

2008

A study of perceived general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction among public school superintendents in Southwestern Ohio

Matthew Mark Bishop
University of Dayton

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate_theses

Recommended Citation

Bishop, Matthew Mark, "A study of perceived general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction among public school superintendents in Southwestern Ohio" (2008). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 1567.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/graduate_theses/1567

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlange1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

A STUDY OF PERCEIVED GENERAL, INTRINSIC, AND EXTRINSIC JOB
SATISFACTION AMONG PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
IN SOUTHWESTERN OHIO

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO

The School of Education and Allied Professions

THE UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership

Matthew Mark Bishop, B.S., M.A.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

DAYTON, OHIO

May 2009

A STUDY OF PERCEIVED GENERAL, INTRINSIC, AND EXTRINSIC JOB
SATISFACTION AMONG PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
IN SOUTHWESTERN OHIO


APPROVED BY:


Charles J. Russo, J.D., Ed.D. Committee Chair Date


Edward D. Garten, Ph.D. Committee Member Date


A. William Place, Ph.D. Committee Member Date


C. Daniel Raisch, Ph.D. Committee Member Date


Thomas J. Lasley II, Ph.D. Dean Date

© Copyright by
Matthew Mark Bishop
All rights reserved

2008

A STUDY OF PERCEIVED GENERAL, INTRINSIC, AND EXTRINSIC JOB
SATISFACTION AMONG PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
IN SOUTHWESTERN OHIO

By

Matthew Mark Bishop, Ph.D.

The University of Dayton, 2008

Charles J. Russo, J.D., Ed.D.

Today's public school superintendent faces unrealistic expectations and an excess amount of pressure. School boards are finding a decline in applicants to open positions and fewer qualified candidates. We expect superintendents to change, redesign, and restructure our public schools. Many superintendents are retiring early, resigning, or being fired because they have not delivered the educational quick fixes that many expected, thus creating a revolving door that results in increased instability, lowered morale, and loss of organizational direction. All of this influences the job satisfaction of the superintendent. This study examined the perceived intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction of superintendents in southwestern Ohio.

Data from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlations, *t* tests, and ANOVAs. The data were collected from public school superintendents in counties in southwestern Ohio during the 2007-2008

school year with at least one year of experience as a superintendent. The variables for the study were as follows: size of the school district where superintendent is currently employed; identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed; designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed; gender of superintendent, age of superintendent, years of experience as a superintendent, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held. The data collected allowed the researcher to draw conclusions, make recommendations, and identify possible critical areas of need with the topic of public school superintendent job satisfaction.

The conclusions for this study were encouraging for public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio. Superintendents reported degrees of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction from *satisfied* to *very satisfied* with all aspects of their jobs. The lack of significant correlation of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction with any of the demographic variables suggests that these factors do not relate to satisfaction or dissatisfaction among public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio.

To my wife, Heather and daughter, Carlie, who were so patient as I spent countless hours from them working on this degree. I love you both very much.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express sincere appreciation to the members of my committee who worked patiently with me to complete this study and to Dr. Charles J. Russo for his guidance throughout the entire process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	The Problem.....	1
	Background of Study.....	5
	Purpose of the Study.....	7
	Research Questions.....	8
	Research Design.....	10
	Population.....	10
	Delimitations.....	13
	Definitions of Key Terms.....	15
	Significance of Study.....	16
	Organization of Study.....	18
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	19
	Introduction.....	19
	A Brief History of the Superintendency.....	20
	The Role of the Public School Superintendent.....	23
	Theories of Job Satisfaction.....	33
	Job Satisfaction and the Superintendent.....	41
	Summary.....	48
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	49
	Introduction.....	49
	Population.....	50
	Procedure.....	50
	Instrumentation.....	52
	Data Analysis.....	55
	Summary.....	56

IV.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	58
	Introduction.....	58
	Demographics.....	59
	Research Questions.....	66
	Summary.....	109
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS....	111
	Summary.....	111
	Demographic Data.....	113
	Job Satisfaction Data.....	116
	Conclusions.....	122
	Recommendations for Further Study.....	124
	Conclusion.....	128
	REFERENCES.....	129
	APPENDICES.....	142
	A-Demographic Data of School Districts	142
	B-Cover Letter	147
	C-Demographic Survey	149
	D-Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire	151
	E-Institutional Review Board Approval Letter.....	155
	F-Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Approval Letter	157

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1	Demographic Statistics for Size of School District.....	60
2	Demographic Statistics for Age.....	61
3	Demographic Statistics for Gender.....	62
4	Demographic Statistics for Identification of School District.....	62
5	Demographic Statistics for Designation of School District.....	63
6	Demographic Statistics for Recent Positions Held Prior to Superintendent.....	64
7	Demographic Statistics for Highest Degree Held.....	65
8	Demographic Statistics for Years of Experience as a Superintendent.....	66
9	Distribution of General Satisfaction Mean Scores.....	67
10	Mean and Standard Deviations on General Questions.....	68
11	Distribution of Intrinsic Satisfaction Mean Scores.....	70
12	Mean and Standard Deviations on Intrinsic Questions.....	71
13	Frequency Table for Question 3.....	71
14	Frequency Table for Question 9.....	72
15	Frequency Table for Question 11.....	72
16	Frequency Table for Question 15.....	73
17	Frequency Table for Question 16.....	73

18	Frequency Table for Question 20.....	74
19	Frequency Table for Question 10.....	74
20	Distribution of Extrinsic Satisfaction Mean Scores.....	75
21	Mean and Standard Deviations on Extrinsic Satisfaction Questions.....	76
22	Frequency Table for Question 5.....	76
23	Frequency Table for Question 6.....	77
24	Frequency Table for Question 12.....	78
25	Frequency Table for Question 13.....	78
26	Frequency Table for Question 14.....	79
27	Frequency Table for Question 19.....	79
28	Size of School District Means Table.....	81
29	Age of Superintendent Means Table.....	85
30	Demographic Statistics for Years of Experience as a Superintendent.....	89
31	Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Size of the School District, Age of the Superintendent, and Years of Experience as a Superintendent.....	92
32	<i>t</i> Tests Comparing Males and Females on Job Satisfaction.....	93
33	Gender of the Superintendent Means Table.....	94
34	Identification of the School District Means Table.....	96
35	Demographic Statistics for Designation of School District.....	99
36	Position Held Prior to Becoming Superintendent Means Table.....	102
37	Demographic Statistics for Highest Degree Attained.....	105
38	Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Type of School District, Rating of the School District, Most Recent Position Held, and Highest Degree Attained.....	109

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

In November 1907, the cover of the American School Board Journal exhibited a cartoon that showed a vacancy notice for a superintendent of schools posted on the front door of the office of a board of education. The notice stated that the board was seeking an individual who would please everybody, from ultraconservatives to radical progressives. This almost-century old cartoon illustrates that even in the formative years of public education and city government in the United States, larger public school systems expected superintendents to appease groups holding divergent values and beliefs. Democratic pluralism, however, is but one factor that has made the superintendency a challenging, complex position of public trust (Kowalski, 1999, p. 2).

Insofar as community members may establish what may be unrealistic expectations on school superintendents, it seems fewer qualified people want the job (Chaddock, 1999; Glass, 2000). Moreover, the excess amount of pressure on the job is another reason for the decline in applications when school superintendents are available

(Daresh & Playko, 1992). Some critical expectations of public school superintendents are to change, redesign, and restructure public schools (Scherer, 1995). Yet, at the same time, superintendents occupy an organizational position that is traditionally defined and committed to resisting change while maintaining stability. As a result, superintendents are retiring early, resigning, or being fired because they have not delivered the educational quick fixes that many expected (Hayes, 2001). Shifts to short tenures of many superintendents have a negative impact on school districts where residents may look at the revolving door at the superintendent's office as creating increased instability, lowered morale, and loss of organizational direction as well as vision for the district (Glass, 1992; McCurdy, 1992).

In addition to the school buildings they visit and the students and teachers they speak with each day, superintendents work and live in the political arena. Superintendents must be aware of political situations that may be brewing while being keenly aware of the dissatisfaction individuals or groups may have for the decisions they need to make. Lutz and Iannaccone (1986) compared this type of dissatisfaction to a disease that superintendents could monitor by carefully examining the political and socioeconomic indicators of their school district communities. Lutz and Iannaccone go on to say that as this disease progresses, different stakeholders with special interests intensify their efforts to influence school district policy and/or procedures. This may result in an increase in voter turnout when electing the members of local boards of education and having incumbent members either defeated at the polls or forced to choose not to seek additional terms. In the end, this disease could cause superintendents to move on or limit their political power to positively effect change. The theory suggests that this disease is not as

swift as it often appears to the casual school district resident, but rather is a long-term infection, usually exhibiting a variety of symptoms in the early stages.

