance. Given the advent of school accountability, high stakes testing, and a myriad of societal changes in the past seven years, the role of the principal has changed and perhaps, so has his/her level of job satisfaction.

This replicated study investigated three aspects of job satisfaction for middle school principals in Virginia: (a) the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), (b) the principals' responses on the twenty dimensions of the MSQ which was used individually to determine job satisfaction and, (c) the influence of the variables of gender, age, education, experience, school location, school population, accreditation status, and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on the general satisfaction of middle school principals as indicated by their satisfaction on the twenty dimensions of the job. All findings were compared with the results of the Newby (1999) study that assessed changes in the levels of satisfaction.

Significance of the Study

There is no shortage of job satisfaction research. Spector (1997) stated that literally thousands of job satisfaction studies could be located in the journals of organizational behavior and related fields. However, little of this research relates to education or educational staff, especially school principals. The field of job satisfaction research is particularly lacking when it comes to studies of middle school principals. After an extensive literature review, only one study by Newby (1999) was located that assessed the levels of job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia. Nearly a

decade has passed, since Newby (1999) gathered her data and analyzed the findings. In that time, society has changed and demands on schools have increased. New terms such as high stakes testing, school report cards, Standards of Learning (SOL), No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) have forced schools to make sweeping changes in the way they conduct business. These changes have forced the principal into the public spot-light and significantly increased the responsibilities and accompanying pressures placed on the position.

This study of job satisfaction of public middle school principals in Virginia provided data to help assess the impact of these changes on the job satisfaction levels of Virginia's current middle school principals. The findings from this study supported the earlier data on the satisfaction level of middle school principals found in Newby's study. In addition, results from the current study were used to identify which demographic variables are satisfiers or dissatisfiers for principals and which can be used to increase principal recruitment and retention. Results from the study may be useful to principals, state and local boards of education, local and state policy makers, superintendents, human resource personnel, and professional organizations. Graduate administrative training programs could use the findings to help prepare future candidates for all aspects of the position. Given the current level of knowledge regarding the satisfaction levels of middle school principals in Virginia, a replicated updated study of Newby's (1999) work would contributes to this field of knowledge.

Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted to identify the job satisfaction levels of public middle school principals in Virginia. The researcher replicated a study conducted by Newby

(1999) to compare job satisfaction levels in 1997 with the levels of job satisfaction reported by middle school principals in 2006. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to determine the levels of job satisfaction for middle school principals using the twenty dimensions of the job and the following demographic variables: gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in this study:

1. What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?
2. Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population what is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?
3. What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals for each of the twenty dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?
4. Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population what is the satisfaction level of middle school principals for each of the twenty dimensions of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire MSQ?
5. Based on the demographic variables of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) what is the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?

Definitions of Key Terms

This replicated study for the purpose of reliability and validity used the same key definitions as Newby (1999) in her study. The following definitions applied in this 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's program for younger children and in turn is built upon by the high school's program for adolescence…not exceeding 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/her requirements are fulfilled by the environment" (Lofquist & Dawis, 1991, p.27).

Gender - refers to the sex of the respondents. This variable was measured by asking respondents to select Male or Female.

Age – refers to the length of life for each respondent. The age of participants was measured by asking respondents to choose one of the following age ranges: Younger than 35, 36 – 45, 46 – 55, or Older than 55.

Degree – refers to an academic title conferred by a college or university upon the completion of a program of study. The degree held by the participants was determined by asking respondents to mark one of the following: Bachelors, Masters, Educational Specialist, or Doctorate.

Experience – refers to the number of years an individual has served as a middle school principal. This variable was determined by asking each participant to indicate

his/her level of experience as a middle school principal by marking one of the following: 0 – 3, 4 – 6, 7 – 9, or 10 or more.

School Location – refers to the geographic location of the school. Respondents were asked to identify their school as Rural, Urban, or Suburban.

School Population – refers to the number of students enrolled in the school. The respondents were asked to indicate their school's enrollment by marking one of the following population ranges: 400 or less, 401 – 599, 600 – 799, 800 – 999, or Greater than 1,000 students.

Accreditation Status – refers to a school's current accreditation standing as determined by the Virginia Department of Education. Participants were asked to identify their school's accreditation standing by marking one of the following: Fully accredited, Provisionally accredited meets state standards, Provisionally accredited needs improvement, or Accredited with warning.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – refers to a school's standing as determined by the Virginia Department of Education under the federal guidelines of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The participants were asked to mark Yes or No based on their school's current AYP standing.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to public middle school principals who are employed full-time in the Commonwealth of Virginia. One limitation of the study was the Individual Information Sheet and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were self-reported instruments. Due to this fact, inadequate answers could not be explored, participants'

questions could not be answered, and there was no way to ensure participation (Stemple, 2004).

A second limitation of this study was created by restricting participation to middle school principals in the state of Virginia, this makes generalizations about middle school principals outside of the state very difficult.

The third limitation was created by restricting participants' responses to the twenty given dimensions on the MSQ; in-depth exploration of the facets causing satisfaction and dissatisfaction for Virginia's middle school principals was not possible.

The fourth limitation was created by a middle school principal conducting the research (personal bias).

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 includes an introduction to the topic, a statement of the problem, significance of the study, purpose of the research, definitions of key terms and limitations of the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of the related literature on job satisfaction, identifies various instruments used to measure job satisfaction, and explores research surrounding various demographic variables. Chapter 3 contains the design of this quantitative study and methods used to gather and analyze data. Chapter 4 reports the analysis of the data from the study and Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, draws conclusions from the research, and makes recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter summarizes the literature surrounding the field of job satisfaction. The chapter is composed of three sections. Sections one and two focus on the definitions of job satisfaction, job satisfaction theories and variables influencing job satisfaction. Chapter two discusses and concludes with an exploration of previous studies on school personnel and job satisfaction.

Definitions of Job Satisfaction

Researchers define job satisfaction in varying ways. No one definition of job satisfaction is identical to another. The literature demonstrates the presence of subtle nuances in the definitions depending on the period and focus of the researchers, but for the purpose of this study the crux lies with the feelings, values and attitude of the employee. Lofquist and Dawis (1991) define job satisfaction as:

> An individual's positive affective evaluation of the target environment; result of an individual's requirement being fulfilled by the target environment; internal indicator of correspondence; a pleasant affective state; the individual's appraisal of the extent to which his or her requirements are met by the environment. (p. 27)

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) concluded that job satisfaction was a culmination of the positive and negative attitudes or feelings toward a job or some specific aspect of a job. Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as how a person feels about his/her job and the different aspects of his/her job. He further elaborated that job satisfaction could be categorized as a global feeling about a job or as a constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job. Locke (1969) stated that job

satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has generated a considerable degree of interest by employers. It is generally agreed by researchers that job satisfaction is linked to an employee's motivation and quality of job performance (Ostroff, 1992). Employers who are able to increase job satisfaction for their employees can reduce absenteeism and turnover (Griffeth, Hom & Guion, 2000). Spector (1997) concluded that when workers find their jobs to be enjoyable and meaningful, people will like their jobs and will be motivated to perform their jobs well. To this end, numerous theories have been created in an attempt to explain job satisfaction albeit with various degrees of success. In the field of job satisfaction several theories have emerged as pillars, supporting and influencing subsequent theory development. Four of the most influential theorists in the field of job satisfaction are Hoppock (1935), Maslow (1954), Herzberg et al.(1957) and Vroom (1964).

Job satisfaction theories are codified by modern day researchers into the categories of either content theories or process theories (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Content theories focus on the question: What motivates people in the work place (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000)? Additionally, content theorists direct their attention to how behavior is energized, how it is directed, how it is sustained, and how it is stopped (Campbell et al., 1970). Some examples of content theories are: Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory (1954) and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1957). On the other hand, process theorists are concerned with how motivation occurs (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Examples of process theories include, but are not limited to: Vroom's

Expectancy Theory, Work Adjustment Theory, Stacy Adams' Equity Theory and Locke and Latham's Goal-Setting Theory.

Content Theories

Many of the early content theorists laid the groundwork from which many contemporary job satisfaction theories have emerged. These theories have served as an anchor for job satisfaction researchers both inside and outside of the field of education (Robbins, 1994). Classical studies demonstrate the evolution of job satisfaction research and their influence can be seen in the writing of modern job satisfaction researchers (Robbins, 1994). Therefore, from a historical perspective, it is important to examine these classical theories of job satisfaction.

According to Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) content theorists are concerned with what it is within a person or his/her environment that energizes and sustains behavior. Hoppock (1935) suggested that to sustain desired behavior one must identify the presence of variables that led to satisfaction. Therefore the absence of these variables would produce dissatisfaction. Hoppock (1935) hypothesized that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were located at opposite ends of the same continuum. Located between the poles lie varying degrees of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with a feeling of neutrality existing at the midway point.

Hierarchy of Needs Theory

Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy theory is probably one of the best known and used theories in the study of job satisfaction within organizations (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Abraham Maslow (1954) believed that people were motivated by unsatisfied

needs. Furthermore these needs drove a person's behavior. He hypothesized that deep within every person there exists a hierarchy of needs. These needs consist of:

1. Physiological needs which include hunger, thirst, shelter, sex and other bodily needs.
2. Safety needs include security and protection from physical and emotional harms.
3. Social needs involve affection, affiliation, acceptance, and friendship.
4. Esteem needs include internal factors such as self-respect, autonomy, and achievement, and external factors including status, recognition, and attention.
5. Self-actualization needs encompass motivation to obtain one's full potential including related notions of growth and self-fulfillment.

Maslow (1954) divided his needs hierarchy into the categories of lower and higher order needs. The classification scheme was rooted in the notion that lower level needs were satisfied externally, while higher level needs were met internally. These needs exist in a specific pattern requiring a lower level need to be substantially satisfied before the next level need can become dominant. Maslow (1954) believed that although no need is ever fully satisfied, a substantially satisfied need no longer motivates allowing movement to the next level.

Motivation-Hygiene Theory (Two-Factor Theory)

Herzberg (1957) expanded on Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory to generate his Motivation-Hygiene Theory. This theory was formulated on the assumption that an individual's relationship to his/her work is a basic one and that his/her attitude to his/her work can very well determine one's success or failure (Robbins, 1994). Herzberg (1959)

sought to answer the question, "What do people want from their jobs (Herzberg, p 6)?" Based on the results of his research, Herzberg (1959) was able to identify two major themes in participants' responses based on whether the person manifested good or bad feelings about his/her job. The good feelings that were reported concerning the job were associated with intrinsic factors. These factors include achievement, recognition, the work, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Herzberg (1959) named these factors job satisfiers or motivators because they help meet an individual's need for psychological growth. Bad feelings were aligned with the environment surrounding the job. Reported bad feelings were classified as extrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors include company policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions and salary. Due to the preventative and environmental nature of these factors Herzberg (1959) named them hygiene factors. Thus, Herzberg (1959) produced a two-level/factor theory composed of hygiene needs and motivational needs.

Herzberg (1959) believed that factors leading to job satisfaction are separate from those that lead to job dissatisfaction. The opposite of job satisfaction was no job dissatisfaction. Furthermore, he proposed the existence of a dual continuum where the opposite of satisfaction was no satisfaction and the opposite of dissatisfaction was no dissatisfaction. The removal of hygiene factors from a job will not necessarily make the job satisfying. According to Herzberg (1959), when hygiene factors are adequate people will not be dissatisfied; however, neither will they be satisfied. True job satisfaction stems from intrinsic need attainment (Robbins, 1994).

Process Theories

Process theories attempt to identify how motivation occurs in the work place; they explain the process of motivation (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Process theories do not examine variables in isolation of one another. A theory may attempt to emphasize rewards, needs, and incentives in understanding job satisfaction and motivation. Process theories attempt to specify how the aforementioned variables interact and influence one another to produce certain kinds of behavior (Campbell et al., 1970).

Expectancy Theory

Victor Vroom is usually credited by vocational psychologist with developing the first complete version of the Expectancy Theory with direct application to organizational settings (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). The following four assumptions comprise the basis for Expectancy Theory:

1. People join organizations with expectations about their needs. These factors influence how a person reacts to an organization.
2. Behavior is a result of conscious choice. A person is free to choose their behaviors based on his/her expectancy calculations.
3. People have different expectations from their employers. These include, but are not limited to; adequate pay, job security, career advancements, and job stimulation.
4. People will make choices to optimize outcomes for oneself. (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2000).

The Expectancy Theory demonstrates that the motivation an employee displays on a job is directly related to the level of performance. The employee expects that certain levels of

performance will result in a fair amount of reward as determined by the employee. Inadequate rewards on the part of the employer will result in a loss of job motivation and satisfaction for the employee (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000).

Work Adjustment Theory

The genesis of the Work Adjustment Theory can be traced to the Work Adjustment Project that began in 1957 in the Industrial Relations Center at the University of Minnesota. The theory of work adjustment is based on the concept of correspondence between the person and the environment (Dawis, Lofquist, & Weiss, 1968). It was proposed by Dawis and Lofquist (1984) that a person brings into this relationship his/her requirements of the environment and the environment imposes its own requirements upon the individual. Dawis and Lofquist (1984) later expanded this premise by specifying that achieving and maintaining a correspondence with the environment are basic motives of human behavior. This theory noted that more than one type of environment exists: work, home, school to which a person must relate. Dawis, Lofquist and Weiss (1968) affirmed that maintaining and achieving correspondence in one environment might in return affect a person's ability to achieve and maintain correspondence in another environment. Therefore work becomes a major environment to which the majority of people must relate (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984).

It was theorized that individuals bring specific skills to the work environment and these skills enable a person to respond to the requirements of the work environment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). The work environment provides certain rewards and these rewards enable the work environment to respond to the requirements of the individual; thus creating a sense of job satisfaction and tenure for the individual (Dawis, Lofquist &

Weiss, 1968). The theory stated that both the individual and the environment are constantly evolving. This continuous and dynamic process of an individual attempting to maintain and achieve correspondence with his/her environment is called work adjustment (Dawis et al., 1968).

According to Dawis and Lofquist (1984) the theory of work adjustment can be summarized into the following assumptions:

1. Work is the interaction between an individual and his/her environment.
2. The work environment requires that certain tasks must be performed and the individual bring his/her own skills to accomplish these tasks.
3. The individual must be rewarded for his/her efforts and preferred working conditions maintained.
4. In order to maintain correspondence, the individual and environment must continue to meet each other's needs.
5. Satisfaction and satisfactoriness result in tenure, the primary indicators of work adjustment.

Equity Theory

Equity Theory states that employees have certain beliefs about the outputs that they receive from their work and the amount of effort put forth by the employee to obtain those outcomes (Adams, 1965). Equity theory focuses on fairness/equity that employees place on their outcome through a process known as social comparison. (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Employees evaluate the ratio between their input and outcome and compare it directly to the ratio between the input and outcome of their peers. As long as the ratios are perceived to be equal, the employee will feel that an equitable exchange

with the employer has occurred. If ratios are perceived to be unequal, the employee feels inadequate; thus, generating a decrease in job satisfaction (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000).

Goal Setting Theory

Edwin Locke (1969) is one of the major contributors to goal-setting theory development. Goal-setting theory is composed of two cognitive determinants of behavior, values and intentions (goals). According to Locke and Latham (1995), value judgments are experienced through emotion. They believed that a person's values guided his/her actions. Locke and Latham (1995) saw goals as directing the attention and actions of the employee. To that extent, challenging goals generate energy, lead to increased effort and help to develop persistent effort. Locke and Latham (1995) felt that goals helped to motivate people to develop techniques to accomplish the required task level. In conclusion, goal attainment could lead to increased job satisfaction and motivation. Conversely, failure to meet the goal could result in frustration, decreased job satisfaction and motivation (Locke & Latham, 1995).

Job Satisfaction Scales

Job satisfaction researchers measure employee's job satisfaction primarily using interviews or questionnaire surveys (Spector, 1997). Although interview surveys are useful in certain applications, they are expensive and time consuming to conduct (Spector, 1997). Researchers are left to interpret and quantify their findings; thus, raising concerns of reliability and validity (Spector, 1997). Conversely, large numbers of subjects can be surveyed both quickly and inexpensively using a questionnaire format. Questionnaire surveys can be quantified and standardized with greater ease than its survey counterpart (Spector, 1997). One of the easiest ways to assess job satisfaction is to

use one of the many existing scales. A large number of these scales have been carefully developed, and in a significant number of studies, concerns of validity and reliability have been addressed (Cook, 1981). A few well-known examples of job satisfaction surveys are: Job Descriptive Index (JDI, Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ, Weiss, Dawis, England, Lofquist, 1967), and Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS, Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

The Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) is considered to be the most popular facet scale survey among organizational researchers (Spector, 1997). Part of its appeal can be attributed to the fact that it is one of the most carefully developed and validated job satisfaction questionnaires (Cook, 1981). The study measures the following five facets of job satisfaction: Work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworkers. Participants are asked a series of questions concerning one of the aforementioned facets. Questions are represented in both a positive and negative fashion. There are only three answers that can be given for each question; yes, uncertain, and no.

The Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) does have its limitations. Having only five facets, researchers are limited in scope. Additionally, not all facets apply to every group (Spector, 1997).

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) comes in two forms. The long version consists of 100 questions and the second short version consists of 20 questions. Both versions cover the 20 facets of job satisfaction which are: activity, independence, variety, social status, supervision (human relation), supervision

(technical), moral values, security, social security, authority, ability utilization, company policy, compensation, advancement, responsibility, creativity, working conditions, coworkers, recognition, and achievement (Weiss et al., 1966). The long form contains five items per facet whereas the short version contains only one item per facet. Researchers can combine the findings into a total score or break the results into intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction subsets based on particular facets (Spector, 1997). Reliability has been good for both total score and intrinsic and extrinsic subsets. Critics have raised concerns that there is not enough distinction between facets creating a high level of correlation between some subsets (Cook, 1981).

Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS)

The Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) was designed to study the effects of job characteristics on people. It contains sections designed to measure: job tasks, motivation, personality, psychological states, and reactions to the job. The Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) covers additional subsets of job satisfaction, pay, security, social, supervision, as well as global satisfaction. Each facet is evaluated on a seven-point scale ranging from extremely dissatisfied to extremely satisfied. The global satisfaction portion of the survey is evaluated using another seven-point scale ranging from disagree strongly to agree strongly.

Facets of Job Satisfaction

Numerous studies have been conducted to determine the impact of various job facets on the satisfaction level of employees. Each job has its own unique set of characteristics or facets that are measured in an attempt to determine whether the proposed items can be considered as casual factors of job satisfaction (White & Spector,

1987). Job satisfaction research on school principals has not generated any well-established list of job facets pertaining to job satisfaction. Some of the most prominent facets of job satisfaction include, but are not limited to: age, salary, gender, degree status, experience, school population and location.

Age

Look in almost any school and you will find people of various ages at work. Therefore, age becomes an important factor in attempting to identify generalized job satisfaction of school principals. Herzberg et al (1957) reported on the relation of age and job satisfaction asserting that job satisfaction started high, declined, and later increased with age; thus, creating a U-shaped curvilinear relationship between age and job satisfaction. Later research conducted by Kacmar and Ferris (1989), supported the finding of Herzberg (1957) by demonstrating a similar U-shaped relationship between age and job satisfaction.