Like political situations, some issues are out of superintendents' ability to control. Moving from a wider perspective, educational reforms and difficulties associated with school financing in Ohio have caused school superintendents additional stress. On two occasions, the Supreme Court of Ohio ruled that the state's funding system was unconstitutional (*DeRolph v. State of Ohio*, 1991/1997). Due to school financing difficulties, more Ohio boards are forced to ask voters for additional tax dollars on a regular basis. For example, in an interview with a Cleveland area newspaper, Paolo DeMaria, the associate superintendent of school finance for the Ohio Department of Education, stated that under the current funding system, most school districts in the state are forced to go to the ballot box at least once every 5 years to ask for new tax revenues (Scott, 2006). The result is that superintendents are constantly explaining to the public why schools need more money and how their districts are accountable for spending existing tax dollars.

Another factor that has added to the stress and extra workload experienced by superintendents arises from the increasing state and federal interest in education such as the restructured accountability system in Ohio and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. To this end, School District Report Cards in Ohio now report whether schools are successful and pressures for schools to be designated as Effective or Excellent are enormous in individual buildings and districts as a whole (Ohio Department of Education, 2006a).

In 2002, President George W. Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Katy Anthes (2003), a policy analyst for the Education Commission of the States, prepared a NCLB policy brief discussing the changing expectations and new challenges of school administrators in today's society. The brief explains the newly reauthorized ESEA has reinforced a major shift in thinking about the roles of not only school administrators but also school board members. The policy brief states that more and more, district leaders are being held responsible for bringing about change and improvement and they are under the growing pressure to increase achievement scores across the board, narrow the test-score gap between disadvantaged and advantaged students, and make sure that all teachers are of high quality.

The NCLB act has thus created a new area of focus for superintendents that may not be present for the typical business executive. Successful school superintendents in this new era of accountability and scrutiny need to "serve as role models, demonstrate the highest degree of professionalism necessary to influence local and state politicians and gain political support for needed changes in curriculum, educational technology and strategic planning" (Castle, 2004, p.1). These factors make it difficult to compare the roles of school superintendents to those of traditional business executives.

Blumberg (1985) confirmed there are factors in the role of superintendency that do not exist in the role of business executives. These factors include such items as the public perception of the superintendent as the guardian of a community's most sacred enterprise, the education of the community's children; the political nature of the relationship between the superintendent and the school board; the fact that

superintendents were once teachers, the same people he or she is now expected to exercise authority over; the large number of community and governmental groups, each with a stake in the local schools; and the need for the superintendent to be visible and accessible to the public. These issues are in addition to the daily conflicts and stresses that superintendents, like business executives, face.

In short, today's superintendents face many tough issues that affect their levels of job satisfaction. Demands for reform and accountability, financial constraints, and managing the politics of the position are just a few examples of what superintendents are dealing with on a daily basis. Further examination of factors leading to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for public school superintendents is needed to make the position more desirable to attract potential applicants and retain existing administrators.

Background of Study

The role of superintendents has evolved over the years to become a multifaceted position that has grown in importance as public schools have expanded in size, scope, and accomplishments. In addition, public schools have taken a lead role in the personal development of our youth. With these challenges placed on public schools and their leaders, the importance of having effective superintendents is enormous (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

Clearly, the management of people is a critical factor in attaining organizational effectiveness. Superintendents experience stresses and constraints during the course of managing the employees of their districts. In other words, this management of district human resources creates positive and negative perceptions leading to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for superintendents (Batchler, 1981).

In differing fields, including education, researchers have studied job satisfaction for over a half century (Castle, 2004; Herzberg, 1976; Herzberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1959; Hoppock, 1935; Hoy & Miskel, 1978; Malanowski, 1999; Maslow, 1954; O'Malley, 2004; C. Smith, 1981; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Soloman, 2004; Steel, 1991; Wilson, 1978; Witt, 1989). The findings of these researchers reveal a relationship between jobs and satisfaction. Specifically, researchers determined a relationship between the employees' work environment and job satisfaction (Malanowski).

Recently, job satisfaction of public school superintendents has become an area of interest in terms of conducting research (Borquist, 1987). Superintendents are finding that the reality of the position is both stressful and full of exciting opportunities. These stressors and opportunities may play an important role in determining satisfaction. A major difficulty with which school systems across the nation are faced is attracting not only qualified but quality people to the role of superintendent. While external pressures are part of the job, there are unlimited possibilities for satisfying internal needs. Superintendents know that they have the ability to alter the course of students' lives, change the behavior of their organizations, and broaden opportunities of communities as a whole, thereby creating a strong attraction to the job (Cuban, 1976). All of these factors make the superintendency an interesting subject to analyze. In fact, few roles are as challenging or important as that of a superintendent of the public school system. As educators look into the future, the job and role of the public school superintendent will inevitably continue to be one of concern, controversy, and consequence (Houston, 2001).

In sum, today's superintendents encounter many challenges and issues. Superintendents must deal with the current push for reform and accountability, serious

school funding issues, and maintaining and procuring technology for the district. The researcher determined that an investigation of the job satisfaction of public school superintendents would be meaningful based on the high turnover rate, lack of qualified educators going into the position, and the stressors that come with the position.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of superintendents and examine those aspects of the job that relate to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. While school superintendents may react to these dimensions in different ways, little research has been conducted on the topic. How superintendents adjust their leadership styles to meet the challenges they face each day affects perceived job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Hoyle, 1989). Aspiring superintendents, school board members, current superintendents, and university preparation programs are all stakeholders that can utilize the results of this study.

School boards, for example, can utilize the results of this study to create conditions where their superintendents would be likely to remain on the job. In addition, increasing satisfaction and limiting dissatisfaction may result in more contented and productive school leaders. School boards can also utilize this information to evaluate whether there are ways they can satisfy their superintendents that may not cost the district resources (Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004). Further, school boards can use the findings on intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction to keep superintendents in their districts for longer periods of time, thus producing much needed stability (Malanowski). The research on motivational theories suggests that everyone has things they are satisfied with that are of a materialistic and more personal nature (Soloman).

In Ohio, school districts are currently seeing an increase in administrators who retire from public education only to be rehired in similar roles. Many boards are quick to rehire these individuals to provide stability, experience, and maturity to possibly volatile situations. Many board members would rather hire someone who has filled the job before rather than risk bringing in someone new who may not work out well. However, when school systems hire individuals who have already retired, they run the risk of placing in power someone who may not be thinking long-term in his or her decision-making processes for the district as the end of employment is well within sight (Ohio School Boards Association, 2006).

Likewise, departments of educational leadership at colleges and universities may utilize the information on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors of superintendents and address the issue in an entry level superintendent course. Motivators of current superintendents can be shared with administrators that are considering whether to seek the top position.

Finally, these results could also be used by potential superintendent candidates who can use them to examine what intrinsic and extrinsic factors affect overall job satisfaction. Candidates could use this information to think about whether they would be satisfied in the position (Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004).

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study on perceived level of job satisfaction among Ohio public school superintendents. The purpose of these questions was to obtain survey data from superintendents and examine what aspects of their job, if any, relate to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Additionally, the counties under

investigation, because of the diversity of size of their student populations, ethnicity of the students and community members, socioeconomic status of the families, academic performance of the school district, classification of the type of school (i.e., rural, suburban, or urban), represent a unique part of the state in terms of education. The researcher believes the specific data collected for public school superintendents will have a positive impact on this area of the state. The research questions that will assist the researcher in determining the job satisfaction of superintendents are as follows:

1. What is the perceived level of job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren Counties, which were selected because of the diversity explained in the previous paragraph?
2. What is the perceived level of intrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation?
3. What is the perceived level of extrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation?
4. Is there a relationship between the perceived general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation and the following variables: size of the school district where superintendent is currently employed, identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed, designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed, gender of superintendent, age of superintendent,

years of experience as a superintendent, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held.

Research Design

The researcher used the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to measure job satisfaction among public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio. This survey has been used more frequently to measure school superintendent job satisfaction scores than any other instrument (Brown, 1978; Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Schoen, 2006; Soloman, 2004; Whitsell, 1987). Additionally, this study investigated the relationship between and among the variables of school superintendents' general job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, and intrinsic job satisfaction to the following variables: size of the school district where superintendent is currently employed, identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed, designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed, gender of superintendent, age of superintendent, years of experience as a superintendent, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held. A more detailed explanation of the research design appears in Chapter III.

Population

As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter III, the research focused on public school superintendents in the following counties in southwestern Ohio: Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren. The researcher would like for the data collected and analyzed to provide valuable information to colleagues in the

immediate area. In addition, southwestern Ohio is a unique part of the state in terms of education. The diversity in the demographics sought in this study is extensive. By the nature of the study, the researcher understands the limitation of generalizing the results of the study across populations. However, the researcher believes the specific data collected for public school superintendents will have a positive impact on this area of the state.

Superintendents represent school districts that carry distinct designations. The information below demonstrates the diversity of the population of superintendents being surveyed by the districts they serve. There are seven different groups for public school districts in the state of Ohio. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE, 2006b) states the purpose of classifying districts is to provide a rational basis for making data-driven comparisons of groups of districts. Such groups include districts that share certain demographic characteristics. However, for this study, the researcher has decided to combine like groups of schools into larger categories. Schools in Groups 1 through 3 will be identified as Rural, schools in Groups 4 and 5 will be identified as Urban, and schools in Groups 6 and 7 will be identified as Suburban. The ODE Web site provides specific definitions for each group and is listed as follows. The first group is Rural/agricultural-high poverty, low median income. These districts are rural agricultural districts and tend to be located in the Appalachian area of Ohio. As a group they have higher-than-average poverty, the lowest average median income level, and the lowest percent of population with college degree or higher compared to all of the groups. There are 96 school districts serving approximately 160,000 students classified as Group 1. The second group is Rural/agricultural – small student population, low poverty, and low to moderate median income. These tend to be small, very rural districts outside of Appalachia with adult

populations that are similar to systems in Group 1 in terms of education level, but their median income level is higher and their poverty rates are much lower. In Ohio, 161 school districts serve approximately 220,000 students in Group 2.

The third group is Rural/small town – moderate to high median income. These districts tend to be in small towns located in rural areas of the state outside of Appalachia. The districts tend to have median income levels similar to the sixth group but with lower rates of both college attendance and managerial/professional occupations among adults. Their poverty percentage is also below average. Group 3 consists of 81 school districts serving approximately 130,000 students. The fourth group is Urban – low median income, high poverty. This category includes urban, or high population density, districts that encompass small or medium size towns and cities. They are characterized by low median incomes and very high poverty rates. There are 102 school districts serving approximately 290,000 students in Group 4.

The fifth group is Major urban – very high poverty. This group of districts includes all of the six largest core cities and other urban districts that encompass major cities. Population densities are very high. The districts all have very high poverty rates and typically have a very high percentage of minority students. There are 15 school districts serving approximately 360,000 students in Group 5. The sixth group is Urban/suburban – high median income. These districts typically surround major urban centers. While their poverty levels range from low to above average, they are more generally characterized as communities with high median incomes and high percentages of college completers and professional/administrative workforce. There are 107 school districts serving approximately 420,000 students in Group 6. The seventh group is

Urban/suburban – very high median income, very low poverty. These districts also surround major urban centers. They are distinguished by very high income levels and almost no poverty. A very high percentage of the adult population has a college degree, and a similarly high percentage works in professional/administrative occupations. There are 46 school districts serving approximately 240,000 students in Group 7.

The total population of superintendents surveyed in this study was 81 administrators who served as superintendents during the 2007-2008 school year with at least one year experience as a superintendent. The Educational Service Centers provided the names and addresses of the superintendents serving in their respective counties to validate the list.

Delimitations

There are seven delimitations to this study. The first delimitation is that it sought only to identify perceptions of job satisfaction among superintendents. The second delimitation is related to the use of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1977) as the survey instrument to collect data. Superintendents responding to the survey may not have been candid with their responses. Although superintendents are professionals and there is no expectation of responses that are anything but truthful, there is always that possibility when conducting research; thus it is important to list it as a concern.

The third delimitation is that the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1977) is a quantitative survey instrument. A qualitative study, through the utilization of personal interviews with a researcher, may reveal new information on job satisfaction and school superintendents. The fourth delimitation is that each superintendent works

with a unique set of board members. These board members come to the table with personal biases and political ties and ideologies that pose a challenge to superintendents and may affect the perceptions of job satisfaction (Glass, 2000). To combat this issue, the Ohio School Boards Association provides boards of education with guidelines on "Boardsmanship" and the state of Ohio has specific guidelines to follow. However, uniformity and consistency cannot be words used to describe school boards in Ohio. What may work well for one superintendent in a school district may not work well in another. As such, it may be difficult for these results to transcend across school district boundaries.

Further, a fifth delimitation is the small number of public school superintendents in specific counties in southwestern Ohio who were employed during the 2007-2008 school year with at least one year of experience as a superintendent. The researcher decided to focus on counties in southwestern Ohio due to a variety of factors. The researcher works in this area of the state and is interested in the responses of colleagues with similar work environments. Southwestern Ohio is a microcosm of the state. There are urban, suburban, and rural areas from which public school superintendents will be responding to questionnaires. In addition, there are differing demographics in the selected counties for the research. Some school districts are very wealthy while some are very poor. Some school districts selected are growing in population while others are losing students each year. The researcher wanted the data to be useful to superintendents and school board members in the immediate area. While the information will be beneficial to the stakeholders in southwestern Ohio, the data may not be transferable to other areas in Ohio or in other states.

In addition to location, a sixth delimitation of this study would be time. Moreover, the results of this study are limited to the fall of 2007. Seventh, the ability to generalize from findings gathered in the short time frame of this study may be a limitation. The data collected in the surveys are based upon the self perceptions of the southwestern Ohio superintendents selected for this study and may not be representative of the remaining Ohio superintendents who did not complete the survey.

Definitions of Key Terms

The following are definitions of key terms for this study.

1. Boss: For responses on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1977), the board of education of each school district is known as the "boss."
2. Designation of the District: The designation the Ohio Department of Education assigns to school districts based on their performance in meeting indicators on the Ohio School Report Card. The indicators are based on districts having a high percentage of students passing achievement tests, graduation rates of high schools, and pupil attendance rates.
3. Extrinsic Job Satisfaction: Factors that produce extrinsic job satisfaction are materialistic in nature. Examples of extrinsic job satisfaction would be a salary, status in the company, a company car, benefits, large office (i.e., salary; Weiss et al., 1977).
4. Intrinsic Job Satisfaction: Factors that produce intrinsic job satisfaction are being valued as an employee, doing meaningful and rewarding work, making a difference in someone's life, being respected for what you do, being valued as a needed member of the company (i.e., achievement; Weiss et al., 1977).

5. Job Dissatisfaction: The degree to which one is dissatisfied with one's current occupation (Herzberg et al., 1959).

6. Job Satisfaction: The degree to which one is satisfied with one's current occupation (Herzberg et al., 1959).

Significance of the Study

School boards look for ways to maintain stability in their districts. Having a superintendent who shares a school board's values and beliefs is important. Yet, once school boards find the right persons, the difficult task of retaining them begins (Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004). Aware of the challenge, the researcher hopes that this study can provide board members with information about Ohio school superintendents. Boards can examine what factors they can satisfy both extrinsically and intrinsically to keep their superintendents content and desiring to stay in their district. While more money and benefits may appear to be obvious solutions to make their school leaders satisfied, boards may be able to meet the intrinsic needs of their chief executives and achieve the same result. If the job satisfaction of school superintendents can be changed for the better, then possibly the growing turnover rate could be shrunk. A smaller turnover rate would have a great impact on school districts across our state (Herzberg et al., 1959; Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004).

It is important, then, for public school superintendents, boards of education, graduate level departments of educational leadership, and aspiring superintendents to learn the levels of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction on the job. This information can be used to modify the behavior of superintendents and boards of education as a way to

keep people content and employed in the district (Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004).

To this end, by looking at aspects of the job that relate to dissatisfaction, school superintendents can utilize the information in this study to decrease dissatisfaction on the job and increase satisfaction. An individual who is satisfied is a much more productive worker (Argyris, 1962; Hanson, 2003; Herzberg et al., 1959; Homans, 1950; Maslow, 1954; Mayo, 1933; McGregor, 1960; Whyte, 1955). As a result of the findings, there may be something that current school superintendents can do immediately to improve how they feel about their present position.

In addition, this study may provide boards of education with the knowledge and tools they need to keep their superintendents satisfied. This would decrease the amount of superintendent turnover we are currently witnessing (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000; Herzberg et al., 1959).

The turnover rate for superintendents has made a big impact on the performance of school boards. In order for lasting change to occur, there should be a period of time of 5 or more years set aside (Glass et al., 2000). Glass et al. state that as superintendents leave after 5 years, 2 ½ years in the urban setting, school districts may never experience the stability that is needed to effect change. The result is new initiative after new initiative from each superintendent that wants to come in and make his or her mark and then move on to the next position (Glass et al.).