Kacmar and Ferris (1989) looked to explain the relationship between age and job satisfaction with special emphasis placed on tenure. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI, Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969) was administered to 81 registered nurses in a medium-sized Midwestern hospital. A polynomial regression analysis was used to assess the form of the relationship between age and job satisfaction. After careful analysis of the data Kacmar and Ferris (1989) reported that a curvilinear relation best described the relation between age and job satisfaction.

White and Spector (1987) sought to demonstrate a positive linear relationship between age and job satisfaction. Subjects were 496 city and county employees working in the state of Florida who were asked to complete the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS,

Spector, 1985). An intercorrelation of variables indicated a positive linear relation with age and job satisfaction, $r = .19$ and $p < .001$. A multiple regression was conducted to test job satisfaction against job congruence, locus of control, organizational level and salary. Subsequent findings demonstrated a significant contribution to the prediction of job satisfaction. The findings suggested that older workers were more satisfied with their jobs due to greater job congruence, locus of control, salary and longer tenure.

Gender

Women are underrepresented in the role of middle school principal. These women operate in a male dominated field. In a recent study conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 4,237 principal and assistant principals were surveyed to explore the conditions and concerns of principals in Virginia (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). The report demonstrated that at the middle school level 62% of principals were male and 38% female. While at the high school level the gender span increased to 71% of principals being male to 29% female (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Herzberg (1957) noted a greater variance among women in their job attitudes than among men. He proposed that the difference could be found in women's fundamental attitude toward their role in life. Eckman (2004) suggests that other factors weigh heavily on a woman's decision to enter into the role of principal notably at the high school level. These factors include role conflict, which encompasses a woman's effort to balance home, family and professional life responsibilities. In addition, Eckman (2004) mentions role commitment, which focuses on a person's desire to prioritize between his/her work and personal relationships as an impediment. These factors have a negative impact on the

job satisfaction rating that perspective female principal's place on the position (Eckman, 2004).

Relations between gender and job satisfaction have been extremely inconsistent across studies (Spector, 1997). When meta-analysis is used to examine the results of different studies, there is a mean correlation of almost zero across dozens of studies and thousands of people (Brush et al., 1987). This points to the conclusion that men and women have the same level of job satisfaction. Hulin and Smith (1965) report that when salary differences, tenure and educational level are controlled, job satisfaction between men and women is negligible.

Degree

The decision to enter into a postgraduate program is a complex one (Belcastro & Koeske, 1996). Baird (1976) in a descriptive study identified the following reasons for attending graduate school: to qualify for a profession, to learn more about a field, and to obtain personal satisfaction. Other occupational rewards play an important role in determining enrollment in a graduate program, they include: promotion, prestige, and income (Davis, 1964). Numerous other variables influence an individual's decision such as: gender, age, years of job experience, personal funds, location of school, martial status, and family support (Belcastro & Koeske, 1996). The status attainment model suggests that a career commitment rooted in favorable job experiences would result in the desire to obtain advanced training or further formal education. Following this line of thought, higher levels of education and training would lead to greater chance of securing higher pay and a more satisfying job. Although this is not always how matters unfold. Quinn, Staines, and McCullough (1974) reported that there is no direct link between incremental increases in education and subsequent increases in job satisfaction.

In a study of the job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia, Newby (1999) reported that respondents scored between 3.61 (SD =.58) and 3.91 (SD = .38). This indicates that regardless of educational level, principals in Virginia were satisfied with their positions. Stemple (2004) reported similar findings on high school principals in Virginia. He found that experience and number of years in a particular school division had no significant bearing on job satisfaction for high school principals.

Experience

Researchers focusing on job satisfaction have had difficulty differentiating between the effects of age and tenure (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992). Previous research on relating tenure and age as individual characteristics of job satisfaction have been criticized for being methodically inconsistent (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992). In an attempt to silence critics, researchers have drawn on the areas of career stage theory and the job experience model to better explain the impact of tenure on job satisfaction. White and Spector (1987) suggested that the effects of age on job satisfaction is indirect, acting through other variables. This implies that older workers were more satisfied with their work, not solely due to the fact that they get more of what they want out of work, but due in part to their longer tenure. Thus while age may be intuitively associated with higher satisfaction, its power as an explanatory variable is questionable (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992). Dawis, Lofquist, and Weiss (1968) believed that tenure is a function of correspondence between the individual and his work environment that leads to satisfactoriness and satisfaction of the individual.

A search of the literature produced few studies exploring middle school principals' tenure and job satisfaction. In Newby's (1999) study, job satisfaction levels of middle school principals in Virginia were studied. Her findings showed that based on

years of tenure the scores ranged from 3.46 (SD = .47) and 3.69 (SD = .58). This demonstrated that regardless of experience, the majority of the middle school principals surveyed were satisfied with their positions. Stemple (2004) in his study regarding the job satisfaction level of high school principals in Virginia reported that there was no significant difference in job satisfaction with total years of experience as a high school principal.

School Population

For many years, economies of scale and program comprehensiveness have provided the reasons for a national trend toward building larger schools (Armstrong, 2001). Conversely, a large majority of school population research has determined that smaller schools are superior to larger schools in most aspects (Armstrong, 2001). Studies suggest the maximum size for elementary schools should be 300-400 students, while secondary schools should fall in the range of 400-800 (Raywind, 1997). Schools of this size demonstrate marked improvement in student achievement, teachers' attitude toward work, administration, and each other (Armstrong, 2001).

JoeAnn Newby (1999) in her study on the job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia focused one facet of her research on school population and principals' job satisfaction. She reported that middle school principals of various school populations were satisfied with their positions. The study also indicated that the satisfaction level of a middle school principal increased with the school's population. Therefore, Newby reported a positive linear association occurred between school population and satisfaction.

Armstrong (2001) conducted a study focusing on the size of a school and the satisfaction level of the principal. Contrary to Newby's (1999) findings, he believed that the larger the population of a school, the lower the satisfaction of the principal. A three-part questionnaire was mailed to 80 high school principals based on four different school populations. Findings from the study indicated the larger the school, the less satisfied the principal was in his/her role. The final results of Armstrong's (2001) study demonstrated a positive correlation existed between school population, locus of control, and job satisfaction for principals in Missouri.

School Location

School location can play an important part in the satisfaction level of principals (Newby, 1999). There are significant differences in the climate, politics, and economics that drive urban, suburban, and rural school districts. Studies that focus on school location and principal job satisfaction are limited, but have one common finding. It appears that principals located in suburban areas report higher levels of job satisfaction than their urban and rural counterparts (Derlin & Schneider, 1994).

Newby (1999) in her dissertation on the satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia looked at school location as one facet affecting the satisfaction level of school principals. She found that public middle school 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 positions. However, suburban principals appeared to be satisfied with their jobs at a consistently higher level than urban and rural principals.

Job Satisfaction of School Principals in Virginia

There is an abundance of job satisfaction research. However, only a handful of this research is focused on the satisfaction level of Virginia's school principals and even less research concerns the job satisfaction of middle school principals (Volkwein & Parmley, 1998).

One such study was conducted by JoeAnn Newby (1999), entitled Job Satisfaction of Middle School Principals in Virginia. Newby sought to answer the following question: What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire? The 1997-98 Virginia Educational Directory was used to sample 188 middle school principals. Demographic data were collected on individuals pertaining to gender, age, experience, degree, school location, and school population. Newby (1999) used the 1967 Long-Form Minnesota Questionnaire to measure job satisfaction. Using this instrument a general satisfaction score for middle school principals was calculated to a mean of 3.65 (SD = .57) indicating that principals were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with their jobs. The mean score for the 20 dimensions ranged from slightly satisfied (2.00 – 2.99) to very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99). In addition, Newby (1999) found that: females were more satisfied with the level of activities and variety in the principal position than their male counterparts; middle age principals (36 – 45) were more dissatisfied with the amount of activity in the position; principals with doctorates or master degrees were less satisfied than principals with specialty degrees. In addition, principals in suburban areas were more satisfied with compensation, supervision, and general working conditions than principals in rural and urban areas. Finally, principals in larger school systems (1,000 students or more) were

more satisfied with advancement opportunities, security, and general satisfaction than principals in smaller school systems (999students or fewer).

Stemple (2004) conducted a study on the satisfaction level of principals in Virginia. He sought to understand the level of satisfaction of high school principals along the variables of: gender, age, salary, number of assistant principals, years as a principal, tenure, school socio-economic status, school population, and school accreditation status. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was sent by electronic mail to 183 high school principals in Virginia to determine which of the aforementioned variables may or may not contribute to job satisfaction. A multiple regression was used to determine the impact of the criterion variables on the satisfaction of the principals. Stemple (2004) reported that high school principals in Virginia were generally satisfied with their positions. Specifically, principals were most dissatisfied with their level of compensation and most satisfied with being of service to others. Significant predictors of satisfaction for Virginia's high school principals were the number of assistant principals and the school's accreditation status. Principals who reported having three or more assistant principals and whose schools were fully accredited reported higher levels of satisfaction with his/her position than those who had less than three assistant principals and were not fully accredited.

Waskiewicz (1999) conducted a study designed to identify variables that explain job satisfaction for secondary school assistant principals. A systemic sample of 400 assistant principals was selected from the 1996 National Association of Secondary School Principals. The short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and a questionnaire designed by Waskiewicz (1999) was mailed and yielded 291 responses.

The results demonstrated that assistant principals are only marginally satisfied with their jobs. Many of the variables that were hypothesized to impact job satisfaction, such as age, compensation, and opportunity for career advancement had little or no bearing on job satisfaction. However, supervisor relations were found to have a significant effect on intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. The remaining variables had no significant effect on job satisfaction.

Brogan (2003) conducted a study to measure the job satisfaction of high school principals in the state of Idaho. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form and a 13 question demographic survey was mailed to 128 high school principals. A total of 78 (60.9%) usable questionnaires were returned. Demographic data were collected pertaining to: enrollment, gender, years in current position, years of experience as a high school principal, highest degree held, geographic region, ethnicity, and number of assistant principals.

A multiple regression was used to analyze the data. The findings indicated a small level of difference in the amount of satisfaction between principals along the lines of gender. Males tended to have higher levels of general job satisfaction in their positions. Principals with more tenure experienced increased levels of job satisfaction than their less experienced counterparts. Principals with the highest number of assistant principals reported having higher levels of job satisfaction. Degree status had no significant effect on the satisfaction of high school principals.

Wheelis (2005) conducted a study on the satisfaction of principals in Louisiana. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form was emailed to 1,328 elementary, middle and high schools. In addition three demographic and open-ended questions were

asked. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data. The analysis demonstrated that there were no significant differences in intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction regarding the variables of: gender, size of school, type of school, highest degree earned and school performance scores. Further statistical analysis revealed a significant relationship between general job satisfaction scores and intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, school performance label and type of school. In conclusion, 64% of participants reported that the students and the chance to work with the students was the greatest source of satisfaction received from their positions.

Summary

This chapter focused on literature that pertains to job satisfaction and school principals. Definitions of job satisfaction were presented to establish a conceptual framework from which to base this study. A number of historical and prominent theories were presented. These theories included: (a) hierarchy of needs theory, (b) motivation-hygiene theory, (c) expectancy theory, (d) work adjustment theory, (e) equity theory, and (f) goal setting theory. In addition, several instruments used to measure job satisfaction were discussed. The literature review examined at the role of the following demographic variables on job satisfaction: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) degree, (d) experience, (e) school population, and (f) school location. The chapter concluded with a discussion of various studies on principal job satisfaction.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This descriptive study was designed to determine the current level of job satisfaction for middle school principals in Virginia. The design of this study replicated a 1999 study conducted by Dr. JoeAnn Newby on the satisfaction levels of middle school principals in Virginia. The first four research questions of this study are identical to Dr. Newby's (1999) study. Although question five was not in the original study, its genesis can be traced to Dr. Newby's (1999) suggested research. The findings from this study were compared with results from Newby's (1999) earlier findings (excluding question five). Subsequent sections of this chapter focus on the design of the study, selection and description of the participants, explanation of the research instrument, data collection techniques, and statistical treatment of data.

Research Questions

The procedures in this chapter were designed to answer the following research questions:

Question 1:

What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

Question 2:

Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population, what is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?

Question 3:

What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals for each of the twenty dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

Question 4:

Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population, what is the satisfaction level of middle school principals for each of the twenty dimensions of the MSQ?

Question 5:

Based on the demographic variables of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), what is the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?

Participants

The 2006 *Virginia Educational Directory* produced by the Virginia Department of Education was used to identify the target population for this study. The target population consisted of middle school principals in the state of Virginia. As defined in Chapter 1, middle schools are schools that "build upon elementary school programs for younger children and in turn are built upon by the high school program for adolescence… not exceeding below grade 4 or above grade 8" (Long, 1989, p.12). Using this definition 335 schools were identified from the directory. Prefixes and first names were used to determine that 180 of the schools had male principals (54%) and 155 had female principals (46%). Excluding the author, the Long Form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was mailed to a total population of 334 potential participants.

Instrumentation

As in Newby's (1999) original study, each participant in this study was mailed a two part self-administered survey. Part one of the survey consisted of an Individual Information Sheet (Appendix A). The data sheets were administered for two reasons. Initially, it eased the participants into the survey by front loading easy questions and helped to vest them in the instrument. Secondly, participants were not as likely to skip over the Individual Information Sheet as they might have been if the sheets were placed at the end of the survey (Stemple, 2004). Part two of the survey consisted of the 1967 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Long Form (Appendix B).

Individual Information Sheet

The Individual Information Sheet was used to gather data about selected characteristics of the respondents. A review of the literature identified specific demographic variables that were related to job satisfaction. As with Newby's (1999) original study, the information requested remained the same for the purpose of comparison. The demographic variables for the study were defined as:

Gender - refers to the sex of the respondents. This variable was measured by asking respondents to select Male or Female.

Age – refers to the length of life for each respondent. The age of participants was measured by asking respondents to choose one of the following age ranges: Younger than 35, 36 – 45, 46 – 55, or Older than 55.

Degree – refers to an academic title conferred by a college or university upon the completion of a program of study. The degree held by the participants was determined by

asking respondents to mark one of the following: Bachelors, Masters, Educational Specialist, or Doctorate.

Experience – refers to the number of years an individual has served as a middle school principal. This variable was determined by asking each participant to indicate his/her level of experience as a middle school principal by marking one of the following: 0 – 3, 4 – 6, 7 – 9, or 10 or more.

School Location – refers to the geographic location of the school. Respondents were asked to identify their school as Rural, Urban, or Suburban.

School Population – refers to the number of students enrolled in the school. The respondents were asked to indicate their school's enrollment by marking one of the following population ranges: 400 or less, 401 – 599, 600 – 799, 800 – 999, or Greater than 1,000 students.

Accreditation Status – refers to a school's current accreditation standing as determined by the Virginia Department of Education. Participants were asked to identify their school's accreditation standing by marking one of the following: Fully accredited, Provisionally accredited meets state standards, Provisionally accredited needs improvement, or Accredited with warning.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – refers to a school's standing as determined by the Virginia Department of Education under the federal guidelines of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The participants were asked to mark Yes or No based on their school's current AYP standing.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is designed to measure an employee's satisfaction with his/her profession. As in the original study conducted by Newby (1999), a slightly modified version of the 1967 Long Form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Appendix B) was used to assess the population's general satisfaction level and account for twenty dimensions of the job that contribute to job satisfaction.

The MSQ is a well known, well respected, and popular research tool among job satisfaction researchers (Spector, 1997). Its origin can be traced to the Work Adjustment Project of the Industrial Relations Center located at the University of Minnesota. The Work Adjustment Project (1957) began studying the work adjustment problems of participants as they related to rehabilitation services. The project sought to develop diagnostic tools for assessing the work adjustment potential of participants for vocational rehabilitation and the assessment of work adjustment outcomes (Dawis et al., 1968). The first instruments used to measure "correspondence" produced adequate reliability, but were cumbersome to score (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). This resulted in the development of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The authors utilized the instrument to collect normative data from 21 MSQ scales for 25 representative occupations including bookkeepers, laborers, typists, engineers, managers, and teachers (Dawis et al., 1964). The MSQ was copyrighted in 1963 and first published in 1964 by George England, Rene Dawis, and Lloyd Lofquist (Dawis et al., 1964). Since its 1964 début, three subsequent revisions of the MSQ were made in 1968, 1969, and 1977.

There are three forms of the MSQ that are available to researchers: two long forms (1977 and 1967 versions) and a short form. The MSQ is a gender-neutral instrument that can be administered to groups or individuals (Dawis et al., 1964). The long form of the MSQ is written on a fifth grade level and can be self-administered in approximately 15 to 20 minutes. The MSQ is designed to measure the level of both intrinsic and extrinsic needs across 20 needs dimensions. The instrument is comprised of 100 items that are placed in 20 different subscales. Each of the 20 different subscales is composed of 5 items.

The MSQ scales are:

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 the job.
5. Authority – The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company policies and practices – The way company policies are implemented.
7. Compensation – Feeling about pay in contrast to the amount of work completed.
8. Coworkers – How one gets along with his/her coworkers.
9. Creativity – The opportunity to try one's own method.
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 from 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 aspect of one's work. (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984).

The 1977 long form version of the MSQ uses a five point Likert scale to record responses. The 1977 version contains the following five responses: very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied. The authors reported a "ceiling effect" obtained from the rating scale. The 1977 long form of the MSQ resulted in the distribution of most scale scores being markedly negatively skewed. It was reported that most of the responses alternated between satisfied and very satisfied. In an effort to compensate for this ceiling effect, the 1967 long form of the MSQ altered its responses to: not satisfied, somewhat satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied, and extremely satisfied. This revision in the rating scale resulted in distributions that tended to be more symmetrically distributed around the satisfied category, with a reported larger item variance (Weiss & Lofquist, 1967).

As in Newby's (1999) earlier study, a slightly modified version of the 1967 long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used. With permission obtained from the Vocational Psychology Research Department located at the University of Minnesota, the following changes were made: the word "company" was changed to "school system" and "boss" was changed to "supervisor." This ensured that the instrumentation used was identical to Newby's (1999) instrumentation and will thereby produce valid comparisons.

Reliability of the MSQ Long Form

Heiman (2001) wrote that reliability is the extent to which a measurement is consistent, can be reproduced, and avoids error. To this end, two measures of reliability were used to test the MSQ: internal consistency and stability. The Hoyt's analysis of variance method demonstrated that the reliability coefficients ranged from a high of .97 to a low of .59. The median Hoyt's reliability coefficients ranged from .93 to .78. There were 567 (27 groups with 21 subscales) Hoyt reliability coefficients reported, 83% were .80 or higher and only 2.5% were lower than .70. These results suggest that the MSQ scales have internal consistency reliabilities (Weiss, 1967). Results from the Hoyt reliability coefficients for the 27 normative groups can be found in Table 1.

Data for the stability of the scores were obtained over two time intervals: one week and one year. Test-retest correlation coefficients can be found in Table 2. The one-week stability coefficients ranged from .66 to .91. The median coefficient was .83 and the general satisfaction scale was .89. The one-year stability coefficients ranged from .35 to .71. The median stability coefficient was .61 and the general satisfaction rating was .70

(Weiss et al., 1967). The authors offered no further explanation for the differences in coefficients for both the one-week and one-year stability scores.