In sum, public school superintendents have a great impact on the school districts they represent. They are the master teacher of their districts, leaders of the administrative

teams and the board of education, representatives of the community, and the face of the school district. They are the face of education in the community.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter I provides an introduction of job satisfaction, including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, as well as a statement of the problem, significance of the study, research questions, definition of terms, assumptions, delimitations, rationale of the study, and organization of the study. Chapter II reviews the literature related to job satisfaction, including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Chapter III describes the survey instrument and procedures used in this study. Chapter IV includes the findings of the study. Chapter V is a summary of the study, including conclusions and recommendations regarding job satisfaction among Ohio public school superintendents.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

For decades, job satisfaction has been a subject of interest and study to researchers. While most job satisfaction research has been conducted in business and industry, educators have developed an interest in assessing the levels of satisfaction in their respective positions such as classroom teachers, building level administrators, district level supervisors, and superintendents (Malanowski, 1999). Vaughn and Dunn (1972) stated that the topic of job satisfaction is

a vital one. It has meaning and significance in its own right. Organizations' effectiveness can never be at peak form if the mental health of the employees in the organization is not considered by top management to be a legitimate area of inquiry. (p. 8)

The literature review covers four areas: a brief history of the superintendency, the role of the public school superintendent, theories of job satisfaction, the superintendency and job satisfaction. In the following history of the superintendency, there is a brief description of how the position has evolved over the years identifying how critics, changing technology, constant pressure and stress, and board members have an impact on job satisfaction. In addition, the section considers how the role of

superintendent has moved toward a more democratic and facilitative leadership style. The next section of the literature review examines major theories of job satisfaction from such names as Hoppock, Mayo, Maslow, McGregor, and Herzberg. The final section of the literature review studies the link between job satisfaction and the superintendency by exploring the response of the community to the position, the political aspect of the job, and the impact of the interactions they have with board members.

A Brief History of the Superintendency

The first school district superintendency was established in Buffalo, New York, in 1837 by the Common Council of the city (Cryss, Grogan, & Bjork, 2002). Since then, the position has evolved through many different stages (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Jackson (1995) postulated, "the evolution of the role of the public superintendent has paralleled the growth of the nation and reflected changing social, economic, and political conditions" (p. 9).

In the beginning, as the population of the United States spread, so did the development of common schools. Boards of education assumed responsibility for the administration of these new schools (Cuban, 1998). As schools grew in number and size, boards of education sought out individuals to implement their policies and supervise daily operations as the demand for operating schools was too much for volunteer board members (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Due to this need for one person to be in charge of the educational process of these common schools, the first superintendents were appointed in eastern cities and in the Ohio Valley (Cuban, 1998). This era began roughly in the early 19th century. At that time, there was little expectation these school leaders would have direct supervision of the curriculum or the teaching staff (Jackson, 1995).

Many early superintendents traveled from school to school instead of being assigned to just one district. These were county superintendents and were common in rural areas of the country (Konnert & Augenstein, 1995).

By the Civil War, school boards in 27 large eastern and midwestern cities such as New York, Boston, and Chicago, appointed superintendents for their schools. After the Civil War, as the population increased, so did the number of superintendents being appointed to lead districts. The latter half of the 19th century saw higher expectations from constituents. Teachers were expected to teach citizenship and values to an increasing immigrant population. This new challenge forced superintendents to move from being clerical supervisors to master educators with significant knowledge of curriculum and instructional practices. However, superintendents would still need to serve as business managers of districts. Thus, the assignment of multiple roles began for superintendents (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Jackson, 1995).

At the beginning of the 20th century, American society was changing from agrarian to industrial and the country was facing a population explosion (Jackson, 1995). The focus for schools centered on the need for children to be able to take their places in factories. District superintendents developed curricular and instructional changes which would prepare the schools' children for this reality (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). As a result, the operations of schools were expected to mirror business. Consequently, school leaders in this era looked to Frederick Taylor's findings on efficiency and Ellwood Cubberley's ideas on scientific management to restructure how schools operated and how students would learn (Hanson, 2003). In this vein, Cubberley (1916) wrote that schools are, in a sense, "factories in which the raw products are to be shaped and fashioned into

products to meet the various demands of life. The specifications for manufacturing come from the demands of twentieth-century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specifications laid down" (p. 325). In sum, according to Cubberley, schools were to look like factories, with children as the raw material, and take on their management principles. The superintendent was expected to be both business manager and professional educator (Jackson, 1995). Education was seen as "an agency of control rather than a catalyst for social change" (Kowalski, 1995, p. 17). The operational nature of the superintendency assumed greater importance during this time period (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

A series of national events, cultural, political, and economic in nature, ushered in a change in the superintendency in the middle of the 20th century as the position was forced into the political and social arena (Cunningham, Hack, & Nystrand, 1977). In the wake of World War II, the United States Supreme Court ruling of *Brown v. Board of Education*, Topeka in 1954 and the launching of the Soviet Sputnik in 1957 were two national and world events that created a new sense of urgency for school reform (Norton, Webb, Duugosh, & Sybouts, 1996). Superintendents felt the national spotlight as schools became the focus of social policy efforts where concepts such as equal opportunity and civil rights were tested (Schlechty, 1997).

As the 20th century progressed, schools and superintendents faced increasing criticism from policymakers and community members. Board members began to question the actions of superintendents while assuming more authority in policy development and operational aspects of schools (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). In a 1970 survey, superintendents listed professional attacks as the most likely factor causing them to leave

the profession (Knezevich, 1971). A more recent survey closely mirrored the 1970 results but listed inadequate school funding as the first reason followed by lack of support from their board of education (Glass, 2000). Norton et al. (1996) stated that superintendents are no longer considered the educational experts they once were and have shifted to an advisory role and being a manager for the board or as Carter and Cunningham (1997) state, a chief executive officer of the school, much like that of a business.

In short, the position of the superintendency has evolved over the years. The superintendency has become more facilitative than directive due to the need to manage personal conflict and pressure on a daily basis. The challenge for today's superintendents is to manage national, state, and local pressures for improving school performance, while teaming with stakeholders to develop effective schools based on student achievement (Marinelli, 1996). The continual shifts in schooling itself underscore the importance of understanding superintendents and how they manage stress.

The Role of the Public School Superintendent

Carter and Cunningham (1997) state that superintendents must display an extensive knowledge of pedagogy, school finance, and political expertise as well as an understanding of the mental, physical, and spiritual growth of children. Kowalski (1999) declared, "Throughout the history of American public education, there have been recurring cycles during which critics expressed their displeasure with schools and demanded improvements" (p. v). Kowalski (1999) adds that "these periods of unrest reflect the fact that this country's citizens have never reached consensus regarding the purposes of public education...and the current quest for educational excellence, however, has several distinct characteristics that make it unique" (p. v).

Superintendents provide leadership to their districts and are responsible for the effectiveness of individual schools along with staff members. It is the expectation of the community for superintendents to be strong leaders who move their districts forward and are in tune with the norms, beliefs, values, and vision of their communities (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995; Hesselbein, Goldsmith, & Beckhard, 1996; Patterson, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1992). Kowalski (1999) noted that "a school district's vision represents consensus about the future and the vision provides the basis for planning" (p. 214).

Carter and Cunningham (1997), authors of *The American School Superintendent: Leading in an Age of Pressure*, wrote that since its inception, the role of the superintendent has gone through four major stages: the clerical position; the master educator who provided direction on curricular and instruction matters; the expert manager who operated the district under the business model; and the chief executive officer for the board of education who serves as an advisor, reform leader, resource manager, communicator, and public relations guru.

In his dissertation on the potential career crisis with the superintendency, Castle (2004) discussed the changing role of school superintendents and the new stressors that come with the position. Today's superintendents are experiencing different roles even compared with ones who served a decade ago. Profound shifts in American culture have compelled public schools and their superintendents to reconsider some of our basic premises of public education. Among these innovations is the rapid increase in the diversity of our students which demands new skills of teachers and administrators. Another major change is rapid advances in the area of technology, specifically the Internet, that have made national boundaries obsolete, even as a digital divide threatens to

widen the gap between the privileged and underprivileged. Add changes such as these to the push toward national commitments such as high standards and accountability and the potential for stress in the superintendency becomes clear.

As recently as the late 1980s, public education witnessed the start of a rapid turnover of superintendents which significantly deterred improvement efforts of districts (Bennett, 1991; Kerr, 1988; Murphy, 1996; Olson, 1995). For example, in one 18 month period over 57% of school districts in the Council of Great City Schools, a national organization founded in 1956 exclusively representing the needs of urban public schools including such cities as Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Dayton, Detroit, Los Angeles, and New York City, had to replace their chief executives whether due to voluntary departures or being fired (Daley, 1990). Many in education recognized the stress that superintendents face on a daily basis. One board member from Illinois commented that "number one, we don't pay them enough; number two, they get treated like garbage; and number three, they get run out of town" (Jones, 1994, p. 24). Regions all over the United States have reported some difficulty attracting well qualified applicants. In 1995 alone, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts witnessed 3% of its superintendents leave the education field entirely and in Colorado, 25% of its school leaders moved on to other careers (Speer, 1995). Similarly, in 1996, 18% of Ohio's school districts did not have a permanent superintendent running the district (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

The pressure to continuously improve as a school district is intense. Consequently, school districts in Ohio, home to this study, are rated from Excellent to Academic Emergency based on the schools' performance on the Ohio School District

Report Card. Hayes (2001) summarized that “ as schools become increasingly accountable to the public, the survival of superintendents depends more and more on their ability to raise the academic achievement of students” (p. 6). Insofar as superintendents are the chief executive officers of school systems, it makes sense that they will be the leaders of any school improvement initiative. However, what exactly should superintendents be doing during the process? How much of an active role should they play? Should they take a more facilitative role and let the people they have put in place lead the process?

The challenge of trying to design improvement initiatives responsive to the needs of a district’s children is often at odds with initiatives from the state and federal governments which seem to value compliance over improvement (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Additionally, as more fiscal resources come from the state and federal levels for school improvement design, superintendents are faced with specific mandates for utilization. In short, superintendents are left with a helpless feeling (Carter & Cunningham). Hayes (2001) further postulates that superintendents of districts that struggle either academically or fiscally become like baseball managers with losing records. Put another way, Hayes’ point was that although many complex factors contribute to the low test scores or need for additional public funds, if there is not improvement, superintendents will eventually be held accountable, paying with the loss of their jobs. This has not been the past reality for superintendents.

The literature on educational leadership often suggests that superintendents move a step back and allow for others to take charge. An example of superintendents allowing others to take charge would be if they created and relied on committees. Many times,

committees wait to see what superintendents would like to do and then model the change effort around those desires. If superintendents truly want the opinions of others, they should remain neutral and have positive comments about ideas, unless of course the suggestions are overtly political or detrimental to a district's success. Coordinators and assistants carry out the work of superintendents, especially in larger urban settings.

Kowalski (1995) reported that urban superintendents who dedicated more time to management and political activities were forced to spend time with outside experts not directly in the field of education. In an interview with Ron Brandt (1993), Phil Schlechty explained that the superintendent's role should not be so much to make decisions as to cause them to be made. He went on to say that the role of the superintendent is not necessarily to solve problems, but to decide which problems are worth solving, and then create an environment where those problems get solved; for example, such as through the adoption of site-based management.

Some superintendents rely on subordinates to assist with the day-to-day operations of their district. Even so, the underlying and primary responsibility of superintendents is to establish visions for their educational organizations and to translate those visions into realities. The visions are converted into goals and objectives for their districts, many times focusing on school reform (Konnert & Augenstein, 1995). In order to understand clearly the linkage between superintendents and school reform, Cuban (1998) declared the following:

conflict is the DNA of the superintendency; persistent conflicts create enduring dilemmas; surrounding these dilemmas are pervasive myths about superintendent tenure and effectiveness; and without a practical understanding of these dilemmas

and myths, expecting superintendents to reform schools will be little more than expecting sand castles to last beyond the incoming tide. (p. 57)

In light of the preceding, superintendents have three main roles in their jobs: instructional, managerial, and political (Cuban, 1998, p. 56). In the instructional role, superintendents are expected to “lead teachers and principals in aligning the curriculum, raising academic standards, and producing better test results” (Cuban, 1998, p. 56). In the managerial role, superintendents are expected to keep their organizations running smoothly and efficiently toward district goals. Cuban (1998) further states that stability is the password. “Reducing conflict is highly prized. Leading, on the other hand, means seeking changes, taking risks, and accepting conflict as a natural condition in the district” (Cuban, 1998, p. 56). Finally, in the political role, superintendents are expected to “use their technical and organizational skills in implementing what others, school boards, governors, state legislatures, and the U.S. Congress, decide” (Cuban, 1998, p. 56). To advance their agendas, “superintendents negotiate with school board members, unions, principals, parent groups, and city officials. They figure out ways to build coalitions for their schools at budget time or during crises” (Cuban, 1998, p. 57).

Kowalski (1999) noted that district enrollment and complexity are key factors in determining the specific roles superintendents play. Larger districts often seek leaders who are specialists and can concentrate on specific items established by the board of education. In these larger districts, many of the superintendents’ duties are delegated to assistants or coordinators. At the same time, in school systems, superintendents are involved in all areas of administration, including the direct supervision of building level administrators (Moore, 2001). Regardless of the size of their districts, most

superintendents are in office for such a brief time and it is difficult to determine the value of their contributions (Kowalski, 1995).

Usdan, McCloud, Podmostko, and Cuban (2001) acknowledged that district leaders are in an arena that is “perpetually besieged by a potpourri of often conflicting forces” (p. 26). Among these forces are state and federal laws and regulations, federal mandates, decentralized school management, demands for greater accountability, changing demographics, the school choice movement, competing community needs, limited resources, partisan politics, legal challenges, shortages of qualified teachers and principals, and a general lack of respect for the education profession.

Accordingly, superintendents must be agents of change. They must convince teachers, administrators, parents, community members, and the board of education to join them in solving problems their district encounters. Superintendents must accomplish all of these tasks by cleverly empowering these stakeholders (Johnson, 1996).

Superintendents need to have practical understandings of these dilemmas; a willingness to teach school boards, staff, and community the complexities of the conflicts that they and their districts face; a clear cause-effect model of how to influence others to do what has to be done; explicit criteria for evaluating their success as superintendents; and finally, the determination to counter the passion of so many policymakers, foundation officers, and corporate leaders seeking short-term solutions (that evaporate in a few years) for long-term dilemmas (Cuban, 1998). Additionally, the ability to bargain, negotiate, coerce, and coordinate is critical for the success of superintendents and their districts (Fore, 1999).

In order for superintendents to effectively accomplish their tasks, they should identify where boards and districts are in working within a system's model (Fore, 1999). To this end, Fore recommended that superintendents and school boards should consider employing the services of an "outside consultant skilled in leading boards in these foundational tasks...a convenient method to accomplish them while at the same time, perhaps, helping the board learn and practice new forms of collaboration in a safe setting" (p. 15). School boards in southwestern Ohio can turn to their own organization, the Ohio School Boards Association (OSBA), to assist them with this endeavor. Schein (1992) spoke of the nexus between leadership and culture by asserting that creating and managing culture is the most important function of boards of education and the school administration. In paraphrasing John Dewey, Phil Schlechty stated that the job of the board is to ensure that what the wisest parents in the community want for their children is what all children receive (as cited in Brandt, 1993).

A major factor impacting the success of superintendents is school boards. McCurdy (1992) believed the demographics of board members today have changed so dramatically from the demographics of board members of the past that the result was a drastic change in the philosophical orientations of board members. Hess (2002) confirmed that half of the school board members in the United States are elected and unchallenged while another sizable segment is appointed by fellow board members during non-election times of the year. Moreover, Glass (2000) acknowledged nearly 60% of board members currently serving our schools have the experience of 5 or fewer years on a school board. This results in superintendents having to reintroduce the system to new board members which, in turn, has the potential to create situations where unfriendly

members of the public may take control of the board. Additionally, under the new leadership, superintendents may be urged to reexamine school improvement initiatives, leadership styles, and/or existing structures. On this issue, Murphy (1996) explained that “we lament the absence of bold leadership, yet we adhere to a system of checks and balances that frustrate bold action...we expect superintendents to be miracle workers, yet we create working conditions that undermine even ordinary competence” (p. 510).

Another aspect when examining boards and superintendents is their evolutionary relationship. Vail (2001) avowed that boards in conflict with their superintendents are incapable of doing anything but poisoning the well. Kowalski (1995) postulates that poor relationships between superintendents and boards “diminish the effectiveness” of the results of their work for their districts (p. 141). Basom, Young, and Adams (1999) affirmed that confrontations between boards and superintendents included responsibility issues, management of time and school district resources, and other issues that have little or no relevance to improving student achievement. Summarizing the importance of a positive superintendent-board relationship, Kowalski (1995) confirmed that various social, professional, ethical, and moral issues impact the relationship between superintendents and school board members. He postulates that superintendents have a professional and ethical obligation to recommend policy matters to the board of education. Although board members are ethically bound to listen, they are not required to follow superintendents’ recommendations in terms of approving agenda items or adopting policy. Consequently, informal and formal communication become critical parts of policymaking. In addition, positive relationships among the board members and the superintendent certainly impact effective communication (Kowalski, 1995).

Rickabaugh and Kremer (1997) developed six practical techniques to maintain positive communication between superintendents and boards. First, they suggest that superintendents remove surprises from board meetings. Superintendents dread when board members question them on matters they feel unprepared to answer without additional information. Second, they call on superintendents to maintain a follow-up routine on assignments. When board members ask for clarification on a question, superintendents should get the answers to them in a timely manner.

Third, superintendents must develop and follow guidelines for when to contact board members. Board members are usually satisfied with weekly memos as well as information provided to them at board meetings. However, when unexpected events occur that are of public interest, board members must be contacted. Fourth, superintendents need to be mindful to develop a consistent process for responding to individual board member requests. In other words, superintendents should refrain from sharing too much with one board member. The board president should be the only member to whom the superintendent provides additional information.

Fifth, superintendents need to position for success with their boards. In this regard, superintendents should assist their boards in making decisions. Thus, they should refer to board policy as guidance. Sixth, superintendents need to avoid pushing if board members already have entrenched beliefs or positions. Pushing board members may only cause them to fight even more aggressively. Superintendents should make their point but respect the fact that there may not be total agreement with board members on every issue.