Table 1.

Median and Range of Hoyt Reliability Coefficients for 27 Normative Groups, by MSQ Scales

Scale	Highest	Median	Lowest
Ability utilization	.97	.91	.79
Achievement	.91	.84	.73
Activity	.92	.86	.71
Advancement	.96	.93	.87
Authority	.92	.85	.66
Company Policies and Practices	.93	.90	.80
Compensation	.95	.91	.82
Co-workers	.93	.85	.67
Creativity	.92	.87	.72
Independence	.91	.85	.73
Moral values	.93	.81	.62
Recognition	.96	.93	.84
Responsibility	.89	.78	.66
Security	.87	.80	.64
Social service	.95	.89	.73
Social status	.92	.79	.71
Supervision-human relations	.95	.89	.75

Supervision-technical	.94	.86	.71
Variety	.93	.86	.59
Working conditions	.87	.89	.80
General satisfaction	.95	.88	.82

From " The Instrumentation for the Theory of Work Adjustment," by Weiss, Dawis, Lofquist and England, 1967, Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Copyright 1967 by the University of Minnesota.

Table 2

Test Re-test Correlation Coefficients for One Week Interval and One Year Interval, by MSQ Scale

Scale	One week N = 75	One year N = 115
Ability utilization	.84	.71
Achievement	.81	.62
Activity	.83	.49
Advancement	.85	.67
Authority	.85	.47
Company Policies and Practices	.80	.61
Compensation	.79	.62
Co-workers	.66	.40
Creativity	.87	.66
Independence	.75	.35
Moral values	.83	.53
Recognition	.86	.69

Responsibility	.87	.61
Security	.70	.58
Social service	.84	.57
Social status	.80	.63
Supervision-human relations	.86	.66
Supervision-technical	.90	.68
Variety	.80	.69
Working conditions	.89	.70
General satisfaction	.89	.70

From " The Instrumentation for the Theory of Work Adjustment," by Weiss, Dawis, Lofquist and England, 1967, Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Copyright 1967 by the University of Minnesota.

Validity of the MSQ Long Form

Validity refers to the extent to which a procedure measures what it is intended to measure (Heiman, 2001). Evidence of the validity of the MSQ is derived primarily from it performing according to theoretical expectations. This type of validity is referred to as construct validity (Weiss et al., 1967). To test the construct validity of the MSQ data 25 occupational groups were analyzed by a one-way analysis of variance (to test differences in the level of expressed satisfaction) and Bartlett's test of homogeneity of variance (to test differences in group variabilities) (Weiss et al., 1967). Analysis of the data reported group differences were statistically significant at the .001 level for both the means and variances on all 20 MSQ scales (Weiss, et al., 1967).

Data Collection Procedures

With permission granted from Virginia Tech's Institutional Review Board (Appendix C), all materials in this study were mailed to participants using the addresses listed in the *Virginia Education Directory*. A five-step data collection process was used to gather the desired information. The steps were an introductory letter, the instrument (MSQ), a postcard reminder, and two follow-up reminders.

Introductory Letter

A letter of introduction was sent to all participants one week prior to the mailing of the survey instrument. The chair of the author's dissertation committee endorsed the letter of introduction. Contents of the letter included: the purpose of the study, assurance of confidentiality, and encouragement for members to participate.

Survey Instrument

After seven days, a second mailing containing a letter of explanation, survey materials, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of materials was sent to participants. Responses were requested within two weeks. The researcher used a number system to monitor response results. This number system assisted in the follow-up of non-responders.

First Reminder Letter

A reminder was mailed to participants two weeks after the mailing of the survey instrument. This letter asked for participants' cooperation and encouraged completion and mailing of the survey. The letter contained the author's telephone number and electronic mail address for participants to call or write with any questions. Additional survey materials and a self-addressed stamped envelope were included.

Second Reminder Letter

Seven days after the first reminder mailing (three weeks after the initial survey mailing) an additional reminder letter was mailed to all non-respondents requesting their participation. In addition, a self-addressed stamped envelope was included along with the author's contact information and a final installment of survey materials.

Final Reminder Letter

One week prior to the close of the study, a final letter to all non-participants was mailed offering them one last opportunity to participate in the study.

Data Analysis

The primary objectives of this study were: (1) the assessment of the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in the state of Virginia, (2) the determination of specific job dimensions that principals perceive as contributing to job satisfaction, (3) determination of the influence of specific demographic variables on job satisfaction. A descriptive analysis was conducted that included means, standard deviations, and range of scores. Listed below are the research questions with the methods of data analysis:

1. *What is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?*

The first question was answered by examining the responses given from 1 question from each of the 20 dimensions on the MSQ. These questions can be used to produce a general satisfaction score. The following questions were selected for analysis: 24, 25, 28, 30, 35, 43, 51, 61, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 82, 93, 96, 98, 99, and 100. A mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) score was calculated using the weighted Likert scale below. The

range scores were utilized to determine an overall satisfaction category for Virginia's middle school principals.

Weight	Range	Scale Option
1	(1.00 – 1.99)	Not Satisfied (NS)
2	(2.00 – 2.99)	Slightly Satisfied (SS)
3	(3.00 –3.99)	Satisfied (S)
4	(4.00 – 4.99)	Very Satisfied (VS)
5	(5.00)	Extremely Satisfied (ES)

2. *Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population, what is the general satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?*

Question two was answered by constructing a frequency table that included the number of participants (N), mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and frequency (f). The mean scores were used to categorize each demographic variable into a satisfaction rating using the aforementioned range scale.

To determine whether or not a statistically significant difference existed between the means, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. Significance was determined at the ($p < 0.05$) level. Those demographic variables that were determined to have a statistically significant difference between the means underwent further analysis using the Scheffe post hoc test to determine any statistically significant differences among demographic subgroups.

3. *What is the satisfaction level of middle school principals for each of the 20 dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?*

A data table was constructed that contained the number (N), mean (M), and standard deviation (SD) of each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ. The means (M) of each dimension were displayed in descending value.

4. *Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population what is the satisfaction level of middle school principals for each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ?*

The independent variables of gender, age, degree status, experience, school location, and school population were analyzed with each of the 20 MSQ dimensions. The results were displayed in a data chart containing: number of respondents (N), mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and significant value (p) for each variable. The results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine statistical significance at the ($p < 0.001$) and ($p < 0.05$) levels. Any demographic group that was determined to have a statistically significant difference in its mean was further examined using the Scheffe post hoc analysis. The Scheffe post hoc test was used to demonstrate any statistically significant differences among demographic subgroups.

5. *Based on the demographic variables of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), what is the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?*

The independent variables of accreditation status and AYP were analyzed with each of the 20 MSQ dimensions. The results were displayed in a data chart containing: number of respondents (N), mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and significant value (p)

for each variable. The results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine statistical significance at the ($p < 0.001$) and ($p < 0.05$) levels. Any demographic group that was determined to have a statistically significant difference in its mean was further examined using the Scheffe post hoc analysis. The Scheffe post hoc test was used to demonstrate any statistically significant differences among demographic subgroups.

Summary

This study was designed to investigate the job satisfaction of middle school principals in the state of Virginia. In addition, the relationship between job satisfaction and specific demographic variables was explored. This chapter contains a description of the population, sampling methods, data collection procedures, and statistical procedures for analysis of collected data. Five research questions were presented with the statistical analyses for each. These analyses included: means (M), standard deviation (SD), frequency distributions (f), analyses of variance (ANOVA), and Scheffe post hoc analyses. It is the intent of the researcher that information resulting from this study will provide valuable information concerning the job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the information from the analysis of data that were collected from the study of job satisfaction of public middle school principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The sections of this chapter include: (a) description of the population, (b) range of scores, (c) analyses and findings presented by research questions, and (d) a brief summary of the findings.

Demographic Data

Using Long's (1989) definition of middle schools, 335 public school principals fell within the established parameters of the study. Excluding the author, a total of 334 questionnaires were mailed to public middle school principals in Virginia. Subsequent mailings consisting of a postcard reminder, and 2 reminder letters produced a response rate of 57 percent (n = 334). Three respondents chose not to participate and five surveys were excluded due to incomplete answers.

Table 3 presents the description of the population by showing the demographic variables with the number (n) of respondents in each category. There were 105 (55.3%, n=190) male participants and 85 (44.7%, n = 190) female participants. Ages of the participants ranged from those younger than 35 (5.8%, n = 190) to those older than 55 (18.9%, n= 190). The majority of principals fell within the age ranges of 36 – 45 (29.5%, n = 190) to 46 – 55 (45.8%, n = 190). These two categories accounted for 75.3% of the total population. Examination of the education level of participants demonstrated that 72.1% (n = 190) of the population had obtained masters degrees while 27.4% (n = 190) had earned either their doctorate or a degree as an educational specialist. The majority of

public middle school principals who participated in this study (72.7%, n = 190) were experienced with six years or less. Principals with seven years or more of experience accounted for 27.4% (n = 190) of the population.

The largest portion of principals responding to the questionnaire were assigned to rural school systems (42.1%, n = 190) and suburban school systems (41.1%, n = 190), while only 16.8% (n = 190) reported being in urban school areas. The principals' school enrollment ranged from less than 400 to over 1,000 students. Schools with student populations of less than 400 comprised 16.8% (n = 190) of the data. Each of the other enrollment categories composed approximately 20% (n = 190) or better of the reporting schools. Principals reported that 84.7% (n = 190) of their schools were fully accredited. However, only 62.1% (n =190) of the principals' schools made AYP while 37.9% failed to make AYP for the previous school year.

MSQ Scale Reliability Analysis

Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) suggest that an internal consistency reliability coefficient be calculated for the sample on which the MSQ is intended to be used. For this study, SPSS was used to compute the Chronbach's Alpha test of internal consistency on the 20 dimensions measured by the MSQ. Chronbach's Alpha generated a total scale score of .95. This alpha suggests that the data collected from the MSQ for this sample has high internal consistency and reliability with this sample. A comparison to Newby's (1999) study demonstrates an equal level of internal consistency and reliability with a total scale score of .95.

Table 3.

Frequency Distributions for Demographic Variables (n = 190)

Demographic Variables	N	Percent
Gender		
Male	105	55.3
Female	85	44.7
Total	190	100.0
Age		
Younger than 35	11	5.8
36 – 45	56	29.5
46 –55	87	45.8
Older than 55	36	18.9
Total	190	100.0
Degree Status		
Bachelors	1	0.5
Masters	137	72.1
Educational Specialist	23	12.1
Doctorate	29	15.3
Total	190	100.0

Years as Middle School Principal		
1 – 3	78	41.1
4 – 6	60	31.6
7 – 9	22	11.6
10 or More	30	15.8
Total	190	100.0
School Location		
Rural	80	42.1
Suburban	78	41.1
Urban	32	16.8
Total	190	100.0
School Population		
400 Students or Less	32	16.8
401 – 600 Students	41	21.6
601 – 800 Students	42	22.1
801 – 1,000 Students	37	19.5
> 1,000 Students	38	20.0
Total	190	100.0
Accreditation Status		
Fully Accredited	161	84.7

Fully Accredited Meets State Standards	3	1.6
Provisionally Accredited Needs Improvement	12	6.3
Accredited with Warning	14	7.4
Total	190	100.0
Adequate Yearly Progress		
Yes	118	62.1
No	72	37.9
Total	190	100.0

Frequencies of MSQ Dimensions

The MSQ and Individual Information Sheet was mailed to 334 public middle school principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia. One hundred and ninety useable surveys were returned. One respondent reported serving as a principal with his/her bachelor's degree. Due to this category's low response rate, no reliable conclusion can be drawn from this demographic and it will not be reported in the findings. A summary of each table is located below.

Ability Utilization

The MSQ defines ability utilization as the opportunity to do things on the job that make use of one's abilities (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967). Data located in Table 4 demonstrates that over half (111 out of 190, or 58.4%) of public middle school principals were very satisfied with this aspect of their position. The next highest

satisfaction rating for ability utilization was extremely satisfied with 53 out of 190 (or 27.9%) of principals reporting a favorable response. Out of 190 participating principals, 18 (or 9.5%) reported being satisfied with ability utilization. The near lowest category was slightly satisfied with 5 out of 190 (or 2.6%) and the lowest, not satisfied, represented 3 out of 190 (or 1.6%) of the participating population of principals. This data demonstrates that the majority (86.3%) of public middle school principals were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with their opportunity to make use of their abilities.

Table 4.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Ability Utilization

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	3	1.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	5	2.6
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	18	9.5
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	111	58.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	53	27.9
Total	190	100.0

Achievement

Weiss et al. (1967) stated that achievement is the feeling of accomplishment that one gets from the job. Data located in Table 5 illustrates that the highest number (118 out of 190, or 62.1%) of public middle school principals were very satisfied with this particular aspect of their positions. The second largest group of principals (43 out of 190, or 22.6%) reported being extremely satisfied with this aspect of the job. Out of 190

participating principals, 26 (or 13.7%) noted being satisfied with their achievement. The lowest group, 3 out of 190 (or 1.6%) reported being not satisfied with the achievement aspect of their positions. This data demonstrates that the majority of participating public middle school principals (84.7%) were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the achievement component of their positions.

Table 5.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Achievement

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	3	1.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	0	0.0
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	26	13.7
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	118	62.1
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	43	22.6
Total	190	100.0

Activity

The MSQ defines the dimension of activity as the ability to keep busy all of the time (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967). Data found in table 6 demonstrates that the largest group (112 out of 190, or 58.9%) of principals was very satisfied with the amount of activity in their positions. The second largest group of principals (44 out of 190 or 23.2%) reported being extremely satisfied with this aspect of the principalship. Out of 190 participating public middle school principals 33, or 17.5%, were satisfied with activity in their positions. Only one participant reported being not satisfied with activity

in his/her job. The data shows that the majority of participating public middle school principals (82.1%) were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the amount of activity of their principalships.

Table 6.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Activity

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	1	0.5
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	0	0.0
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	33	17.5
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	112	58.9
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	44	23.2
Total	190	100.0

Advancement

Weiss et al. (1967) explained the job dimension of advancement as the ability to get ahead on the job. Data found in table 7 shows that the highest number of reporting public school principals (78 out of 190) or (41.1%) were very satisfied with their opportunities for advancement. The second largest group (57 out of 190, or 30%) reported being satisfied with the area of advancement. Out of 190 participating public middle school principals, 24 (or 12.6%) reported being extremely satisfied, while 22 out of 190 (or 11.7%) reported only being slightly satisfied with their chances at advancement. The smallest participating group chose not satisfied and consisted of 9 principals who comprise 4.7% of the 190 participants. The data shows that over half

(71.1%) of the reporting public middle school principals were either satisfied or very satisfied with their opportunities for advancement.

Table 7.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Advancement

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	9	4.7
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	22	11.7
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	57	30.0
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	78	41.1
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	24	12.6
Total	190	100.0

Authority

The MSQ states that authority is the opportunity to tell others what to do (Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist, 1967). The data found in Table 8 demonstrates that the largest group of participating public middle school principals (92 out of 190, or 48.5%) were very satisfied with their degree of authority in the position. The second largest group (71 out of 190, or 37.5%) reported being satisfied with their amount of authority. The middle group (20 out of 190 participants, 10.5%) claimed to be extremely satisfied with their level of authority. The next lowest category (6 out of 190, or 3.2%) was slightly satisfied, and the lowest (1 out of 190, or 0.5%) was not satisfied with the amount of authority in the job. The data indicates that the majority of principals (86%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with the level of authority in their positions.

Table 8.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Authority

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	1	0.5
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	6	3.2
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	71	37.5
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	92	48.5
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	20	10.5
Total	190	100.0

School Policies and Practices

School policies are defined by the MSQ as the way policies are put into practice by the school. Data presented in Table 9 demonstrates that the largest group (96 out of 190, or 50.6%) were very satisfied with their school policies and practices. The second largest group (50 out of 190, or 26.2%) were satisfied with the way policies were put into practice in their schools. Out of 190 public middle school principal participants, 20 (10.6%) were slightly satisfied with school policies and practices. The next lowest category (17 out of 190, or 8.9%) reported being extremely satisfied; the smallest group, 7 out of 190 (or 3.7%), were not satisfied with their school's policies and practices. The data indicates that 76.8% of participating public middle school principals were either satisfied or very satisfied with the way policies were put into practice in their schools.

Table 9.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: School Policies and Practices

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	7	3.7
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	20	10.6
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	50	26.2
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	96	50.6
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	17	8.9
Total	190	100.0

Compensation

Compensation is defined by the MSQ as being the amount of pay for the work that is done. The data located in Table 10 shows the largest group (68 out of 190, or 41.1%) as being very satisfied with their compensation. The second largest group (51 out of 190, or 26.9%) were satisfied with their amount of pay. Out of 190 public middle school participants, 38 (20%) stated that they were slightly satisfied with their level of job compensation. The next lowest level (12 out of 190, or 6.3%) were not satisfied and the smallest group (11 out of 190, or 5.8%) reported being extremely satisfied with their pay. The data in Table 10 indicates that 73.8% of the participating public middle school principals reported being satisfied, very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the amount of compensation for their positions.

Table 10.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Compensation

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	12	6.3
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	38	20.0
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	51	26.9
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	78	41.1
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	11	5.8
Total	190	100.0

Co-workers

Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) defined co-workers as the way people on the job get along with one another. Data from Table 11 shows that the largest group (93 out of 190, or 48.8%) of participants were very satisfied with their co-workers. The second largest group (54 out of 190, or 28.5%) reported being satisfied with their relations with other co-workers. Out of 190 public middle school participants, 35 (18.4%) stated that they were extremely satisfied with their fellow co-workers. The next smallest group (7 out of 190, or 3.8%) was slightly satisfied and the smallest group, only 1 out of 190 (or 0.5%), reported to be not satisfied with his or her co-workers. The data from Table 11 indicates that the majority (95.7) of participating principals were satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with the way people get along on the job with one another.

Table 11.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Co-workers

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	1	0.5
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	7	3.8
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	54	28.5
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	93	48.8
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	35	18.4
Total	190	100.0

Creativity

The MSQ defines creativity as the chance to try one's own methods of doing the job. The data in Table 12 demonstrates that the largest group (117 out of 190, or 61.6%) of participating principals were very satisfied with the amount of creativity allowed in their positions. The second largest group (49 out of 190, or 25.8%) reported being extremely satisfied with their level of creativity. Out of 190 participants, 19 (10.1%) stated that they were satisfied with the chance to try their own methods on the job. The next lowest group (4 out of 190, or 2%) were slightly satisfied and the smallest group, 1 out of 190 (or 0.5%), reported being not satisfied with his or her amount of creativity allowed on the job. The data from Table 12 indicates that the majority (87.4%) of participating public middle school principals were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the prospects of attempting their own methods of doing the job.

Table 12.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Creativity

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	1	0.5
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	4	2.0
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	19	10.1
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	117	61.6
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	49	25.8
Total	190	100.0

Independence

Independence is defined by the MSQ as the chance to work alone on the job. Based on the data located in Table 13 the largest number of participants (88 out of 190, or 46.3%) reported being very satisfied with their level of independence. The second largest group (69 out of 190, or 36.3%) reported being satisfied with their independence. Out of 190 public middle school principals, 20 (10.5%) reported that they were extremely satisfied with amount of independence offered by their positions. The next lowest group (10 out of 190, or 5.4%) was slightly satisfied and the smallest group (3 out of 190, or 1.6%) reported being not satisfied with their current level of independence in the job. The data from Table 13 indicates that the majority (93.1%) of participating public middle school principals were either satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with their chances to work alone on the job.

Table 13.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Independence

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	3	1.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	10	5.4
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	69	36.3
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	88	46.3
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	20	10.5
Total	190	100.0

Moral Value

The MSQ defines moral value as the ability to do things that do not go against one's conscience. The data from Table 14 shows that the largest group (120 out of 190, or 63.2%) of participating principals were very satisfied with their moral values. The second largest group (46 out of 190, or 24.2 %) reported being extremely satisfied with the current status of their moral values. Out of 190 participating principals, 20 (10.5%) stated that they were satisfied with the moral value aspect of their positions. The smallest group (4 out of 190, or 2.1%) reported that they were slightly satisfied with their moral values. The data from Table 14 indicates that the majority of participating public middle school principals (87.4%) were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the ability to conduct their jobs without going against their consciences.

Table 14.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Moral Values

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	0	0.0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	4	2.1
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	20	10.5
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	120	63.2
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	46	24.2
Total	190	100.0

Recognition

Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) defined recognition as the praise one gets from doing a good job. The data pertaining to recognition is located in Table 15. This data demonstrated that the largest group (79 out of 190, or 41.6%) of participating principals were very satisfied with the amount of recognition in their positions. The second largest group (62 out of 190, or 32.6%) reported being satisfied with their current levels of recognition. Out of 190 participants, 20 (10.5%) stated that they were slightly satisfied with the recognition they received. The next lowest group (18 out of 190, or 9.5%) reported being extremely satisfied and the smallest group (11 out of 190, or 5.8%) indicated that they were not satisfied with the amount of recognition received on the job. The data in Table 15 signifies that the majority of participating public middle school principals (74.2%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with the praise they receive for a job well done.

Table 15.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Recognition

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	11	5.8
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	20	10.5
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	62	32.6
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	79	41.6
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	18	9.5
Total	190	100.0

Responsibility

The MSQ defines responsibility as the freedom to use one's own judgment. Data concerning responsibility is located in Table 16. This data demonstrates that the largest group (116 out of 190, or 61%) of participating principals reported being very satisfied with the amount of responsibility of their positions. The next largest group (43 out of 190, or 22.7%) stated that they were satisfied with their level of responsibility. Out of 190 public middle school participants 24 (12.6%) were extremely satisfied with their current state of responsibility on the job. The smallest group (7 out of 190, or 3.7%) were slightly satisfied with the status of their responsibility. The data from Table 16 indicates that the majority (83.7%) of participating principals were either satisfied or very satisfied with their ability to use their own judgment.

Table 16.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Responsibility

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	0	0
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	7	3.7
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	43	22.7
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	116	61.0
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	24	12.6
Total	190	100.0

Security

The MSQ defines security as the way a job provides for steady employment. The data regarding security is located in Table 17. Data from table 17 demonstrates that the largest portion (104 out of 190, or 54.7%) of participating principals were very satisfied with the level of security in their current positions. The second largest group (50 out of 190, or 26.3%) reported being satisfied with their job security. Rounding out the middle (22 out of 190, or 11.6%) were those principals who were extremely satisfied with the amount security offered by their position. The next lowest group (9 out of 190, or 4.8%) reported feeling slightly satisfied and the smallest group (5 out of 190, or 2.6%) claimed to be not satisfied with the level of security in their positions. The data from Table 17 indicates that the majority of participating public middle school principals (81%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with the way their jobs provide for steady employment.

Table 17.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Security

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	5	2.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	9	4.8
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	50	26.3
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	104	54.7
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	22	11.6
Total	190	100.0

Social Service

Social service was defined by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) as the ability to do things for other people. The data regarding social service can be located in Table 18. The largest group of participating principals (108 out of 190, or 56.8%) reported feeling very satisfied with the amount of social service in their jobs. The second largest group (71 out of 190, or 37.4%) was extremely satisfied with their level of social service. The satisfied group comprised (8 out of 190, or 4.2%) of the participants. The next lowest group (2 out of 190, or 1.1%) reported being slightly satisfied and the smallest group (1 out of 190, or 0.5%) indicated being not satisfied with the level of social service offered in the position. The data from Table 18 demonstrates that the majority of participating public middle school principals (179 out of 190, or 94.2%) were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with their opportunities to do things for others.

Table 18.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Social Service

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	2	1.1
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	1	0.5
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	8	4.2
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	108	56.8
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	71	37.4
Total	190	100.0

Social Status

Social status is defined by the MSQ as the chance to be somebody in the community. Data regarding social status is located in Table 19. The largest portion of participating principals (92 out of 190 or 48.4%) reported being very satisfied with their current level of social status in the community. The second largest group (78 out of 190, or 41%) was satisfied with their social status. Out of 190 participating public middle school principals, 10 (5.3%) reported feeling extremely satisfied with their amount of social status. The next lowest group (9 out of 190, or 4.8%) was slightly satisfied, while the last group (1 out of 190, or 0.5%) reported being not satisfied with the current level of social status surrounding the position. The data from Table 19 demonstrates that the majority of principals (170 out of 190, or 89.4%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with their opportunity to be somebody in the community.

Table 19.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Social Status

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	1	0.5
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	9	4.8
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	78	41.0
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	92	48.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	10	5.3
Total	190	100.0

Supervision – Human Relations

Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) defined supervision – human relations as the way supervisors oversee other employees. The data regarding supervision – human relations can be found in Table 20. This data shows the largest group of participating principals (86 out of 190, or 45.4%) reported feeling very satisfied with the human relations aspect of their position. The next largest group (45 out of 190, or 23.7%) stated they were extremely satisfied with human relations portion of their position. Out of 190 participating public middle school principals, 32 (16.8%) were satisfied with human relations in the position. The next lowest group (20 out of 190, or 10.5%) was slightly satisfied and the smallest group (7 out of 190, or 3.6%) reported being not satisfied with human relations in their principalships. Based on the data from Table 20, the majority of participating principals (69.1%) were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the way they supervise their employees.

Table 20.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Supervision – Human Relations

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	7	3.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	20	10.5
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	32	16.8
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	86	45.4
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	45	23.7
Total	190	100.0

Supervision – Technical

Supervision – technical is defined by the MSQ as the competence of the principals' supervisors in making decisions. The data for supervision – technical is located in Table 21. Data from Table 21 demonstrates that the largest portion of participating principals (93 out of 190, or 48.8%) were very satisfied with their technical - supervision. The next largest group (41 out of 190, or 21.6%) reported being satisfied with their current level of technical - supervision. Out of 190 participating middle school principals 30 (15.8%) stated that they were extremely satisfied with their technical - supervision. The next lowest group (19 out of 190, or 10.1%) was slightly satisfied and the smallest group (7 out of 190, or 3.7%) reported being not satisfied with their current level of technical support. The data in Table 21 indicates that the majority of participating principals (64.6%) were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with their supervisors' competence to make decisions.

Table 21.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Supervision - Technical

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	7	3.7
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	19	10.1
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	41	21.6
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	93	48.8
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	30	15.8
Total	190	100.0

Variety

Variety was defined by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) as the chance to do different things from time to time. The data for variety is located in Table 22. Analysis of the data shows that the largest portion of participating principals (126 out of 190, or 66.3%) reported being very satisfied with variety in the position. The next largest group (34 out of 190, or 18%) was satisfied with level of variety in their jobs. The middle group (26 out of 190, or 13.7%) stated that they were extremely satisfied with the amount of variety in their positions. The next lowest group (3 out of 190, or 1.5%) was slightly satisfied, while the smallest group (1 out of 190, or 0.5%) reported being not satisfied with the variety of the job. This data demonstrates that the majority (84.3%) of participating public middle school principals were either satisfied or very satisfied with their opportunities to do different things from time to time.

Table 22.

Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Variety

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	1	0.5
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	3	1.5
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	34	18.0
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	126	66.3
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	26	13.7
Total	190	100.0

Working Conditions

The MSQ defines working conditions as the physical surroundings of the job. Data pertaining to working conditions is located in Table 23. Inspection of the data shows that the largest group of participating principals (92 out of 190, or 48.5%) stated that they were very satisfied with their working conditions. The next largest group (44 out of 190, or 23.2%) was extremely satisfied with the working conditions of their positions. The third largest group (34 out of 190, or 17.7%) reported being satisfied with their working conditions. The second smallest group (17 out of 190, or 9%) stated that they were slightly satisfied and the smallest group (3 out of 190, or 1.6%) reported being not satisfied with their working conditions. Data from Table 23 indicates that the majority of participating public middle school principals (71.7%) were either very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the physical surroundings of their jobs.

Table 23.

*Frequency of Responses for MSQ Dimension: Working Condition*s

Scale	f	Percent
Not Satisfied (1.00 – 1.99)	3	1.6
Slightly Satisfied (2.00 – 2.99)	17	9.0
Satisfied (3.00 – 3.99)	34	17.7
Very Satisfied (4.00 – 4.99)	92	48.5
Extremely Satisfied (5.00)	44	23.2
Total	190	100.0

Analyses and Findings Arranged by Research Question

This section contains each research question used in this study. The questions are followed by a description of the analysis used and a review of the findings.

Question 1

What is the general satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

The MSQ provides a scale to measure general job satisfaction. This scale utilizes one question from each of the twenty dimensions previously outlined. The following questions were used to determine the general job satisfaction for public middle school principals in Virginia: 24, 25, 28, 30, 35, 43, 51, 61, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 82, 93, 96, 98, 99, and 100 (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967). The calculated mean score for participants was M = 4.45 with a standard deviation of SD = .610 (n = 190). Based on the MSQ Manual (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967) the general job satisfaction

rating for participating public middle school principals in Virginia is considered to be very satisfied.

Question 2

Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree status, experience, school location, and school population, what is the general job satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia?

The general job satisfaction level was determined for each of the demographic variables. One-way ANOVAs were used to compare the mean job satisfaction scores group by each demographic variable. Results from the ANOVAs are located in Table 24.

Table 24.

General Job Satisfaction and Demographics

Variable	N	M	SD	F	P
Gender					
Male	105	4.10	.486		
Female	85	3.98	.633		
Total	190	4.05	.558	.896	.654
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.29	.420		
36 – 45	56	4.03	.665		
46 – 55	87	4.04	.480		
Older than 55	36	4.02	.590		

Total	190	4.05	.558	.867	.701
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.50			
Masters	137	4.04	.542		
Education Specialist	23	4.12	.475		
Doctorate	29	4.01	.689		
Total	190	4.05	.558	1.025	.442
Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.04	.607		
4 – 6	60	4.01	.503		
7 – 9	22	4.13	.560		
10 or more	30	4.07	.545		
Total	190	4.05	.558	.786	.820
School Location					
Rural	80	4.01	.503		
Suburban	78	4.12	.561		
Urban	32	3.97	.671		
Total	190	4.05	.558	.864	.706

School Population					
400 or less	32	3.91	.496		
401 – 600	41	4.04	.667		
601 – 800	42	4.08	.518		
801 – 1,000	37	4.02	.608		
More than 1,000	38	4.15	.464		
Total	190	4.05	.558	1.300	.128

* $p < .05$

Gender

Testing revealed that no significant difference existed in job satisfaction between male and female public middle school principals in Virginia ($p = .654$). Participating male principals reported a mean score of 4.10 ($SD = .486$); the mean score for female principals was 3.98 ($SD = .633$).

Age

There was no statistically significant difference between the age of participating public middle school principals and their levels of job satisfaction ($p = .701$). Principals older than 55 years of age reported the lowest level of job satisfaction ($M = 4.02$, $SD = .590$). Participating principals younger than 35 years of age reported the highest levels of job satisfaction ($M = 4.29$, $SD = .420$).

Degree Status

No significant difference exists between the job satisfaction and the degree status of participating principals ($p = .442$). Those respondents who reported having their

doctorate had a mean score of 4.01 (SD = .689). Respondents with an educational specialist degree reported the highest level of job satisfaction (M = 4.12, SD = .475).

Experience as a Middle School Principal

This study found no significant difference between the number of years as a public middle school principal and the level of job satisfaction (p = .820). Those principals who reported being on the job for 4 to 6 years of service had lower levels of job satisfaction (M = 4.01, SD = .503) than all other reporting groups. Participants with 7 to 9 years of experience as principals reported having the highest levels of job satisfaction (M = 4.13, SD = .560).

School Location

A participant's school location had no significant affect on the job satisfaction level of respondents (p = .706). Principals located in urban areas reported having the lowest level of job satisfaction (M = 3.97, SD = .671). Participating principals located in suburban areas had the highest level of job satisfaction (M = 4.12, SD = .561), with rural area respondents falling in the middle (M = 4.01, SD = .503).

School Population

School population had no statistically significant affect on the level of job satisfaction reported by participating public middle school principals (p = .128). Respondents working in schools with 400 or fewer students reported having the lowest levels of job satisfaction (M = 3.91, SD = .496). The highest level of job satisfaction was reported by principals in schools having populations of 1000 students or more (M = 4.15, SD = .464).

Question 3

What is the general satisfaction level of public middle school principals for each of the 20 dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

A mean score and standard deviation for each of the twenty dimensions of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was calculated and ranked in descending order. Information regarding the mean scores for each of the twenty dimensions can be found in Table 25. Eleven out of the 20 dimensions demonstrated that respondents are very satisfied with these aspects of their positions, while the remaining nine dimensions indicated that respondents are satisfied with these certain areas of the principalship.

Table 25.

Rank Order of MSQ Dimensions

Dimensions	N	M	SD
1. Social Service	190	4.52	.574
2. Moral Value	190	4.37	.563
3. Creativity	190	4.35	.610
4. Achievement	190	4.33	.619
5. Ability	190	4.31	.657
6. Activity	190	4.31	.558
7. Variety	190	4.23	.542
8. Coworkers	190	4.14	.684
9. Responsibility	190	4.13	.611

10. Working Conditions	190	4.08	.826
11. Security	190	4.01	.777
12. Authority	190	3.97	.601
13. Supervision - Human Relations	190	3.97	.964
14. Supervision - Technical	190	3.94	.884
15. Independence	190	3.84	.698
16. Social Status	190	3.82	.658
17. School Policies and Practices	190	3.82	.821
18. Advancement	190	3.74	.931
19. Recognition	190	3.67	.919
20. Compensation	190	3.51	.963

Question 4

What was the satisfaction level for each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ according to the demographic variables of gender, age, degree status, experience as a school principal, school location, and school population?

The satisfaction score for each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ were analyzed according to the independent variables of: gender, age, degree status, experience as a middle school principal, school location, and school population. Statistical analyses were conducted and results placed in Tables 26 – 49. An analysis of variance was conducted to compare the means of each demographic group. Significance was measured at ($p < .05$) level. The Scheffe post hoc test of analyses was conducted to determine if any significant difference exists among subgroups.

Ability Utilization

The results from job satisfaction and principals' ability utilization by gender, age, degree status, experience as a middle school principal, school location, and school population are located in Table 26. Analysis of the results demonstrates that the highest levels of job satisfaction among participating principals was found in male principals (M = 4.39, SD = .569), principals who are younger than 35 (M = 4.45, SD = .743), principals holding an educational specialist degree (M = 4.46, SD = .554), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.49, SD = .581), principals working in suburban locations (M = 4.42, SD = .569), and principals who worked in schools with populations of more than 1,000 students (M = 4.50, SD = .635).

The lowest levels of job satisfaction with ability utilization were reported with: female principals (M = 4.21, SD = .866), principals between the ages of 36 – 45 (M = 4.23, SD = .835), principals with 0 – 3 years of experience (M = 4.22, SD = .801), principals with their masters degrees (M = 4.28, SD = .668), principals located in urban school systems (M = 4.19, SD = .843), and principals in schools with a population of less than 400 students (M = 4.14, SD = .641). The mean scores ranged from 4.28 to 4.50 which indicates that respondents were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their opportunities to use their abilities in the role of principal.

The ANOVA indicated a significant reading (p = .014) regarding school location. The Scheffe post hoc test indicated that no significant difference existed among the means of rural, urban, and suburban schools. These results are located in Table 27.

Table 26.

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimensions: Ability Utilizations

Variable	N	M	SD	f	P
Gender					
Male	105	4.39	.569		
Female	85	4.21	.866		
Total	190	4.31	.657	1.508	.107
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.45	.743		
36 – 45	56	4.23	.835		
46 – 55	87	4.31	.512		
Older than 55	36	4.37	.642		
Total	190	4.31	.657	1.095	.364
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.80			
Masters	137	4.28	.668		
Education Specialist	23	4.46	.554		
Doctorate	29	4.33	.658		
Total	190	4.31	.657	.541	.915

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.22	.801		
4 – 6	60	4.35	.465		
7 – 9	22	4.49	.581		
10 or more	30	4.33	.608		
Total	190	4.31	.657	1.601	.077
School Location					
Rural	80	4.25	.649		
Suburban	78	4.42	.569		
Urban	32	4.19	.843		
Total	190	4.31	.657	2.064	.014*
School Population					
400 or less	32	4.14	.641		
401 – 600	41	4.25	.812		
601 – 800	42	4.35	.444		
801 – 1,000	37	4.28	.684		
More than 1,000	38	4.50	.635		
Total	190	4.31	.657	1.264	.230

* $p < .05$

Table 27.

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Ability Utilization and Area

Area (I)	Area (J)	Mean difference (I – J)	p
Rural	Suburban	-.1706	.262
	Urban	.0775	.851
Suburban	Rural	.1706	.262
	Urban	.2481	.197
Urban	Rural	- .0775	.851
	Suburban	- .2481	.197

*p < .05

Achievement

The results of job satisfaction with the participating principals' feeling of accomplishment by gender, age, degree status, experience, school population, and school location can be found in Table 28. The highest levels of job satisfaction were reported in: male principals (M = 4.37, SD = .497), principals older than 55 years of age (M = 4.41, SD = .509), principals with an educational specialist degree (M = 4.49, SD = .451), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.43, SD = .579), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.43, SD = .601), and principals working in schools with student populations larger than 1,000 students (M = 4.51, SD = .532).

The lowest levels of job satisfaction were found in: female principals (M = 4.29, SD = .744), principals between than the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 4.30, SD = .497), principals

with their doctorates (M = 4.26, SD = .807), principals with 0 – 3 years of experience as a middle school principal (M = 4.28, SD = .762), principals located in urban schools (M = 4.17, SD .881), and principals working in schools with a student population of less than 400 students (M = 4.19, SD = .459). The mean scores ranged from 4.51 to 4.26 which indicates that respondents were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their opportunities to use their abilities in the role of principal.

The ANOVA produced a significant reading (p = .030) regarding school location. The Scheffe post hoc test indicate that no significant difference exists among the means of schools with populations of 400 or less, 401 – 600 students, 601 – 800 students, 801 – 1,000 students, or schools with more than 1,000 students. Results from the Scheffe post hoc test are located in Table 29.

Table 28.