Else (1993) declared that while the potential for strain is great, the board/superintendent relationship does more to determine the effectiveness and efficiency

of education in schools than any other single factor. Superintendents find that the make up of boards looks much different after a few years of service and a board election or two. Many times, a new board's majority would like to select its own superintendent to operate the district and represent its views (Glass, 2000).

Conflict between superintendents and their boards results in attracting fewer applicants than in years past. Superintendents report conflict between themselves and their school boards as the second most common reason for exiting their school district behind moving to larger or higher paying districts (McAdams & Cressman, 1997). Educational administration recruiters, school boards, and superintendents involved in the search process speak to a fast developing shortage of qualified and experienced educators to take the reins of school districts nationwide (Glass, 2000).

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Gruneberg (1979) reported that for decades, the research on job satisfaction has primarily focused on two distinct goals: discovering the causes of satisfaction and looking for the effects of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on specific types of actions such as productivity or turnover. Job satisfaction is a meaningful and significant issue that can positively or negatively affect an organization. Locke (1969) defined overall job satisfaction as the "pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job achieving or facilitating one's values" (p. 316). Schultz (1982) described job satisfaction as "the psychological disposition of people toward their work-and this involves a collection of numerous attitudes or feelings" (p. 287). Lofquist and Dawis (1991) identified job satisfaction as "an individual's positive affective evaluation of the target

environment; a pleasant affective state; the individual's appraisal of the extent to which his or her requirements are fulfilled by the environment" (p. 27).

As psychological well-being is a critical component for leaders to make informed decisions, it is important for organization leaders to be at the peak of mental health when faced with difficult issues on daily bases. The process of management is strengthened to the extent that absent areas of knowledge can, in this way, be filled in with research data pertinent to managerial process and change (Vaughn & Dunn, 1972). Weiss et al. (1977) stated that general job satisfaction is represented by the individual worker's appraisal of his satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the work environment. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) described job satisfaction as the feelings of affective responses a worker has about his or her job.

Moving from a summative to a historic view of job satisfaction, some of the earliest studies on the topic were completed by Robert Hoppock who believed there may be no such thing as job satisfaction. To Hoppock, family relationships, health, relative factors may have been as important as the job itself in determining what individuals tentatively choose to call job satisfaction. Persons may have been satisfied with one aspect of their jobs and dissatisfied with others (Hoppock, 1935). He concluded that if the presence of a certain variable led to satisfaction, then its absence led to dissatisfaction. Therefore, Hoppock viewed job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as sharing the same continuum between satisfaction and dissatisfaction, a feeling of neutrality in which individuals were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Newby, 1999).

Hanson (2003) explained that from 1927 through 1932, the studies at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works under the guidance of Elton Mayo examined

working conditions as a source of job satisfaction, specifically the illumination of the work area. Productivity rose and fell without direct relation to illumination. However, the study discovered that workers tended to act as members of informal groups. In addition to the groups were the development of social norms, non-economic rewards and punishments, and the role of informal leadership. Mayo discovered, in the Bank Wiring Room observation, that five norms guided employee behavior: avoid being a rate-buster (do not produce at too high a level), refrain from being a chiseller (do not turn out too little work), avoid being a squealer (do not report associates), refrain from acting officially (act like a regular guy), and pass on being noisy, self-assertive, and anxious for leadership (Mayo, 1933). Although superintendents are considered the boss, they can still subscribe to some of the five norms in efforts to maintain satisfaction. They still answer to their boards of education and can apply some of the principles listed above.

From Mayo's Hawthorne Works studies in the 1930s sprung a new theory on job satisfaction involving human relations in the early to mid 1950s. Homans (1950) and Whyte (1955) both focused on the presence of human relationships affecting entire organizations, both finding that group ties provided an incentive for their eventually following established group norms. Building on this point, superintendents must interact with people at every facet in their district. The students are so to speak the products, the faculty and staff the employees, and the parents and community the customers. Therefore, the superintendency is a position full of personal contacts. Human relations are at the heart of the daily agenda of a district leader.

Maslow (1954), an existential psychologist, developed a hierarchy of needs. The needs were divided into lower order needs namely; basic physiological needs, safety and

security needs, and social needs; and higher order needs including esteem needs, and self-actualization. Maslow believed that only after the lower order of needs is met can the higher order needs be satisfied. For superintendents, an example of lower order needs is contract length. Superintendents who have contracts with a considerable length may be able to move to higher levels based on their feelings of security. In addition to contract length, both public and private praise by their boards may move superintendents to higher levels of intrinsic job satisfaction, thus raising esteem levels.

In addition to Abraham Maslow, Douglas McGregor postulated a theory on motivation. Kowalski (1999) wrote about McGregor's two separate views of human motivation. One focused on the instinct and impulsiveness of the human being. This view was identified as Theory X. The other, Theory Y, focused on the rational and goal seeking side of humans. Theory X identifies the following basic needs of workers by describing them as indolent and working as little as possible, lacking ambition, disliking responsibility, and preferring to be led, being indifferent to the needs of the organization and thinking only of themselves, as not being very intelligent, as gullible, as easily led by demagogues, and resistant to change. Theory Y views workers' interests and capabilities in a more positive light. In his discussions of Theory Y, McGregor felt that "the essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward organizational rewards" (McGregor, 1960, p. 61). There are two basic assumptions of Theory Y: first, human beings do not naturally resist change and second, present in all people is the capacity for assuming responsibility, the ability to complete organizational goals and to grow personally and professionally. McGregor's view of job satisfaction is that if people in organizations are

resistant to change, administration is forced to rely on the Theory X type of management which involves tight controls. Conversely, he theorized that if people in organizations are relatively happy and interested in their job, Theory Y type management style may be used to meet job satisfaction (Bournias, 2006). Accordingly, Theory X superintendents are considered to be more directive and top down with their management style while Theory Y superintendents follow a more facilitative approach.

In addition to Theories X and Y, Ouchi (1981) identified a motivation theory based on Japanese companies that produced high productivity, morale, and motivation calling it Theory Z. Under this motivation theory, workers are guaranteed positions for life to increase their loyalty. Under this approach, success or failure is shared among all stakeholders as workers do not specialize in one area of the operation as workers learn about different aspects of the company. The theory also emphasizes the importance of a company's leadership being involved in all aspects of the employees' life, on and off the job.

Chris Argyris had a similar viewpoint to Douglas McGregor on job satisfaction in that he "saw a basic conflict between human personality and the way in which organizations are typically structured and managed" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 106). Both Argyris and McGregor believed that organizations treated their employees as children. Argyris maintained that as organizations treated their workers in this manner, the employees reacted by withdrawing through chronic absenteeism or simply by quitting; staying on the job but withdrawing psychologically, becoming indifferent, passive, and apathetic; resisting by restricting output, engaging in deception or sabotage; trying to climb the hierarchy to get better jobs; forming groups (such as labor unions) to

redress the power imbalance; and socializing their children to believe that work is unrewarding and hopes for advancement are slim. Argyris was of the opinion that organizations would eventually discourage even the most dedicated of workers unless their managerial practices changed (as cited in Bolman & Deal, 1997).

As cited in other studies on job satisfaction and motivation, the Two Factor Theory of Frederick Herzberg is one of the most popular (Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004). Herzberg (1966) differentiated two categories of factors: motivators which lead to satisfaction and hygiene factors which lead to dissatisfaction. The motivators relate to Maslow's higher order need levels, including achievement, recognition, and other intrinsic factors. Hygiene elements relate to Maslow's lower order need levels including security, salary, and working conditions (Adcock, 1991).

By separating the factors involved with job satisfaction, Herzberg et al. (1959) maintained that the causes of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate. Satisfaction is on a continuum from satisfaction to no satisfaction. The presence of intrinsic motivators results in satisfaction with the job, but their absence does not necessarily lead to job dissatisfaction. Herzberg et al. further reported that the extrinsic hygiene factors are necessary conditions for, but do not of themselves produce, job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. found that people usually mention hygiene factors when describing dissatisfying job related events. They described hygiene factors as administrative policies and practices, supervision, salary, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, status, job security, and effects on personal life. Herzberg believed that hygiene factors, whether present or absent, were not associated with effort (Hall, 1991).

Herzberg (1966) maintained the desire for workers to fulfill their potential drives them to seek growth and provides the incentive to achieve. Through his research, he understood that worker productivity would increase if the workers themselves sustained satisfaction. He discovered that feelings of accomplishment, professional growth, and recognition provided workers with the satisfaction necessary to be happy and productive. Herzberg identified six motivating factors: achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and professional growth. He reported that employers could increase productivity and have high employee morale if they adhered to his advice and satisfied intrinsic needs of their workers.