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimensions: Achievement

Variable	N	M	SD	f	Q
Gender					
Male	105	4.37	.497		
Female	85	4.29	.744		
Total	190	4.33	.619	.743	.719
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.40	.514		

36 – 45	56	4.33	.848		
46 – 55	87	4.30	.497		
Older than 55	36	4.41	.509		
Total	190	4.33	.619	1.049	.407
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.80			
Masters	137	4.33	.599		
Education Specialist	23	4.49	.451		
Doctorate	29	4.26	.807		
Total	190	4.33	.619	1.454	.139
Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.28	.762		
4 – 6	60	4.37	.469		
7 – 9	22	4.43	.579		
10 or more	30	4.33	.496		
Total	190	4.33	.619	.486	.931
School Location					
Rural	80	4.31	.498		
Suburban	78	4.43	.601		
Urban	32	4.17	.881		

Total	190	4.33	.619	1.151	.320
School Population					
400 or less	32	4.19	.459		
401 – 600	41	4.31	.798		
601 – 800	42	4.35	.479		
801 – 1,000	37	4.29	.722		
More than 1,000	38	4.51	.532		
Total	190	4.33	.619	1.921	.030*

* $p < .05$

Table 29.

Scheffe Post Hoc Tests for Achievement and School Enrollment

Area (I)	Area (J)	Mean difference (I – J)	p
400 Students or less	401 – 599	-.475	.962
	600 – 699	-.746	.824
	800 – 999	-.496	.959
	> 1,000	-.139	.282
401 - 599	400 Students or less	.475	.962
	600 – 699	-.270	.994
	800 – 999	-.021	1.000
	> 1,000	-.925	.641

600 – 699	400 Students or less	.746	.824
	401 – 599	.270	.994
	800 – 999	.249	1.000
	> 1,000	- .654	.641
800 – 999	400 Students or less	.496	.959
	401 – 599	.021	1.000
	600 - 699	- .249	.996
	> 1,000	- .904	.683
Greater than 1,000 Students	400 Students or less	1.390	.282
	401 – 599	.925	.641
	600 – 699	.654	.865
	800 – 999	.904	.683

*p < .05

Activity

Analyses of participants' job satisfaction concerning their ability to remain busy at work by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population are located in Table 30. The highest levels of job satisfaction among respondents were reported by: female principals (M = 4.33, SD = .598), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.41, SD = .596), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.40, SD = .549), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.41, SD = .584), principals in

suburban areas (M = 4.35, SD = .506), and principals in schools with a student population of more than 1,000 (M = 4.42, SD = .570).

The lowest reported satisfaction scores were: male principals (M = 4.29, SD = .526), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 4.25, SD = .520), principals with their doctoral degrees (M = 4.23, SD = .756), principals with 4 – 6 years of experience (M = 4.25, SD = .497), principals located in rural schools (M = 4.25, SD = .506), and principals in schools with a student population of 400 students or less (M = 4.20, SD = .474). The mean scores range from 4.60 to 4.20 which indicate that respondents were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with the opportunities to remain busy in the principalship.

The analysis of variance produced no significant differences in job satisfaction with activity and gender, age, degree, experience, school location, or school population.

Table 30.

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimensions: Activity

Variable	N	M	SD	f	P
Gender					
Male	105	4.29	.526		
Female	85	4.33	.598		
Total	190	4.31	.558	.854	.587
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.41	.596		

36 – 45	56	4.35	.632		
46 – 55	87	4.25	.520		
Older than 55	36	4.34	.523		
Total	190	4.31	.558	1.211	.283
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	4.60			
Masters	137	4.31	.513		
Education Specialist	23	4.40	.549		
Doctorate	29	4.23	.756		
Total	190	4.31	.558	1.775	.061
Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.33	.608		
4 – 6	60	4.25	.497		
7 – 9	22	4.41	.584		
10 or more	30	4.29	.532		
Total	190	4.31	.558	.931	.529
School Location					
Rural	80	4.25	.506		
Suburban	78	4.35	.620		
Urban	32	4.33	.536		

Total	190	4.31	.558	.826	.615
School Population					
400 or less	32	4.20	.474		
401 – 600	41	4.36	.506		
601 – 800	42	4.30	.512		
801 – 1,000	37	4.23	.703		
More than 1,000	38	4.42	.570		
Total	190	4.31	.558	1.552	.117

* $p < .05$

Advancement

Table 31 displays the job satisfaction level of participating principals' opportunities for advancement by gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population. The highest reported levels of job satisfaction were found in: male principals (M = 3.89, SD = .777), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 3.98, SD = 1.09), principals with degrees as educational specialists (M = 3.84, SD = .894), principals with 4 – 6 years of experience (M = 3.84, SD = .797), principals in suburban schools (M = 3.90, SD = .862), and principals in schools with student populations of more than 1,000 students (M = 3.89, SD = .853).

The lowest job satisfaction levels were reported by: female principals (M = 3.56, SD = 1.07), principals older than 55 years of age (M = 3.55, SD = .951), principals with their doctorate (M = 3.70, SD = .989), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 3.55, SD = .936), principals in urban schools (M = 3.57, SD = 1.10), and principals in

schools with 400 students or less (M = 3.43, SD = .856). The mean scores ranged from 3.70 to 3.98, which indicates that respondents were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with their opportunities for advancement.

The ANOVA produced a significant reading (p = .023) regarding principals' opportunity for advancement. However, the Scheffe post hoc test indicated that no significant difference existed between the means of male and female chances for advancement.

Table 31.

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimensions: Advancement

Variable	N	M	SD	f	P
Gender					
Male	105	3.89	.777		
Female	85	3.56	1.070		
Total	190	3.74	.931	1.810	.023*
Age					
Younger than 35	11	3.98	1.090		
36 – 45	56	3.80	.959		
46 – 55	87	3.75	.887		
Older than 55	36	3.55	.951		
Total	190	3.74	.931	1.071	.385

Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	2.80			
Masters	137	3.74	.930		
Education Specialist	23	3.84	.894		
Doctorate	29	3.70	.989		
Total	190	3.74	.931	.797	.715
Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.78	.993		
4 – 6	60	3.84	.797		
7 – 9	22	3.55	.936		
10 or more	30	3.58	1.010		
Total	190	3.74	.931	1.166	.290
School Location					
Rural	80	3.67	.913		
Suburban	78	3.90	.862		
Urban	32	3.57	1.100		
Total	190	3.74	.931	.784	.731
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.43	.856		
401 – 600	41	3.71	1.130		

601 – 800	42	3.87	.854		
801 – 1,000	37	3.74	.896		
More than 1,000	38	3.89	.853		
Total	190	3.74	.931	.893	.597

* $p < .05$

Authority

Table 32 depicts participating principals' job satisfaction level with their opportunity to tell others what to do by gender, age, degree, experience, school location and population. The highest mean scores for respondents were: male principals (M = 4.06, SD = .575), principals younger than 35 (M = 4.11, SD = .531), principals with masters degrees (M = 4.00, SD = .587), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.20, SD = .592), principals located in urban areas (M = 4.10, SD = .632), and principals working in schools with student populations of 1,000 or more (M = 4.09, SD = .575).

The lowest mean scores were reported by: female principals (M = 3.89, SD = .632), principals between the ages of 36 – 45 (M = 3.94, SD = .682), principals with doctorate (M = 3.96, SD = .729), principals with 4 – 6 years of experience (M = 3.94, SD = .596), principals located in rural school settings (M = 3.93, SD = .584), and principals of schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.79, SD = .629). The mean scores ranged from 3.96 to 4.20, which indicates that respondents were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) to very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their levels of authority in their positions.

The ANOVA conducted produced no significant differences between authority and any of the demographic subgroups.

Table 32.

Demographic Scores for MSQ Dimensions: Authority

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.06	.575		
Female	85	3.89	.623		
Total	190	3.99	.601	.713	.759
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.11	.531		
36 – 45	56	3.94	.682		
46 – 55	87	3.99	.566		
Older than 55	36	4.00	.584		
Total	190	3.99	.601	1.279	.224
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.40			
Masters	137	4.00	.587		
Education Specialist	23	3.97	.521		
Doctorate	29	3.96	.729		
Total	190	3.97	.601	1.044	.413

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.97	.620		
4 – 6	60	3.94	.596		
7 – 9	22	4.20	.592		
10 or more	30	3.97	.559		
Total	190	3.99	.601	.512	.924
School Location					
Rural	80	3.93	.584		
Suburban	78	4.01	.605		
Urban	32	4.10	.632		
Total	190	3.99	.601	.586	.873
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.79	.629		
401 – 600	41	4.00	.538		
601 – 800	42	4.00	.512		
801 – 1,000	37	4.01	.740		
More than 1,000	38	4.09	.575		
Total	190	3.97	.601	.717	.755

* $p < .05$

School Policies and Practices

Information regarding participating principals' job satisfaction with the way school policies are implemented by gender, age, degree, experience, school population and location is located in Table 33. The highest mean scores were identified as: male principals (M = 3.86, SD = .714), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.11, SD = .589), principals with an educational specialist degree (M = 4.09, SD = .663), principals with 0 – 3 years of experience (M = 3.83, SD = .872), principals located in a suburban area (M = 3.90, SD = .751), and principals with schools that have a student population of 601 – 800 (M = 3.93, SD = .817).

The lowest mean scores were reported by: female principals (M = 3.77, SD = .939), principals between the ages of 36 – 45 (M = 3.75, SD = .989), principals with a doctorate (M = 3.76, SD = .822), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 3.80, SD = .696), principals located in urban schools (M = 3.76, SD = .895), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.67, SD = .848). The range of mean scores for school policies were 3.76 – 4.11, which indicated that respondents were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) to very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99).

The analysis of variance produced a significant reading (p = .046) regarding principals' years of experience in the position. The Scheffe post hoc test indicated that no significant difference existed among the means of the following years of experience: 0 – 3, 4 – 6, 7 – 9, and 10 or more. These results of the Scheffe post hoc test can be found in Table 34.

Table 33.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: School Policies and Practices

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	3.86	.714		
Female	85	3.77	.939		
Total	190	3.82	.821	.964	.506
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.11	.589		
36 – 45	56	3.75	.989		
46 – 55	87	3.83	.742		
Older than 55	36	3.80	.784		
Total	190	3.82	.821	1.067	.389
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	2.20			
Masters	137	3.78	.833		
Education Specialist	23	4.09	.663		
Doctorate	29	3.76	.822		
Total	190	3.82	.821	.927	.550

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.83	.872		
4 – 6	60	3.81	.772		
7 – 9	22	3.80	.696		
10 or more	30	3.83	.902		
Total	190	3.82	.821	1.666	.046*
School Location					
Rural	80	3.78	.847		
Suburban	78	3.90	.751		
Urban	32	3.76	.895		
Total	190	3.82	.821	1.183	.278
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.67	.848		
401 – 600	41	3.81	.961		
601 – 800	42	3.93	.817		
801 – 1,000	37	3.86	.731		
More than 1,000	38	3.77	.739		
Total	190	3.82	.821	1.046	.412

* $p < .05$

Table 34.

Scheffe Post Hoc Test: Policy and Practice/Years as Principal

Years (I)	Years (J)	Mean difference (I – J)	Sig
0 – 3	4 – 6	.012	1.000
	7 – 9	.026	.999
	10 or more	-.001	1.000
4 – 6	0 – 3	-.012	1.00
	7 – 9	.013	1.00
	10 or more	-.013	1.00
7 – 9	0 – 3	-.026	.999
	4 – 6	-.013	1.000
	10 or more	-.027	1.000
10 or more	0 – 3	.001	1.00
	4 – 6	.013	1.00
	7 – 9	.027	1.00

*P < .05

Compensation

Table 35 contains the results of principal satisfaction with the amount of pay received for the work conducted. These scores are presented by the demographic groups of gender, age, degree, experience, school location and population. The highest mean

scores were: male principals (M = 3.57, SD = .952), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 3.71, SD = .797), principals with masters degrees (M = 3.56, SD = .933), principals with 0 – 3 years of experience (M = 3.53, SD = .920), principals located in suburban areas (M = 3.65, SD = .945), and principals of schools with student populations in the range of 601 – 800 (M = 3.74, SD = .930).

The lowest mean scores reported were: female principals (M = 3.44, SD = .978), principals older than 55 years of age (M = 3.43, SD = .976), principals with doctorates (M = 3.39, SD = 1.07), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 3.45, SD = 1.13), principals in rural area schools (M = 3.38, SD = 1.01), and principals of schools with populations of 1,000 or more (M = 3.34, SD = 1.06). The range of mean scores was 3.39 – 3.74, which indicates that participating principals were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with the amount of pay received for their efforts.

The analysis of variance conducted produced no significant differences between compensation and the demographic subgroups of age, gender, degree, years of experience, school population, and school location.

Table 35.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Compensation

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	105	3.57	.952		
Female	85	3.44	.978		
Total	190	3.51	.963	.738	.783

Age					
Younger than 35	11	3.71	.797		
36 – 45	56	3.61	1.050		
46 – 55	87	3.46	.925		
Older than 55	36	3.43	.976		
Total	190	3.51	.963	.505	.962
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.2			
Masters	137	3.56	.933		
Education Specialist	23	3.40	1.040		
Doctorate	29	3.39	1.070		
Total	190	3.51	.963	.529	.951
Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.53	.920		
4 – 6	60	3.52	.864		
7 – 9	22	3.45	1.130		
10 or more	30	3.48	1.160		
Total	190	3.51	.963	.808	.706

School Location					
Rural	80	3.38	1.010		
Suburban	78	3.65	.945		
Urban	32	3.51	.862		
Total	190	3.51	.963	.918	.565
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.43	.976		
401 – 600	41	3.58	.983		
601 – 800	42	3.74	.930		
801 – 1,000	37	3.43	.857		
More than 1,000	38	3.34	1.060		
Total	190	3.51	.963	1.274	.203

* $p < .05$

Co-workers

Table 36 contains principals' job satisfaction with the way they get along with their co-workers. The information is presented by the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, years of experience, school location and population. The highest reported scores were observed for: male principals (M = 4.17, SD = .598), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 4.19, SD = .619), principals with masters degrees (M = 4.16, SD = .690), principals with 10 or more years of experience (M = 4.28, SD = .572), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.26, SD = .638), and principals in schools with student populations of 1,000 or more (M = 4.25, SD = .628).

The lowest scores observed were with: female principals (M = 4.10, SD = .780), principals between the ages of 36 – 45 (M = 4.03, SD = .787), principals with their doctorate (M = 4.06, SD = .727), principals with 0 – 3 years of experience (M = 4.05, SD = .753), principals working in urban schools (M = 3.96, SD = .844), and principals in schools with a student population of 400 or less (M = 3.96, SD = .643). The range of mean scores was 4.06 – 4.28. This indicates that participating principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their fellow co-workers.

The ANOVA produced no significant differences among the means of co-workers and gender, age, degree, experience, school location or size.

Table 36.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Co-workers

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.17	.598		
Female	85	4.10	.780		
Total	190	4.14	.684	.706	.720
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.18	.812		
36 – 45	56	4.03	.787		
46 – 55	87	4.19	.619		
Older than 55	36	4.16	.633		

Total	190	4.14	.684	1.650	.065
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.40			
Masters	137	4.16	.690		
Education Specialist	23	4.14	.670		
Doctorate	29	4.06	.727		
Total	190	4.14	.684	.838	.634
Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.05	.753		
4 – 6	60	4.13	.635		
7 – 9	22	4.24	.700		
10 or more	30	4.28	.572		
Total	190	4.14	.684	1.037	.419
School Location					
Rural	80	4.09	.645		
Suburban	78	4.26	.638		
Urban	32	3.96	.844		
Total	190	4.14	.684	1.090	.368

School Population					
400 or less	32	3.96	.643		
401 – 600	41	4.08	.802		
601 – 800	42	4.23	.619		
801 – 1,000	37	4.13	.701		
More than 1,000	38	4.25	.628		
Total	190	4.14	.684	1.705	.054

* $p < .05$

Creativity

Information regarding participating principal job satisfaction for the opportunity to try one's own ideas in completing a task by gender, age, degree, experience, school population and location is located in Table 37. The highest mean scores were seen in: male principals (M = 4.37, SD = .558), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.61, SD = .469), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.58, SD = .489), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.47, SD = .507), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.40, SD = .576), and principals in schools with student populations of 1,000 or more (M = 4.51, SD = .474).

The lowest scores for creativity were: female principals (M = 4.32, SD = .663), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 4.31, SD = .515), principals with masters degrees (M = 4.29, SD = .599), principals with 10 years or more of experience (M = 4.24, SD = .673), principals located in rural schools (M = 4.31, SD = .623), and principals in schools with student populations of 800 – 1,000 (M = 4.27, SD = .665). The range of

mean scores fell between 4.20 – 4.61. These scores indicate that participating principals were very satisfied (4.29 – 4.99) with the amount of creativity in their roles as principal.

The analysis of variance indicates no significant difference among the mean scores for creativity and age, gender, degree, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 37.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Creativity

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.37	.558		
Female	85	4.32	.663		
Total	190	4.35	.606	1.358	.173
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.61	.469		
36 – 45	56	4.35	.748		
46 – 55	87	4.31	.515		
Older than 55	36	4.36	.605		
Total	190	4.35	.606	.583	.885
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	4.20			

Masters	137	4.29	.599		
Education Specialist	23	4.58	.489		
Doctorate	29	4.41	.699		
Total	190	4.35	.606	1.125	.338
Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.38	.672		
4 – 6	60	4.32	.509		
7 – 9	22	4.47	.507		
10 or more	30	4.24	.673		
Total	190	4.35	.606	1.210	.268
School Location					
Rural	80	4.31	.623		
Suburban	78	4.40	.576		
Urban	32	4.32	.657		
Total	190	4.35	.606	1.074	.383
School Population					
400 or less	32	4.29	.614		
401 – 600	41	4.29	.790		
601 – 800	42	4.39	.415		
801 – 1,000	37	4.27	.665		

More than 1,000	38	4.51	.474		
Total	190	4.35	.606	.740	.742

* $p < .05$

Independence

Data regarding principal satisfaction with the chance to work alone by gender, age, degree, level of experience, school population, and school location can be found in Table 38. The highest mean scores reported were by: male principals (M = 3.91, SD = .645), principals older than 55 (M = 3.94, SD = .751), principals with their doctorate (M = 3.97, SD = .743), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.14, SD = .751), principals in suburban schools (M = 3.89, SD = .723), and principals in schools with student populations between 601 – 800 students (M = 3.99, SD = .624).

The lowest levels of principals' job satisfaction for independence were found in: female principals (M = 3.77, SD = .756), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 3.64, SD = .662), principals with their masters degrees (M = 3.81, SD = .702), principals with 4 – 6 years of experience (M = 3.74, SD = .680), principals located in rural schools (M = 3.79, SD = .646), and principals in school with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.66, SD = .631). The range of mean scores for independence was 3.64 – 4.20. This range indicates that participating principals were either satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) or very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their amount of independence on the job.

An analysis of variance was conducted on the data set, which found no significant difference among the means of independence and the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 38.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Independence

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	3.91	.645		
Female	85	3.77	.756		
Total	190	3.84	.698	.959	.507
Age					
Younger than 35	11	3.64	.662		
36 – 45	56	3.74	.793		
46 – 55	87	3.89	.608		
Older than 55	36	3.94	.751		
Total	190	3.84	.698	1.069	.388
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	4.20			
Masters	137	3.81	.702		
Education Specialist	23	3.87	.634		
Doctorate	29	3.97	.743		
Total	190	3.84	.698	.534	.933

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.76	.689		
4 – 6	60	3.74	.680		
7 – 9	22	4.14	.751		
10 or more	30	4.03	.648		
Total	190	3.84	.698	.647	.850
School Location					
Rural	80	3.79	.646		
Suburban	78	3.89	.723		
Urban	32	3.83	.784		
Total	190	3.84	.698	1.421	.132
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.66	.631		
401 – 600	41	3.88	.739		
601 – 800	42	3.99	.624		
801 – 1,000	37	3.73	.689		
More than 1,000	38	3.90	.774		
Total	190	3.84	.698	1.148	.313

Moral Value

Table 16 depicts principal job satisfaction with not having to conduct actions that go against their conscience. Table 39 addresses this data and is organized based on the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, years of experience, school location and population. The highest mean scores were observed in: male principals (M = 4.39, SD = .520), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.54, SD = .543), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.49, SD = .507), principals with 10 years or more of experience (M = 4.51, SD = .399), principals in suburban schools (M = 4.44, SD = .566), and principals of schools with student populations of 1,000 or more (M = 4.56, SD = .399).

The lowest scores were observed in: female principals (M = 4.35, SD = .614), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 4.34, SD = .486), principals with their doctorate (M = 4.27, SD = .737), principals with 4 – 6 years of experience (M = 4.31, SD = .513), principals working in rural schools (M = 4.31, SD = .593), and principals with schools that have student populations between 801 – 1,000 (M = 4.22, SD = .785). The range of mean scores for moral value was 4.00 – 4.56, which indicates that participating principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with not having to conduct actions against their conscience.

An analysis of variance was conducted for principal job satisfaction and moral value. No statistically significant reading was found for the demographic factors of: gender, age, degree status, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 39.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Moral Value

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.39	.520		
Female	85	4.35	.614		
Total	190	4.37	.563	1.074	.384
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.54	.543		
36 – 45	56	4.35	.693		
46 – 55	87	4.34	.486		
Older than 55	36	4.41	.525		
Total	190	4.37	.563	.490	.928
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	4.00			
Masters	137	4.39	.527		
Education Specialist	23	4.49	.507		
Doctorate	29	4.22	.737		
Total	190	4.37	.563	1.713	.062

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.35	.619		
4 – 6	60	4.31	.513		
7 – 9	22	4.42	.665		
10 or more	30	4.51	.399		
Total	190	4.37	.563	.920	.534
School Location					
Rural	80	4.31	.593		
Suburban	78	4.44	.566		
Urban	32	4.37	4.37		
Total	190	4.37	.563	1.045	.411
School Population					
400 or less	32	4.29	.648		
401 – 600	41	4.43	.467		
601 – 800	42	4.33	.421		
801 – 1,000	37	4.22	.785		
More than 1,000	38	4.56	.399		
Total	190	4.37	.563	1.214	.273

* $p < .05$

Recognition

The information concerning principals' job satisfaction and the praise they receive for doing a good job is located in Table 40. The data is present for the following demographic variables: age, gender, degree, years of experience, school population and size. The highest reported mean scores were observed in: male principals (M = 3.76, SD = .821), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.07, SD = .728), principals with doctorate degrees (M = 3.88, SD = .737), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 3.84, SD = .931), principals located in suburban schools (M = 3.79, SD = .861), and principals in schools with student populations between 601 – 800 (M = 3.85, SD = .848).

The lowest reported scores were: female principals (M = 3.56, SD = 1.02), principals older than 55 (M = 3.52, SD = .854), principals with masters degrees (M = 3.62, SD = .527), principals with 10 or more years of experience (M = 3.45, SD = .984), principals located in rural schools (M = 3.56, SD = .924), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.42, SD = .988). The range of mean scores was 3.62 – 4.07, which indicates that principals were either satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) or very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with the level of recognition received in their positions.

The ANOVA produced no statistically significant readings concerning participating principals' job satisfaction and the amount of praise received on their jobs for the demographic variables of: age, gender, degree, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 40.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Recognition

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	3.76	.821		
Female	85	3.56	1.020		
Total	190	3.67	.919	1.055	.402
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.07	.728		
36 – 45	56	3.79	.943		
46 – 55	87	3.60	.939		
Older than 55	36	3.52	.854		
Total	190	3.67	.919	.829	.664
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	2.60			
Masters	137	3.62	.527		
Education Specialist	23	3.73	.507		
Doctorate	29	3.88	.737		
Total	190	3.67	.919	1.460	.110

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.72	.986		
4 – 6	60	3.64	.782		
7 – 9	22	3.84	.931		
10 or more	30	3.45	.984		
Total	190	3.67	.919	1.157	.303
School Location					
Rural	80	3.56	.924		
Suburban	78	3.79	.861		
Urban	32	3.68	1.030		
Total	190	3.67	.919	1.489	.099
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.42	.988		
401 – 600	41	3.69	.988		
601 – 800	42	3.85	.848		
801 – 1,000	37	3.69	.851		
More than 1,000	38	3.65	.918		
Total	190	3.67	.919	1.320	.180

* $p < .05$

Responsibility

The data for principal job satisfaction with the freedom to use one's own judgment by gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location is presented in Table 41. The highest mean job satisfaction scores were reported by: male principals (M = 4.19, SD = .569), principals younger than 35 (M = 4.35, SD = .552), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.19, SD = .538), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.23, SD = .589), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.19, SD = .631), and principals in schools with student populations of more than 1,000 (M = 4.28, SD = .487).

The lowest scores were reported by: female principals (M = 4.06, SD = .656), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 4.11, SD = .526), principals with masters degrees (M = 4.13, SD = .616), principals with 10 years or more of experience (M = 4.08, SD = .684), principals in urban schools (M = 3.99, SD = .688), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.97, SD = .545). The range of mean scores was 4.13 – 4.35, which indicates that principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with the level responsibility on the job.

An analysis of variance was conducted for job satisfaction and responsibility. The test produced no statistically significant difference for the means of responsibility and the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 41.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Responsibility

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.19	.569		
Female	85	4.06	.656		
Total	190	4.13	.611	1.402	.151
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.35	.552		
36 – 45	56	4.12	.729		
46 – 55	87	4.11	.526		
Older than 55	36	4.14	.629		
Total	190	4.13	.611	.874	.594
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.80			
Masters	137	4.13	.616		
Education Specialist	23	4.19	.538		
Doctorate	29	4.14	.666		
Total	190	4.13	.611	1.556	.091

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.14	.671		
4 – 6	60	4.11	.499		
7 – 9	22	4.23	.589		
10 or more	30	4.08	.684		
Total	190	4.13	.611	.610	.864
School Location					
Rural	80	4.13	.559		
Suburban	78	4.19	.631		
Urban	32	3.99	.688		
Total	190	4.13	.611	1.371	.166
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.97	.545		
401 – 600	41	4.17	.688		
601 – 800	42	4.14	.543		
801 – 1,000	37	4.07	.738		
More than 1,000	38	4.28	.487		
Total	190	4.13	.611	1.361	.171

* $p < .05$

Security

Table 42 contains information concerning participating principal job satisfaction and the security that their principalships provide. The information is presented by the following demographic variables: gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location. The highest job satisfaction scores were observed in: male principals (M = 4.07, SD = .695), principals older than 55 years of age (M = 4.12, SD = .713), principals with education specialist degrees (M = 4.04, SD = .822), principals with 10 or more years of experience (M = 4.30, SD = .500), principals in suburban schools (M = 4.13, SD = .748), and principals in school with student populations greater than 1,000 (M = 4.12, SD = .746).

The lowest mean scores were reported by: female principals (M = 3.93, SD = .866), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 3.96, SD = .776), principals with their masters degrees (M = 4.00, SD = .764), principals with 4 – 6 years of experience (M =3.92, SD = .754), principals working in urban schools (M = 3.74, SD = 1.08), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.81, SD = .785). The range of mean scores for security was 3.20 – 4.30. These scores indicate that participating principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with the security aspects of their positions.

An analysis of variance was conducted for job satisfaction and responsibility. The test produced no statistically significant difference for the means of security and the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 42.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Security

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.07	.695		
Female	85	3.93	.866		
Total	190	4.01	.777	1.026	.433
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.11	.524		
36 – 45	56	3.99	.865		
46 – 55	87	3.96	.776		
Older than 55	36	4.12	.713		
Total	190	4.01	.777	.983	.481
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.20			
Masters	137	4.00	.764		
Education Specialist	23	4.04	.822		
Doctorate	29	4.03	.829		
Total	190	4.01	.777	1.282	.205

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.93	.862		
4 – 6	60	3.92	.754		
7 – 9	22	4.11	.770		
10 or more	30	4.30	.500		
Total	190	4.01	.777	.577	.913
School Location					
Rural	80	4.00	.640		
Suburban	78	4.13	.748		
Urban	32	3.74	1.080		
Total	190	4.01	.777	1.290	.200
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.81	.785		
401 – 600	41	3.97	.868		
601 – 800	42	4.10	.657		
801 – 1,000	37	4.01	.823		
More than 1,000	38	4.12	.746		
Total	190	4.01	.777	1.110	.346

* $p < .05$

Social Service

Principals' job satisfaction data regarding their opportunities to assist others is located in Table 43. The information is presented by the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience level, school population and location. The highest scores observed were with: male principals (M = 4.54, SD = .458), principals older than 55 (M = 4.59, SD = .498), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.67, SD = .398), principals with 10 years or more of experience (M = 4.61, SD = .403), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.55, SD = .565), and principals in schools with student populations exceeding 1,000 (M = 4.67, SD = .403).

The lowest mean scores were reported by: female principals (M = 4.48, SD = .692), principals between the ages of 36 – 45 (M = 4.47, SD = .777), principals with their doctorate (M = 4.46, SD = .756), principals working in rural schools (M = 4.51, SD = .480), principals with 0 – 3 years of experience (M = 4.49, SD = .705), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 4.40, SD = .477). The range of mean scores was 4.40 – 4.67 for social service. These scores indicate that participating principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their opportunities to be of service to others in their positions.

An analysis of variance was conducted for principal job satisfaction and social service. No statistically significant reading was found for the demographic factors of: gender, age, degree status, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 43.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Social Service

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.54	.458		
Female	85	4.48	.692		
Total	190	4.51	.574	.495	.916
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.51	.547		
36 – 45	56	4.47	.777		
46 – 55	87	4.51	.445		
Older than 55	36	4.59	.498		
Total	190	4.52	.574	.733	.718
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	4.60			
Masters	137	4.50	.556		
Education Specialist	23	4.67	.398		
Doctorate	29	4.46	.756		
Total	190	4.52	.574	1.629	.087

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.49	.705		
4 – 6	60	4.49	.449		
7 – 9	22	4.55	.576		
10 or more	30	4.61	.403		
Total	190	4.52	.574	.668	.781
School Location					
Rural	80	4.51	.480		
Suburban	78	4.55	.565		
Urban	32	4.45	.799		
Total	190	4.52	.574	1.024	.429
School Population					
400 or less	32	4.40	.477		
401 – 600	41	4.45	.748		
601 – 800	42	4.55	.433		
801 – 1,000	37	4.50	.699		
More than 1,000	38	4.67	.403		
Total	190	4.52	.574	.973	.477

* $p < .05$

Social Status

Information regarding participating principals' job satisfaction and their chances to be somebody in the community is presented in Table 44. The data is arranged according to the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location. The highest mean readings were observed in: male principals (M = 3.89, SD = .626), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 3.95, SD = .594), principals with masters degrees (M = 3.86, SD = .641), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 3.89, SD = .578), principals working in urban schools (M = 3.89, SD = .771), and principals in schools with student populations between 601 – 800 (M = 3.98, SD = .513).

The lowest mean scores were reported by: female principals (M = 3.73, SD = .687), principals older than 55 years of age (M = 3.71, SD = .631), principals with their educational specialist degrees (M = 3.64, SD = .562)), principals with 4- 6 years of experience (M = 3.77, SD = .696), principals working in suburban schools (M = 3.78, SD = .629), and principals of schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.74, SD = .625). The range of mean scores was 3.00 – 3.98, which indicates that participating principals were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with the amount of social status surrounding their positions.

An ANOVA was conducted which found no statistically significant difference among the means of social status and the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 44.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Social Status

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	3.89	.626		
Female	85	3.73	.687		
Total	190	3.82	.658	.790	.688
Age					
Younger than 35	11	3.95	.594		
36 – 45	56	3.81	.790		
46 – 55	87	3.86	.582		
Older than 55	36	3.71	.631		
Total	190	3.82	.658	1.379	.162
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.00			
Masters	137	3.86	.641		
Education Specialist	23	3.64	.562		
Doctorate	29	3.81	.782		
Total	190	3.82	.658	1.070	.388

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.83	.666		
4 – 6	60	3.77	.696		
7 – 9	22	3.89	.578		
10 or more	30	3.87	.633		
Total	190	3.82	.658	.481	.948
School Location					
Rural	80	3.83	.642		
Suburban	78	3.78	.629		
Urban	32	3.89	.771		
Total	190	3.82	.658	.863	.607
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.74	.625		
401 – 600	41	3.79	.693		
601 – 800	42	3.98	.513		
801 – 1,000	37	3.75	.787		
More than 1,000	38	3.83	.653		
Total	190	3.82	.658	.844	.628

Supervision - Human Relation

Table 45 contains information regarding participating principal job satisfaction and their supervision of other workers on the job. The information is presented by the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, years of experience, school population and location. The highest mean scores were observed in: male principals (M = 4.05, SD = .878), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.44, SD = .463), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.15, SD = .769), principals with 10 or more years of experience (M = 4.05, SD = .921), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.01, SD = 1.06), and principals in schools that have student populations in excess of 1,000 (M = 4.14, SD = .832).

The lowest mean scores for participating principals were with: female principals (M = 3.91, SD = 1.06), principals between the ages of 36 – 45 (M = 3.94, SD = 1.18), principals with their bachelor degree (M = 2.00), principals with 0-3 years of experience (M = 3.95, SD = 1.08), principals working in urban schools (M = 3.72, SD = 1.06), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.79, SD = 1.02). The range of mean scores was 2.00 – 4.44. These scores indicate that principals were either slightly satisfied (2.00 – 2.99), satisfied (3.00 – 3.99), or very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with the amount of human relation in their role as principal.

The analysis of variance was conducted and no statistically significant difference was found between supervision – human relation and age, degree, years of experience, school population and location. However, there was a significant reading between males and females (p = .024).

Table 45.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Supervision - Human Relation

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	4.05	.878		
Female	85	3.91	1.060		
Total	190	3.99	.964	1.843	.024*
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.44	.463		
36 – 45	56	3.94	1.180		
46 – 55	87	3.95	.913		
Older than 55	36	4.01	.811		
Total	190	3.99	.964	.853	.636
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	2.00			
Masters	137	3.99	.989		
Education Specialist	23	4.15	.796		
Doctorate	29	3.88	.922		
Total	190	3.97	.964	1.278	.207

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.95	1.080		
4 – 6	60	4.01	.883		
7 – 9	22	3.97	.842		
10 or more	30	4.05	.921		
Total	190	3.99	.964	.606	.892
School Location					
Rural	80	3.91	1.010		
Suburban	78	4.19	.810		
Urban	32	3.72	1.060		
Total	190	3.99	.964	.703	.805
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.79	1.020		
401 – 600	41	3.93	1.140		
601 – 800	42	4.06	.888		
801 – 1,000	37	3.97	.930		
More than 1,000	38	4.14	.832		
Total	190	3.99	.964	1.075	.381

* $p < .05$

Supervision - Technical

Data regarding principals' job satisfaction and their supervisors' ability to advise others is located in Table 46. The information is presented by the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience level, school population and location. The highest scores observed were in: male principals (M = 3.99, SD = .818), principals younger than 35 (M = 4.15, SD = .754), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.04, SD = .965), principals with 7 - 9 years of experience (M = 4.08, SD = .752), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.15, SD = .762), and principals in schools with student populations exceeding 1,000 (M = 4.06, SD = .824).

The lowest mean scores were reported by: female principals (M = 3.88, SD = .960), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 3.92, SD = .851), principals with their doctorate degrees (M = 3.94, SD = .884), principals with 0 – 3 years of experience (M = 3.89, SD = .944), principals working in urban schools (M = 3.65, SD = .984), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 3.74, SD = .796). The range of mean scores was 2.60 – 4.15 for technical - supervision. These scores indicate that participating principals were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) or very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their supervisors' ability to give competent advice to others.

An analysis of variance was conducted on principal job satisfaction and supervision - technical. No statistically significant reading was found for the demographic factors of: gender, age, degree status, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 46.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Supervision - Technical

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Gender					
Male	105	3.99	.818		
Female	85	3.88	.960		
Total	190	3.94	.884	.672	.853
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.15	.754		
36 – 45	56	3.94	1.01		
46 – 55	87	3.92	.851		
Older than 55	36	3.93	.804		
Total	190	3.94	.884	.881	.602
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	2.60			
Masters	137	3.94	.875		
Education Specialist	23	4.04	.965		
Doctorate	29	3.92	.866		
Total	190	3.94	.884	.838	.654

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	3.89	.944		
4 – 6	60	3.91	.838		
7 – 9	22	4.08	.752		
10 or more	30	4.04	.921		
Total	190	3.94	.884	1.238	.236
School Location					
Rural	80	3.87	.912		
Suburban	78	4.15	.762		
Urban	32	3.65	.984		
Total	190	3.92	.884	.644	.861
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.74	.796		
401 – 600	41	3.91	1.07		
601 – 800	42	4.05	.865		
801 – 1,000	37	3.90	.813		
More than 1,000	38	4.06	.824		
Total	190	3.94	.884	.822	.672

* $p < .05$

Variety

Data for principals' job satisfaction and the opportunity to try different things in the position is located in Table 47. The information is presented by the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, experience, school population and location. The highest mean scores were reported by: male principals (M = 4.26, SD = .513), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.29, SD = .653), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 4.44, SD = .372), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.37, SD = .514), principals working in suburban schools (M = 4.27, SD = .606), and principals in schools with student populations exceeding 1,000 (M = 4.36, SD = .439).

The lowest scores were reported by: female principals (M = 4.19, SD = .577), principals older than 55 years of age (M = 4.19, SD = .542), principals with their doctorate (M = 4.16, SD = .719), principals with 4 – 6 years of experience (M = 4.18, SD = .452), principals in rural areas (M = 4.19, SD = .492), and principals in schools with student populations of 400 or less (M = 4.09, SD = .443). The range of mean scores for variety was 4.16 – 4.44. These scores indicate that participating principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with the level of variety in their positions.

An analysis of variance was conducted for principal job satisfaction and variety. No statistically significant reading was found for the demographic factors of: gender, age, degree status, years of experience, school population and location.