In addition, Herzberg (1966) explained that extrinsic factors actually need to be addressed by employers. These factors produced dissatisfaction, which was confirmed in his findings. He explained there was no way to eliminate the factors leading to dissatisfaction. Herzberg concluded that it was up to employers to lessen the dissatisfaction employees experience regarding these issues. For example, salary is a hygiene factor. Employees are generally dissatisfied with their salary as most people think they are worth more than they are paid. Even so, employers are usually not in the position to give employees what they want every time. Nonetheless, employers can make sure that the wages they pay are comparable to those paid for similar positions in other companies. When employees realize this fact, their level of dissatisfaction should decrease. The opposite of dissatisfaction is not satisfaction. Rather, it is less dissatisfaction. Employees will never be without dissatisfaction or satisfaction; they will, on the other hand, have different degrees of each.

More recently, Hanson (2003) believed that the body of research on motivation centers around two theoretical orientations: content theory and process theory. Content theory suggests that humans are driven by basic and learned needs. Some of those basic needs include food and safety while some learned needs are competition and ambition. When needs are satisfied, Hanson maintained that humans then move on to other needs to fulfill that are arranged in a hierarchy. Hanson believed that human beings will work to achieve a desired goal as long as they feel they can truly achieve it along with the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards associated with the goal. According to Hanson (2003),

In the final analysis, we make choices based on cognitive reasoning. We also seek to benefit from our choices, whether the benefits are measured in our contribution to a better society, dollars, summer vacations, increased levels of learning, or smiles on kids' faces. Depending on our priorities, all are important in the motivation process. (p. 213)

In summary, this section of the literature review offered many theories regarding job satisfaction such as Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg's Two Factor Theory, and McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. The research on job satisfaction primarily focused on discovering the causes of satisfaction and looking for the effects of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on specific types of actions. Job satisfaction is a significant issue and can positively and negatively affect the performance of superintendents, just like other school employees.

Job Satisfaction and the Superintendency

Carter and Cunningham (1997) noted that “the success and prosperity of American education may well depend as much on the survival of the superintendent as it does on his or her ability to be an effective educational leader” (p. 3). An array of researchers consider the school superintendency a field of research that has been largely overlooked (Borquist, 1987; Castle, 2004; Malanowski, 1999; Nelson, 1987; O’Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004; Whitsell, 1987). The superintendency requires a leader who is visionary, creative, bold, and has the capacity to initiate change (American Association of School Administrators, 1993). Further, Crowson (1987) explained that the job of school superintendents is a distinct puzzle and that the role is considered to be high in conflict when compared to the similar job of city manager. The superintendency should be known for its visibility and beck-and-call responsiveness to school board and community. At the same time, it is a position that at its core is more heavily focused inward toward the management of the school district and its professionals. As a result, the expectations for superintendents are demanding (as cited in Castle, 2004).

An author describing himself as a veteran fighter in the field of American education made the following comment to Callahan in his 1964 book, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (as cited in Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2002, p. 1):

The point I wish to make is that nothing, absolutely nothing, is of more vital consuming interest to the average superintendent than the tremendously important question of whether he will be retained in his present position for the coming year...He knows from statistics, observations, and experiences that he is in the most hazardous occupation known to insurance actuaries. Deepsea diving and

structural steel work have nothing on the business of school superintending.

Lloyds will insure the English clerk against rain on his weekend vacation, but no gambling house would be sufficiently reckless to bet on the chances of re-election for school superintendents three years or even two years ahead.

The renewal of superintendents' contracts may have more to do with how leaders can navigate through political waters than with delivering academic achievement. In the current political climate, it is not correct to defend public schools. Superintendents must always be pushing for improvement for the sake of accountability while serving as the cheerleader for the schools. It is hard to play to both crowds at the same time (Cuban, 1985). In the 2006 survey conducted by the American Association of School Administrators, 59% of the superintendents surveyed indicated that stress is great or considerable (Hicks, 2007). The pressures of the superintendency are unique and have a major impact on job satisfaction levels. Still, some of the actions of superintendents can impact their situation like Dennis Kelly (1997), Superintendent of Schools for the Lyons Township School District in La Grange, Illinois, who affirmed that superintendents tend to shoot themselves in the foot on many issues. By way of demonstration, Kelly provided six quick lessons for school leaders to find success:

most people lose their jobs not because they are incompetent, but because they are uncooperative, people should never confuse the number of hours worked with the value to the organization, respect the opposition, realize that there is absolutely no relationship between the length of the meeting and its productivity, and understand that critics will more likely make someone a better leader than drive them to an early grave, and it's all about human relationships. All of it. (p. 46)

The position of superintendency can be stressful. Even so, there are benefits granted that some consider desirable. Kowalski (1999) described the high status and prestige of the superintendent's position. Superintendents are usually well-known in their communities and receive considerable exposure in the media. Yet, many practitioners view extrinsic rewards such as salary and fringe benefits as significant rewards. Kowalski pointed out that superintendents are routinely the highest paid employees in their organizations and in some instances, the salary gap between them and the next highest paid employees is substantial. In addition, superintendents frequently receive more lucrative fringe benefit packages than those provided for other employees. While extrinsic rewards are common among superintendents, it may be the intrinsic rewards that may have more of an impact on whether they stay in the position for a longer period of time.

Besides intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, superintendents' relationships with their boards of education can impact job satisfaction. Superintendents' relationships with their boards of education are critical for their success (Kowalski, 1999). Moreover, Mountford (2004) observed that the relationship between school board members and superintendents is often characterized as controversial, arduous, and challenging. Consequently, it is difficult for researchers to agree on the causes of such difficulties for superintendents. Norton et al. (1996) indicated, "since the day that the office of the superintendent was created until present, there has been a strained relationship between the board that makes policy and the superintendent that carries it out" (p. 34).

Along the same line of thought, Price (2001) asserted that unlike most corporate governing boards, school board members are politically elected office holders who define

their roles differently than typical corporate board members. While corporate board membership involves a fundamentally different incentive that is primarily economic in nature, school board membership involves an incentive that is political in nature. The stakeholders are parents as well as taxpayers and have personal interests in every decision made. With such a high interest in what they do, the public can insert much influence into the process. Burns (1993) described a new breed of board members as intern politicians, full of righteous indignation, ambition, insecurity, and anger. She goes on to say that the board members see public disagreements as opportunities rather than disasters. Superintendents, however, may look at public disagreements as a reflection of their leadership. Consequently, some superintendents choose to play it safe and avoid conflict with their boards of education. Brubaker and Coble (1995) wrote

the conflict inherent to the fragility of the role of today's superintendents is illustrated in the statement...I can keep the job but not move the district forward. I couldn't be derailed, but just plodding on without a creative vision would be depressing. (p. 35)

School board members play a significant role in whether superintendents are satisfied with their positions while other factors may influence their feelings of frustration. Kowalski (1999) pointed out that superintendents are individuals, they react differently to common problems and needs. Some superintendents are optimists, others are pessimists; some are extroverts and can deal easily with the public through the media, others are introverts and rely on seconds in command and press releases to promote their ideas. In addition, the demographics of school districts where superintendents are employed may impact their feelings of frustration. More specifically, superintendents in

larger districts may express frustrations that are different in nature than those who lead smaller, rural districts. By way of illustration, superintendents in large, suburban districts may spend hours interacting with local business leaders at a Chamber of Commerce meeting while their colleagues' rural school systems may spend hours convincing board members that new school buses with certain types of engines are better in the long run than competing engines since their parts are cheaper and more readily available in the immediate area. In other words, superintendents are faced with many different problems and situations across school districts and each unique set of facts and circumstances will affect job satisfaction differently. Therefore, since boards play such a significant role in determining job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, superintendents must be conscious of the philosophy and practices of their bosses.

Kowalski (1995) stated that school board member perceptions of the ideal superintendent are formed by personal convictions. He identified nine problems commonly attributed to superintendents in terms of expectations of school board members. The first problem Kowalski identified is lack of integrity, meaning that a superintendent may simply not be trustworthy in the eyes of a board. In these cases, board members may have doubts about the information they receive from the leader and question his or her judgment. Kowalski's second point is lack of respect for board members. The superintendent demonstrates little respect for board members' ability to understand issues or information presented to them. The third problem identified by Kowalski is failing to maintain stability in districts when superintendents disclose confidential information to employees, the media, or others; the board feels it cannot trust its leader. Fourth, Kowalski asserted that superintendents sometimes act in a

subordinating rather than cooperating manner. The superintendent does not see the school board as partners but rather as adversaries. His fifth point is superintendents are guilty of failing to lead effectively. The superintendent does not take an active role in developing a vision for the district. Critical decisions are avoided rather than embraced. Kowalski's sixth point is superintendents fail to effectively manage. The superintendent is reluctant to manage the district and make important decisions. Seventh, Kowalski asserted superintendents fail to be accessible. The superintendent does not return phone calls to board members and does not see anyone without an appointment. He or she does not participate in community activities. His eighth point is superintendents fail to communicate. The superintendent does not maintain open two-way communication with board members. Board members are often surprised with information or issues. Ninth, Kowalski pointed out superintendents fail to comply with ethical and moral standards, meaning the superintendent engages in inappropriate behavior. It should be noted that school districts may have differing views on what is and is not acceptable to their community standards.