Table 47.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Variety

Variable	N	M	SD	f	P
Gender					
Male	105	4.26	.513		
Female	85	4.19	.577		
Total	190	4.23	.542	1.147	.321
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.29	.653		
36 – 45	56	4.22	.656		
46 – 55	87	4.24	.447		
Older than 55	36	4.19	.542		
Total	190	4.23	.542	.709	.763
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.60			
Masters	137	4.21	.517		
Education Specialist	23	4.44	.372		
Doctorate	29	4.16	.719		
Total	190	4.23	.542	1.062	.395

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.21	.627		
4 – 6	60	4.18	.452		
7 – 9	22	4.37	.514		
10 or more	30	4.27	.491		
Total	190	4.23	.542	.468	.947
School Location					
Rural	80	4.19	.492		
Suburban	78	4.27	.606		
Urban	32	4.25	.499		
Total	190	4.23	.542	1.489	.119
School Population					
400 or less	32	4.09	.443		
401 – 600	41	4.22	.595		
601 – 800	42	4.23	.508		
801 – 1,000	37	4.15	.667		
More than 1,000	38	4.36	.439		
Total	190	4.23	.542	.728	.744

* $p < .05$

Working Conditions

Table 48 contains data for principal job satisfaction and the working conditions of the school. The information is presented by the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, experience, school population, and school location. The highest mean scores for working conditions were observed in: female principals (M = 4.11, SD = .577), principals younger than 35 years of age (M = 4.36, SD = .594), principals with masters degrees (M = 4.15, SD = .786), principals with 7 – 9 years of experience (M = 4.19, SD = .712), principals of suburban schools (M = 4.10, SD = .898), and principals in schools with student populations between 401 – 600 students (M = 4.29, SD = .662).

The lowest mean scores for working conditions were reported by: male principals (M = 4.06, SD = .513), principals between the ages of 46 – 55 (M = 4.01, SD = .850), principals with educational specialist degrees (M = 3.40), principals with 10 or more years of experience (M = 4.05, SD = 1.05), principals of rural schools (M = 4.07, SD = .834), principals of schools with student populations of 400 students or less (M = 3.81, SD = 1.04). The range of mean scores for working conditions was 3.40 – 4.36. These scores indicate that participating principals were either satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) or very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their working conditions.

An analysis of variance was conducted and showed no statistically significant difference between working conditions and gender, age, years of experience, school population, and school location. However, a significant reading was reported between working conditions and degree status (p = .036). The Scheffe post hoc test showed no statistically significant difference among the degree statuses of: masters, educational specialist, or doctorate. Results of the post hoc test are located in Table 49.

Table 48.

Demographic Scores for MSQ: Working Conditions

Variable	N	M	SD	f	P
Gender					
Male	105	4.06	.513		
Female	85	4.11	.577		
Total	190	4.23	.542	1.046	.412
Age					
Younger than 35	11	4.36	.594		
36 – 45	56	4.09	.861		
46 – 55	87	4.01	.850		
Older than 55	36	4.16	.777		
Total	190	4.08	.826	1.330	.179
Degree Status					
Bachelors	1	3.40			
Masters	137	4.15	.786		
Education Specialist	23	3.85	.942		
Doctorate	29	3.95	.897		
Total	190	4.08	.826	1.762	.036*

Years as Middle School Principal					
0 – 3	78	4.06	.873		
4 – 6	60	4.09	.678		
7 – 9	22	4.19	.721		
10 or more	30	4.05	1.050		
Total	190	4.08	.826	.559	.918
School Location					
Rural	80	4.07	.834		
Suburban	78	4.10	.898		
Urban	32	4.07	.619		
Total	190	4.08	.826	.588	.898
School Population					
400 or less	32	3.81	1.040		
401 – 600	41	4.29	.662		
601 – 800	42	3.95	.818		
801 – 1,000	37	4.07	.830		
More than 1,000	38	4.24	.731		
Total	190	4.08	.826	1.143	.318

*p < .05

Table 49.

Scheffe Post Hoc Test: Working Condition and Degree

Area (I)	Area (J)	Mean difference (I – J)	p
Masters	Education Specialist	.294	.286
	Doctorate	.194	.513
Educational Specialist	Masters	-.294	.286
	Doctorate	-.099	.911
Doctorate	Masters	-.195	.513
	Education Specialist	.099	.911

*p < .05

Question 5

Based on the demographic variables of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), what is the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?

The general job satisfaction level was determined for the demographic variables of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). ANOVAs were used to compare the mean job satisfaction scores group by each demographic variable. Results from the ANOVAs are located in Table 50.

Accreditation Status

There was no significant difference between job satisfaction of participating principals and school accreditation status (p = .311). Respondents reported the highest

level of job satisfaction (M = 4.07, SD = .535) in the area of Fully Accredited. The lowest level of job satisfaction for participating principals was reported in the area of Provisionally Accredited Meets States Standards (M = 3.88, SD = .401).

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Whether or not a school obtained Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) made no significant difference in the job satisfaction of participating principals. However, those principals who reported making AYP had a higher job satisfaction rating (M = 4.09, SD = .568) than the principals whose schools did not make AYP (M = 3.97, SD = .535).

Table 50.

General Satisfaction and Demographics

Variable	N	M	SD	f	p
Accreditation Status					
Fully Accredited	161	4.07	.535		
Provisionally Accredited Meets States Standards	3	3.88	.401		
Provisionally Accredited Needs Improvement	12	3.79	.891		
Accredited with Warning	14	4.00	.470		
Total	190	4.05	.556	1.12	.311

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)					
Yes	118	4.09	.568		
No	72	3.97	.535		
Total	190	4.04	.558	1.42	.065

Summary

This chapter presented the data obtained from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the demographic information gathered from the Individual Information Sheet. The data that was collected was examined to gain insight into: (a) specific demographic information concerning public middle school principals in Virginia, (b) the overall level of job satisfaction, (c) the level of job satisfaction based on the twenty dimensions of the MSQ, (d) the relationship of the demographic variables to the level of job satisfaction for public middle school principals, and (e) the impact of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on the satisfaction level of participating principals.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter opens with a summary of the study. The first part of the chapter contains a restatement of each research question and a summary of the findings. The second part of the chapter will focus on the conclusions drawn from the study. The third section contains the recommendations for future research and the discussion section concludes the chapter.

Summary of Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction for public middle school principals in Virginia. This study concentrated on determining: (a) the overall satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia; (b) the satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia according to the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, years of experience, school location and student population; (c) the satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia for each of the twenty dimensions of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ); (d) the degree to which each demographic variable predicted job satisfaction of public middle school principals in Virginia; and (e) the overall satisfaction rating of public middle school principals based on the variables of accreditation and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Each of the aforementioned questions was analyzed using descriptive statistics that included frequency distributions, ANOVAs, and Scheffe post hoc test.

Summary of Findings

There were five questions that guided this study. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire long form and a demographic information sheet were used to gather data

on participants' job satisfaction. Information obtained from the MSQ was scored on a five point Lickert scale. The Likert scale was:

Weight	Range	Scale Option
1	(1.00 – 1.99)	Not Satisfied (NS)
2	(2.00 – 2.99)	Slightly Satisfied (SS)
3	(3.00 –3.99)	Satisfied (S)
4	(4.00 – 4.99)	Very Satisfied (VS)
5	(5.00)	Extremely Satisfied (ES)

Each question is presented in this section followed by a summary of the findings.

Question 1

What was the general satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

Based upon the data gathered from 190 returned Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) surveys, the mean general satisfaction level of participants was 4.45 (SD = .610). This demonstrates that respondents were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their positions as principals. Newby's (1999) study showed that principals' mean general satisfaction level was 3.65 (SD = .57). This indicated that at the time of Newby's (1999) study, principals were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with their positions.

Question 2

Based on the demographic variables of: gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population, what is the general satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia?

Gender

Male principals reported a slightly higher level of job satisfaction than their female counterparts. The general mean level of job satisfaction for participating male public middle school principals was 4.10 (SD = .486), while female public middle school principals reported a mean job satisfaction level of 3.98 (SD = .633). In general, both male and female public middle school principals reported higher mean job satisfaction levels than in Newby's (1999) study. While this study revealed no statistically significant difference between male and female principals, male principals reported being more satisfied with their positions. In a similar study conducted with high school principals in Virginia, Stemple (2004) also showed that male principals had a higher job satisfaction level than female principals. These findings are contrary to Newby's (1999) study that reported female principals as having a higher mean job satisfaction level 3.74 (SD = .61) than male principals 3.56 (SD = .52).

Age

The data collected from this study showed that the range of mean scores for all age groups was 4.02 (SD = .509) to 4.29 (SD = .420). This indicates that participating principals, regardless of age, were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with being a public middle school principal. Principals in the youngest group disclosed the highest levels of job satisfaction 4.29 (SD = 420), while those principals in older groups reported lower levels of job satisfaction. The data collected indicates that there were no statistically significant differences between the age of respondents and job satisfaction levels. Similar findings were reported by Stemple (2004) and Newby (1999). This study concurs with the findings of Newby (1999) that younger principals were more satisfied with their positions than

older principals. However, this is contrary to the findings of Herzberg et al. (1957) who claimed that older workers were more satisfied with their positions.

Degree

Based on reported degree status, participating principals scored between 4.04 (SD = .542) and 4.01 (SD = .689) regarding their level of job satisfaction. This demonstrates that regardless of their degree status respondents were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their positions. No statistically significant difference was found between the level of education of principals and their job satisfaction. The highest mean level of job satisfaction was reported by principals with educational specialist degrees 4.12 (SD = .475), followed by principals with their masters degrees 4.04 (SD = .542). The lowest reported mean was principals with their doctorate degrees. These findings mirror Newby's (1999) data and concur with the earlier research conducted by Quinn, Staines, and McCullough (1974). Quinn, Staines, and McCullough (1974) reported that there was no direct link between incremental increases in education and increased job satisfaction.

Experience

There was no statistically significant difference regarding the years as a public middle school principal and the level of job satisfaction. The range of mean scores reported was between 4.01 (SD = .503) and 4.13 (SD = .560). This demonstrates that regardless of years of experience, participating principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their jobs. However, principals in the categories of 7 – 9 years and 10 or more years reported higher mean job satisfaction levels than all other categories. These data concur with the earlier findings of Newby (1999) that more experienced principals reported higher job satisfaction levels. In addition, these findings support earlier work

conducted by Dawis, Lofquist, and Weiss (1968) that demonstrated tenure as a function of correspondence between an individual and their work environment.

School Location

Participating principals working in rural, suburban, and urban areas were satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) to very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their positions as principal. The range of mean scores was between 3.97 (SD = .671) to 4.12 (SD = .561) regarding job satisfaction levels. However, suburban principals reported higher mean satisfaction ratings than their rural and urban counterparts. These data exactly replicated Newby's (1999) findings that reported the highest level of job satisfaction occurred with suburban principals. Further support is found in the research of Derlin and Schneider (1994) and Stemple (2004) that upheld both the higher job satisfaction level of suburban principals and the lower levels of job satisfaction reported by urban and rural school principals.

School Population

Based on school population, participating principals in these categories reported mean scores with a range of 3.91 (SD = .496) to 4.15 (SD = .464). This indicates that regardless of the population of the school, respondents were either satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) or very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their roles as principals. There was no statistically significant difference between the population of the school and the level of job satisfaction. Principals of schools with populations over 1,000 students reported having the highest level of job satisfaction, while principals of schools with populations of 400 students or less reported the lowest levels of job satisfaction. These findings concur with both the findings of Newby (1999) and Stemple (2004) which indicated the job satisfaction increased with the size of the student body.

Question 3

What is the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals on each of the twenty dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

The mean scores for the twenty dimensions were calculated and placed in a hierarchy. The participants reported having the highest mean scores in the following areas: (a) doing things for others (social service – M = 4.52, SD = .574); (b) being able to do things that did not go against their conscience (moral value – M = 4.37, SD = .563); and (c) the opportunity to try one's own methods (creativity – M = 4.35, SD = .610). Compensation had the lowest mean score of any of the twenty dimensions (M = 3.51, SD = .963). These findings are consistent with what was reported by Newby (1999) in her earlier study.

Question 4

Based on the demographic variables of gender, age, degree, experience, school location, and school population, what is the job satisfaction level of public middle school principals for each of the twenty dimensions of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

Gender

Males reported a higher mean satisfaction score 4.10 (SD = .486) than females 3.98 (SD = .633). Under further statistical analysis, it was discovered that males reported being very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with thirteen dimensions and satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with the other 7. Female principals reported being very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with 10 dimensions of the MSQ and satisfied with the other 10 dimensions. There was a

statistically significant difference reported in the dimensions of advancement (p= .023) and supervision-human relation (p = .024). Participating male principals had higher mean job satisfaction levels in eighteen of the twenty dimensions. Female principals scored higher in the categories of activity and working conditions. These findings are contrary to Newby's (1999) findings, which reported that females were more satisfied than male principals. Both studies indicate that female principals were more satisfied with the level of activity associated with the principalship.

Age

Principals younger than thirty-five years of age reported the highest mean job satisfaction level 4.29 (SD = .420). This age group reported being very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with 16 dimensions of the MSQ and satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with 4 dimensions. In addition, principals younger than thirty-five years of age had the highest job satisfaction levels in fifteen of the twenty dimensions of the MSQ. There was no statistically significant difference between the age of respondents and the level of job satisfaction reported.

Degree

Participating principals with their educational specialist degree reported the highest mean job satisfaction level 4.12 (SD = .475). This group reported being very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with 13 dimensions of the MSQ and satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with the other 7. Principals with their doctorate degrees reported the lowest levels of job satisfaction, scoring very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) in 10 dimensions and satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) in the remaining MSQ dimensions. Principals with their educational specialist

degree had higher job satisfaction scores in thirteen dimensions of the MSQ than principals with masters degrees or doctorates.

A statistically significant reading was reported between working conditions and degree status ($p = .036$). The Scheffe post hoc test showed no statistically significant difference among the degree statuses of: masters, educational specialist, or doctorate.

Experience

Participating principals with 7 – 9 and 10 or more years of experience reported having the highest mean levels of job satisfaction. Both groups scored very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) on 13 dimensions of the MSQ and satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) on the other 7. Principals with 7 – 9 years reported the highest mean job satisfaction level 4.13 ($SD = .560$). These principals had higher job satisfaction scores on 11 of 20 dimensions of the MSQ than the other three experience groups.

The analysis of variance produced a statistically significant reading ($p = .046$) regarding principals' years of experience in the position. The Scheffe post hoc test indicated that no statistically significant difference existed among the means of the following years of experience: 0 – 3, 4 – 6, 7 – 9, and 10 or more.

School Location

Participating principals in public suburban middle schools reported having the highest mean job satisfaction level 4.12 ($SD = .561$). These principals demonstrated being very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) on 14 dimensions of the MSQ and satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) on the other 6 dimensions. In addition, these principals had higher job satisfaction ratings on 18 of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ than principals of both rural and urban middle schools.

The ANOVA indicated a statistically significant reading (p = .014) regarding school location. The Scheffe post hoc test indicated that no statistically significant difference existed among the means of rural, urban, and suburban schools.

School Population

Principals who work in schools with student populations that exceed 1,000 students reported having the highest mean job satisfaction level 4.15 (SD = .464). Principals in this group noted being very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with 14 dimensions of the MSQ and satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with the remaining 6 dimensions. Participating principals in this demographic demonstrated higher job satisfaction ratings on 14 out the 20 dimensions of the MSQ than the other four population categories.

The ANOVA produced a statistically significant reading (p = .030) regarding school location. The Scheffe post hoc test indicate that no statistically significant difference exists among the means of schools with populations of 400 or less, 401 – 600 students, 601 – 800 students, 801 – 1,000 students, or schools with more than 1,000 students.

Question 5

Based on the demographic variables of accreditation status and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), what is the general job satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia?

Accreditation Status

Principals who worked in schools that were fully accredited reported the highest level of mean job satisfaction 4.07 (SD = .535). The range of job satisfaction scores was between 4.07 (SD = .535) and 3.79 (SD = .891). This indicates that regardless of

accreditation status, participating principals were either very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) or satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with their role. There was no statistically significant difference between the accreditation status of the schools and the level of principals' job satisfaction.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

The highest mean job satisfaction level for this demographic was reported by principals whose schools had made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) 4.09 (SD = .568). The range of mean job satisfaction scores was 4.09 (SD = .568) to 3.97 (SD = .535). This indicates that regardless of whether or not a school met AYP, principals were either very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) or satisfied (3.00 – 3.99) with their positions as principals. No statistically significant difference was found between job satisfaction levels and the school Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status.

Conclusions

Based upon the data reported in Chapter 4, the following conclusions have been discerned:

1. Since Newby's (1999) study, job satisfaction levels have increased for public middle school principals in Virginia. This study determined that participating principals were very satisfied (4.00 – 4.99) with their roles. A mean job satisfaction score of 4.45 (SD = .558) was reported by respondents.
2. This study indicated that the location of a principal's school plays an important role in his/her job satisfaction level (p = .014). In addition, the highest mean job satisfaction score for school location was reported by principals in suburban

schools (M = 4.12, SD = .561). Principals in suburban areas scored higher on 18 of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ than those in rural and urban districts.

3. This study demonstrated that age plays an important role in the job satisfaction level of participating principals. Principals in the thirty- five years of age or younger demographic reported the highest mean job satisfaction levels 4.29 (SD = .420). Principals in this demographic set reported higher job satisfaction scores than their contemporaries on 15 of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ.
4. Participating male principals reported higher mean job satisfaction levels than female principals. Male principals had a mean job satisfaction level of 4.10 (SD = .486), while female principals reported a mean score of 3.98 (SD = .633). Additionally, male principals had higher job satisfaction ratings on 18 of 20 dimensions of the MSQ than did their female counterparts. Gender played a statistically significant role in the job satisfaction level of participating principals in the MSQ dimensions of advancement (p = .023) and human relations (p = .024).
5. Participating principals who had educational specialist degrees reported the highest mean job satisfaction level (M = 4.12, SD = .475). Respondents in this demographic group scored higher on 13 of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ. Degree status played a statistically significant role in the job satisfaction levels of participants in the MSQ dimension of working conditions (p = .036).
6. Years of experience as a middle school principal had a statistically significant effect on the job satisfaction level of respondents when viewed with the MSQ dimension of school policies and practices (p = .046). Principals with 7 – 9 years

of experience reported having the highest mean job satisfaction level 4.13 (SD = .560). This group scored higher job satisfaction ratings on 11 out of 20 dimensions of the MSQ.

7. Principals of schools with student population in excess of 1,000 students reported the highest mean job satisfaction rate 4.15 (SD = .464). Respondents in this demographic set scored higher on 14 out of 20 dimensions of the MSQ. School population had a statistically significant role with the job satisfaction of respondents in the MSQ dimension of achievement (p = .030).
8. Accreditation and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) had no statistically significant bearing on the job satisfaction rating of participating principals.

Recommendations for Practitioners

This study provides valuable information to state and local officials, superintendents, and human resource personnel that will assist in increasing the job satisfaction of middle school principals. Based on the data gathered from this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Participating principals reported being very satisfied in their positions as middle school principals. It is recommended that state policy makers, superintendents, school boards, human resource departments and central office staff continue their efforts to support principals. As the requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) increase over the coming years, resources and support systems must be continuously evaluated. Only through a concerted effort will the satisfaction level of middle school principals in Virginia remain at its current level.

2. The findings from this study reported that compensation was the lowest job satisfaction dimension reported in the hierarchy. Principals place a value on the job that they perform for their schools. When compensation does not meet that value job satisfaction levels are affected. State and local governments must do more to ensure that principals are compensated at the same rates across the state. In addition, work and responsibility loads must be compared to comparable positions outside the field of education to ensure a competitive pay base. If school officials wish to maintain a consistent supply of qualified principals, issues surrounding principal salaries must be addressed.
3. Participating principals in suburban areas reported having the highest job satisfaction ratings, while their counterparts in urban and rural schools reported lower levels of job satisfaction. State and local school officials must evaluate the challenges facing principals that are created by school location. Only by communicating with these principals can an accurate assessment of their needs be determined. With their needs clearly identified, state and local school officials can allocate the necessary resources to assist principals in improving their schools. This may in turn help close the job satisfaction gap between principals based on their school location.

Recommendations for Future Research

Given the findings and conclusions of this study, this researcher offers seven recommendations. The recommendations are as follows:

1. The long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) measures 20 dimensions of job satisfaction. Each dimension is composed of five questions

making the survey instrument 100 questions long. Many of the respondents made note of the survey's length and repetitious nature. Therefore, it is recommended that the short form of MSQ be utilized or a different job satisfaction inventory be considered.

2. This study was a replication of an earlier project conducted by Dr. JoeAnn Newby (1999). In keeping with the original study, survey instruments were mailed to participants. This method was slow, labor intensive, and costly. Therefore, it is recommended that future researchers use electronic survey methods.
3. This study focused on the job satisfaction levels of public middle school principals based on a predetermined set of demographic variables and the 20 dimensions of the MSQ. Principals were not given the opportunity to expand on survey items. Therefore, it is recommended that some qualitative search techniques be employed to allow principals the opportunity to express their thoughts on given topics.
4. This study could be replicated using public elementary school principals in Virginia. Given recent studies by Stemple (2004) concerning high school principals and this study with middle school principals, a study about public elementary school principals would be useful. This would help demonstrate the job satisfaction level of primary and secondary school principals across the state of Virginia.
5. Compensation was rated as the lowest job satisfaction dimension by participating middle school principals. One question for future researchers would be to

determine at what level of compensation would public middle school principals be satisfied?

6. Participating principals with their doctorate reported the lowest levels of job satisfaction. Future researchers may want to consider what role higher degree status plays with career advancement.
7. Although not directly researched by this study, future researchers may want to explore how technology, data driven decision making, and expanding testing programs affect the job satisfaction levels of principals.

Discussion

This study produced a number of findings surrounding the job satisfaction levels of public middle school principals in Virginia. In this section, some of those major findings will be revisited. The researcher will discuss these data and speculate on possible explanations for the results.

The findings from this study demonstrate that participating principals were very satisfied with their positions. This replicated study showed an increase in the overall job satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia from Newby's (1999) original study. The researcher offers a possible explanation for the increase. At the time of Newby's (1999) study the school accountability movement was in its infancy. Principals were feeling the pressure of SOL testing for the first time. Many school divisions could offer principals little assistance as everyone struggled to understand these new expectations. Subsequently, over the years nerves have settled surrounding accountability testing and most school divisions now offer principals a myriad of resources to help lead their schools to success. The addition of resources and exposure to

the tests has helped most principals settle their collective nerves surrounding high stakes testing; thus, anxiety was reduced and the overall level of job satisfaction increased.

This study demonstrated that compensation was a major concern for participating principals. Compensation rated as the lowest contributor to job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with Newby's (1999) study. One could speculate that principals are reporting concerns with their compensation due to a number of possible reasons. These may include, but are not limited to: (a) discrepancies in the amount of compensation compared to the levels of accountability and responsibility; (b) non-education positions are compensated at higher rates and report greater benefit packages; and (c) amount of time required by the position produces an hourly pay rate lower than that of many teachers. This study helps to illustrate that salary concerns are contributing to the job satisfaction level of participating principals. One question for future researchers would be to determine at what level of compensation would public middle school principals be more satisfied?

Data from this study showed that suburban principals were more satisfied with their positions than their rural and urban peers. One possible reason for the higher job satisfaction rate may be due to the higher socioeconomic standing of many suburban school systems. This equates into modern and better equipped facilities, increased fiscal and human resources, and higher salaries for employees. Additionally, populations of suburban school districts may have a higher percentage of college educated parents who set greater academic expectations for their children. Although this study did not find a statistically significant difference between job satisfaction levels and principal location, it

would be interesting to identify the difference between the principalships and determine how school location plays a role in job satisfaction.

Principals with their educational specialist degree reported the highest level of job satisfaction among participating principals. Interestingly, participating principals with their doctorates reported the lowest levels of job satisfaction. One possible explanation for this finding may be that principals with their doctorates may have a greater need for career advancement. The fact that many of these principals with advanced degrees have not moved on to higher positions within school systems may be a source of job dissatisfaction. Future researchers may want to consider what role higher degree status plays with career advancement expectation and what impact it has on job satisfaction.

Findings from this study indicated that principals from larger schools reported higher job satisfaction levels than in smaller schools. One could speculate that principals in smaller schools are located in smaller school districts, thus they have less fiscal and human resources at their disposal. This reduces the amount of options and programs that are available to students. Many smaller schools have fewer resource personnel available to assist the school; thereby, forcing the principals of smaller schools to shoulder more of the responsibilities. Additionally, job stress is increased as principals struggle to do more with less to compete with larger schools. A follow-up study for school population and principal job satisfaction may bring greater clarity to this matter.

The age of participating principals also impacted job satisfaction. Principals who were younger than 35 years of age reported the highest levels of job satisfaction. Although not directly researched by this study, one possible explanation may be due to the physical demands of the position. Long days set at a high pace may play a role in the

job satisfaction level of many of the older participating principals. In addition, older principals may not have fully embraced the data driven decision making process demanded by No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Future researchers may want to explore how technology, data driven decision making, and expanding testing programs affect the job satisfaction of principals.

This study demonstrated that male public middle school principals were more satisfied with their positions than female public middle school principals. Contrary to this study, Newby (1999) reported that female principals were more satisfied than male. The exact reason(s) for this difference is unclear and was not investigated in this study or in Newby's (1999) study. A follow-up study would be beneficial to explain the specific role that gender plays in job satisfaction.

This study demonstrates that within the research parameters participating middle school principals were very satisfied with their positions. If school systems are concerned about recruiting and retaining quality principals, steps must be taken to ensure that the position is attractive to applicants. Central office and human resource personnel must systematically evaluate the satisfaction level of building level administrators. Only through a conscious focused effort can school systems hope to improve the job satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia.

Summary

This chapter discussed the results from the study and statistically significant findings. The purpose of the study was to determine the job satisfaction level of public middle school principals in Virginia. The research replicated an earlier study conducted by Newby (1999). The data demonstrate that principals are very satisfied with their

positions. Based on the results of the study, recommendations for future research and practitioners were presented. Finally, a general discussion of the findings was offered for consideration.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1965). *Advances in experimental psychology* (vol. 2). New York: Academic Press.

Armstrong, B. C. (2001*). School size as a factor in the job satisfaction and locus of control of high school principals in Missouri.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Baird, L. L. (1976). *Who goes to graduate school and why they get there*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Bedeian, A. G., & Ferris G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: a tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 40(1), 33-48.

Belcastro, R. B., & Koeske, G. F. (1996). Job satisfaction and intention to seek graduate education. *Journal of Social Work*, 32, 315-327.

Berkowitz, L., Fraser, C., Treasure, P. F., & Cochran, S. (1987). Pay, equity, job gratifications, and comparisons in pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(4), 1-9.

Brogan, G. B. (2003). *Job satisfaction of Idaho high school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Idaho State University.

Bruce, W. M., Blackburn, J. W. (1992). *Balancing job satisfaction & performance: A guide for human resource professionals.* Connecticut: Quorum Books.

Brush, D. H., Moch, M. K., & Pooyan, A. (1987). Individual demographic differences and job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 8, 139-155.

Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., & Weick, K. E. (1970). *Managerial*

behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Chen, K., Blendinger, J., & McGrath, V. (2000). *Job satisfaction among high school assistant principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, Starkeville.

Cook, J. D. (1981). *The experience of work*. New York: Academic Press.

Cummings, L. L. (1969). *Reading in organizational behavior and human performance*. Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Davis, L. A. (1964). *Great aspirations*. Chicago: Aldine.

Dawis. R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1964). *A theory of work adjustm*ent. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.

Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment*. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Press.

Dawis, R., Lofquist, L. H., & Weiss, D. J. (1968). A theory of work adjustment: a revision. Bulletin University of Minnesota. *Industrial Relations Center*, 47, 1-15.

DeMato, S. D., & Curcio, C. C. (2004). Job satisfaction of elementary school counselors: a new look. Professional School Counseling, 7(4), 236-245.

DeMato, S. D. (2001). *Job satisfaction among elementary school counselors in Virginia: thirteen years later.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Derlin, R. & Schneider, G. T. (1994). Understanding job satisfaction principals and teachers, urban and suburban. *Urban Education*, 29(1), 63-88.

DiPaola, M. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study

of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 43-66.

Eckman, E. W. (2004). Similarities and differences in role conflict, role commitment, and job satisfaction for female and male high school principals. Education Administration Quarterly, 40(30), 366-387.

Eckman, E. W. (2002). Women high school principals; perspectives on role conflicts, role commitment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of school leadership*, 12, 57-77.

Educational Research Services. (1999). Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship: An exploratory study. Retrieved December 1, 2005, from http://www.naesp.org.

Freeman, L. L. (2003). Are you paid what you are worth?. *Scholastic Administrator*, 3(2), 30-36.

Friesen, D. (1984). Factors contributing to the job satisfaction of school principals. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 30(3), 157-170.

Friesen, D., Holdway, E. A., & Rice, A. W. (1983). Satisfaction of school principals with their work. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19(4), 35-58.

Goodwin, R. H., Cunningham, M. L., & Childress, R. (2003). The changing role of the secondary principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 26-42.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., Guion, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correslates of employee turnover: Updates, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 463-479.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159 – 170 .

Heiman. G. W. (2001). *Understanding Research Methods and Statistics*. New York. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review, Jan-Feb 53 – 62.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinions*. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper.

Howley, C. (1994). The academic effectiveness of small-scale schooling (An Update). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED372897), 1-7.

Hulin, C., & Smith, P. C. (1965). Sex differences in job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 209-216.

Jacobson, S. L., & Woodworth, B. E. (1989). Preparing rural administrators: what do they need? what do they want?. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. (ED316361), 1-41.

Jex, S. M., & Gudanowski, D. M. (1992). Efficacy beliefs and work stress: an exploratory study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 509-517.

Johnson, J. (2004). What school leaders want. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 24-27.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530-541.

Kacmar, M. K., & Ferris, G. R. (1989). Theoretical and methodological considerations in

the age-job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 201-207.

Kennedy, C. (2000). *Summary of responses to NAESP/NASSP/NMSA survey questions*. Principal Leadership Summit, Washington, D.C.

Khan, U. A. (1993). Type of administrator differences in work satisfaction of secondary school administrators. *Education*, 113, 574-578.

Klecker, B. M., & Loadman, W. E. (1999). Male elementary school teachers' rating of job satisfaction by years of teaching experience. *Education*, 119(3), 504-513.

Klien, S. M. (1966). Education level and satisfaction with pay. *Personnel Psychology*, 19(19), 195-208.

Kornhauser, A. (1965). *Mental Health of the New Industrial Workers*. New York: Wiley.

Kurtz, H. (2000). Principal assignment. *Rocky Mountain News*, 1, October.

Lawler, E. E. (1994). *Motivation in work organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lehman, L. E. (1991). *School size as a correlate of job satisfaction among middle-level principals in India.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction?. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(4), 309-336.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1995). A theory of goal setting and task performance (2nd ed.). Englewood NJ: Prentice-Hall.

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.

Lunenburg, F. C., Ornstein, A. C. (2000). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices* (3rd ed.). Connecticut: Wadsworth.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370 -396.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Newby, J. E. (1999). *Job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitude, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 963-974.

Palmore, E. (1969). Predicting longevity: a follow-up controlling for age. *Gerontologist*, 9(4), 247 – 250.

Pierson, M., & Rodrick, B. (1991). The bill of rights for the school principal, the employment contract. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the legal problems of education, (37th, Orlando, Florida, 22-24).

Pond, S. B., & Geyer, P. D. (1987). Employee age as a moderator of the relation between perceived work alternatives and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(4), 1987.

Quinn, R. P., Staines, G. L., & McCullough, M. R. (1974). Job satisfaction: Is there a trend? (Manpower Research Monograph No. 30, U.S. Department of Labor). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Raywind, M. A. (1997). Small schools: a reform that works. *Educational Leadership*, 55(4), 34-39.

Rice, W. R., Dean, B. M., & Bennett, D. E. (1989). Standards of comparison and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 2-14.

Robbins, S. P. (1994). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickerson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worke*r. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Saleh, S. D., & Otis, J. L. (1964). Age and level of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 17, 425-430.

Schmidt, G. L. (1976). Job satisfaction among secondary school administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 12(20), 68-86.

Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, S. J. (2005). *Classics of organizational theory* (6th ed.). California: Thomson Wadsworth.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction, applications, assessments, causes, and consequences*. California: Sage Publications.

Stemple, J. D. (2004). *Job satisfaction of high school principals in Virginia*. Unpublished

doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Tack, W. M., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril.* Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Tallerico, M. (1996). Retaining women in the superintendency: the location matters. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32, 642-664.

Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2004). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline and by geographic region. *Education*, 124(3), 528-539.

Thompson, D. P., McNamara, J. F., & Hoyle, J. R. (1997). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: a synthesis of research findings. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33(1), 7-37.

Volkwein, J. F., & Parmley, K. (1998). Comparing administrative satisfaction in public and private higher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED429498), 1-22.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.

Vroom, V. H. (1994). *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Waskiewicz, S. P. (1999). *Variables that contribute to job satisfaction of secondary school assistant principals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.* Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., Lofquist, L. H., England, G. W., (1966). *Instrumentation for the Theory of Work Adjustment.* Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Whan, L., & Thomas A. (1996). The principal and stress in the workplace: An observational and physiological study. *Journal of School Leadership*, 6(4), 444-465.

Wheelis, V. L. (2005). *The relationship between school performance scores and job satisfaction of principals in Louisiana*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana Tech University.

Whitaker, K. S. (2000). *Executive summary of superintendent perceptions of quantity and quality of candidates for the principalship*. Unpublished manuscript.

White, A. T., & Spector P. E. (1987). An investigation of age-related factors in the age job-satisfaction relationship. *American Psychological Association*, 2(3), 261-265.

Witt, L. A., & Lendell, G. N. (1992). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 1-13.

Worrell, T. G. (2004). *School psychologists' job satisfaction: ten years later.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Young, I. (1984). And examination of job satisfaction for female and male public school superintendents. *Planning and Changing*, 15(2), 114-124.

APPENDIX A

Individual Information Sheet

Individual Information Sheet

Directions: Please mark the appropriate letter that describes your response.

1. What is your age?

   ____ YOUNGER THAN 35

   ____ 36 – 45

   ____ 46 – 55

   ____ OLDER THAN 55

2. What is your gender?

   ____ Male

   ____ Female

3. What is your current degree status?

   ____ Bachelors

   ____ Masters

   ____ Educational Specialist

   ____ Doctorate

4. How many years have you been a middle school principal?

   ____ 0 – 3

   ____ 4 – 6

   ____ 7 – 9

   ____ 10 or more

5. The area in which your school is located is best described as:

    ____ Rural

    ____ Suburban

    ____ Urban

6. What is the size of your school?

    ____ 400 Students or less

    ____ 401 – 599 Students

    ____ 600 – 799 Students

    ____ 800 – 999 Students

    ____ Greater than 1,000 students

7. What is your school's accreditation status?

    ____ Fully Accredited

    ____ Provisionally Accredited Meets State Standards

    ____ Provisionally Accredited Needs Improvement

    ____ Accredited with Warning

8. Did your school make Adequate Yearly Progress under No Child Left Behind?

    ____ Yes

    ____ No

APPENDIX B

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Sample Questions

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
Sample Questions

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect with of my job?

ES means I am **extremely satisfied** with this aspect of my job.
VS means I am **very satisfied** with this aspect of my job.
S means I am **satisfied** with this aspect of my job.
SS means I am **slightly satisfied** with this aspect of my job.
NS means I am **not satisfied** with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about…

	ES	VS	S	SS	NS
1. The chance to be of service to others.	___	___	___	___	___
5. The variety in my work.	___	___	___	___	___
10. The way my supervisor and I understand each other.	___	___	___	___	___
15. The technical "Know-how" of my supervisor.	___	___	___	___	___
20. The chance to be active much of the time.	___	___	___	___	___
25. The chance to do different things from time to time.	___	___	___	___	___
30. The way my supervisor handles his/her employees.	___	___	___	___	___
36. The chance to develop close friendships with my co-workers.	___	___	___	___	___
43. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.	___	___	___	___	___
50. The way my supervisor backs up his/her employees (with top management).	___	___	___	___	___
55. The way my supervisor delegates work to others.	___	___	___	___	___
60. Being able to stay busy.	___	___	___	___	___
66. The chance to tell people what to do.	___	___	___	___	___
72. My pay and the amount of work I do.	___	___	___	___	___
78. The way they usually tell me when I do my job well.	___	___	___	___	___
85. The chance to do many different things on the job.	___	___	___	___	___
91. The way layoffs and transfers are avoided in my job.	___	___	___	___	___
94. My chance for advancement.	___	___	___	___	___
98. The praise I get for doing a good job.	___	___	___	___	___
100. Being able to keep busy all the time.	___	___	___	___	___

(Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967)

APPENDIX C

IRB Exempt Approval

VirginiaTech

Office of Research Compliance
1880 Pratt Drive (0497)
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
540/231-4358 Fax: 540/231-0959
E-mail: ctgreen@vt.edu
www.irb.vt.edu

FWA00000572(expires 7/20/07)
IRB # is IRB00000667.

DATE: May 24, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Travis W. Twiford
Daniel Bowling

FROM: Carmen Green

SUBJECT: **IRB Exempt Approval:** "Job Satisfaction of Middle School Principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia: Revisited"

I have reviewed your request to the IRB for exemption for the above referenced project. I concur that the research falls within the exempt status. Approval is granted effective as of May 24, 2006.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report promptly proposed changes in previously approved human subject research activities to the IRB, including changes to your study forms, procedures and investigators, regardless of how minor. The proposed changes must not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.

2. Report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.

cc: File

APPENDIX D

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Permission

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Department of Psychology
College of Liberal Arts

N218 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Office: 612-625-2818
Fax: 612-626-2079
www.psych.umn.edu
Email: psymain@umn.edu

May 25, 2006

Daniel L. Bowling
9195 Pamunkey River Farms Drive
Mechanicsville, VA 23111

Dear Daniel L. Bowling:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use 336 copies of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1967 long version on your secured web site for use in your research.

Please note that you must include the following copyright statement:

Copyright 1977, Vocational Psychology Research
University of Minnesota. Reproduced by permission.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.