As noted by Kowalski (1999), the lack of communication between boards and superintendents can strain relationships. McCurdy (1992) identified four distinct points to keep in mind related to improving communication: board members often do not understand the differences between their roles and those of the superintendents, poor communication by both parties contributes to conflict, board members often enter office with personal agendas, and board members and superintendents often fail to establish a necessary level of mutual trust (p. 48). Additionally, relationships may deteriorate due to the lack of proper monitoring. According to Castello, Creco, and McGowan (1992),

superintendents should “periodically engage the board of education in discussions designed to provide at least an informal evaluation of their relationship” (p. 149).

Similarly, Kowalski (1999) stated that the majority of boards and superintendents who have effective, collaborative relationships work at it. Superintendents must take a proactive role in these relationships. They must learn to recognize what is positive and what is perceived as a political leadership style. However, superintendents should not be afraid to make unpopular recommendations to the board; the superintendent is the chief advisor to the board. Most of his/her advice will be accepted and acted upon favorably by the board. The challenge for superintendents within the highly political environment of public education is to establish credibility and embrace the political power that can mobilize resources to achieve results (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) asserted that superintendents should “exercise the wisest kind of political behavior by resolving conflicting demands of many constituents and, in turn, gain their support for decisions” (p. 7). Superintendents who maintain positive relationships with their boards may increase their chance of being satisfied in their position; thus boards play a significant role in the success of a school leader. Therefore, it is imperative that superintendents spend much time and effort building strong relationships with their boards.

In short, it is apparent that board and superintendent conflict is a characteristic of the job in this era of accountability (Lashway, 2002). Kowalski (1995) reports that professional journals are filled with observances of many types of conflict that range from role definition and fulfillment to finance related issues to political judgments and accountability for student achievement. Although the issues are broad and universal, they

are not trivial. How superintendents respond to these issues may determine whether they have a job to go to the next day.

Summary

In short, this review of literature presented information on the role of the school superintendent, highlighted some of the major theories of job satisfaction, and reviewed the impact the position of public school superintendent has on job satisfaction. Through the literature review, it is evident that a number of factors can contribute to the level of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Some of the satisfying factors mentioned in the literature include social service and status of the position, longevity of the position, and the interpersonal relationships with the board of education. Some of the dissatisfying factors mentioned in the literature include salary, lack of recognition, stress of the position, the demands of the position, and negative relations with the board of education. With this as a background, this study next examines whether certain variables impact the level of job satisfaction.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the levels of job satisfaction of school superintendents in select counties in southwestern Ohio. The researcher selected the following counties in southwestern Ohio because of the diversity in the demographics and the ability to generalize the findings to this area: Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren Counties. In addition, southwestern Ohio is a unique part of the state in terms of education. The diversity in the demographics sought in this study is extensive.

By the nature of the study, the limitations of generalizing the results of the study across populations are understood. However, the researcher believes the specific data collected for public school superintendents will have a positive impact on this area of the state. Additionally, this study investigated the relationship of the following variables to the variables of school superintendents' general job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, and intrinsic job satisfaction: size of the school district where superintendent is currently employed, identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed, designation of the school district (i.e., excellent,

effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed, gender of superintendent, age of superintendent, years of experience as a superintendent, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held.

This section includes information on the population of superintendents selected for this study, the procedure followed, the instrument utilized, and how the data analysis was carried out.

Population

The total population of superintendents surveyed was 81 who served during the 2007-2008 school year in the counties under investigation. The researcher obtained the names and addresses of all current superintendents from the Educational Service Centers of each county under investigation. As noted, the school districts represented in this study were in the following counties: Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren. The complete list of school districts in each county is listed in Appendix A along with demographic data.

Procedure

On September 18, 2007, the researcher mailed a packet containing a cover letter (Appendix B) to 81 public school superintendents in Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren Counties, a numbered demographic survey (Appendix C), a numbered, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form, Weiss et al., 1977; see Appendix D), and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The information was utilized to gather data for the study on school superintendent job satisfaction.

The cover letter (Appendix B) was designed to seek voluntary cooperation from school superintendents. It explained the purpose and nature of the study on superintendent job satisfaction, identified the University of Dayton as the institution with which the researcher is associated, and provided instructions for the completion and subsequent return of the survey and demographic information. In addition, the cover letter assured respondents that no superintendents would be identified personally and all responses would be kept anonymous and confidential.

The demographic survey (Appendix C) requested information regarding the following variables: size of the school district where superintendent is currently employed, identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed, designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed, gender of superintendent, age of superintendent, years of experience as a superintendent, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held. The demographic information was used as variables and correlated with superintendents' job satisfaction responses from the MSQ.

On September 28, 2007, the researcher sent a follow-up mailing to all school superintendents requesting them again to participate in the study if they had yet to do so. The University of Dayton's Institutional Review Board (see Appendix E) gave approval to conduct the survey in July of 2007. Responding superintendents were able to check a box on the demographic survey sheet if they wished to receive a copy of the results of the study.

The researcher began the process of data analysis after the surveys were completed and returned by mail. The data were collected, coded, and entered into the SPSS database.

The responses were analyzed to establish individual item scores, a general job satisfaction score, an intrinsic job satisfaction score, and an extrinsic job satisfaction score. The researcher utilized correlations to determine if a relationship exists between the following variables: size of the school district where the superintendent is employed, age of the superintendent, and years of experience of the superintendent to a general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction score. To determine whether a relationship exists between the gender of the superintendent and general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction, a *t* test was utilized. Finally, the researcher conducted a series of analysis of variance (ANOVAs) procedures to see if the following variables showed a significant relationship to their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction scores: identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural), designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency), most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study of school superintendent job satisfaction was the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), originally copyrighted in 1963. This survey has been used in recent doctoral dissertations to measure school superintendent job satisfaction (Malanowski, 1999; O'Malley, 2004; Soloman, 2004). The researcher originally sought a survey instrument specifically designed to measure job

satisfaction of school superintendents and contacted Dr. Paul Winter of the University of Louisville. He was not aware of an instrument specifically designed for school superintendents. However, he did suggest the investigation of the following instruments to assess job satisfaction of school superintendents: the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) and the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). After review, it was determined that each instrument did not specifically address school superintendents.

The MSQ does measure education job satisfaction for teachers and Chief Executive Officers (CEO) of businesses and organizations (Weiss et al., 1977). School superintendents are the CEOs of their districts. With this information and the fact that the MSQ has been used with success with superintendents, the researcher gained confidence with the instrument.

The MSQ is a paper-and-pencil inventory that takes about 10 minutes to complete, is gender neutral, and can be administered to groups or individuals (Weiss et al., 1977). The instructions for the administration of the MSQ can be found in a questionnaire style booklet.

The MSQ utilizes 20 survey items to produce intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, and general job satisfaction scores. The intrinsic job satisfaction factors are: the chance to do something that makes use of my time (Ability Utilization), the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job (Achievement), being able to keep busy (Activity), the chance for advancement on this job (Advancement), my pay and the amount of work I do (Compensation), the way my co-workers get along with each other (Co-workers), the chance to try my own methods of doing the job (Creativity), the chance

to work alone on the job (Independence), being able to do things that do not go against my conscience (Moral Values), the chance to do things for other people (Social Service), the chance to be somebody in the community (Social Status), the working conditions (Working Conditions).

The extrinsic job satisfaction factors in the MSQ are: the chance to tell other people what to do (Authority), the way company policy and practices are implemented (Company policies and practices), the praise I get for doing a good job (Recognition), the freedom to use my own judgment (Responsibility), the way my job provides for steady employment (Security), the chance to do different things from time to time (Variety). The general job satisfaction factors in the MSQ are: the way my boss handles his/her employees (Supervision and human relations), the competence of my supervisor in making decisions (Supervision-technical), the addition of all items from the intrinsic and extrinsic scales listed above (O'Malley, 2004; Weiss et al., 1977). The 20 responses on the MSQ are scored using a 5-point Likert scale: *very satisfied* (5-VS), *satisfied* (4-S), *neither satisfied nor dissatisfied* (3-N), *dissatisfied* (2-D), and *very dissatisfied* (1-VD) (Weiss et al., 1977). These 20 questions represent specific variable categories of the questionnaire that will be used to determine levels of satisfaction when analyzed with other variables of interest. The researcher will measure levels of general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction from these data.

The Manual for the MSQ short form (as cited in Malanowski, 1999; Soloman, 2004) addresses issues of reliability. The short form has high reliability coefficients, ranging from .87 to .92. The general satisfaction scores yielded a coefficient of .89 in test-retest correlation over a one-week period and .70 over a one-year period. The median

reliability coefficients for intrinsic satisfaction is .86, for extrinsic satisfaction is .80, and for general satisfaction is .90.

There have been over 15 studies completed on the issue of job satisfaction in the field of education using these 20 job satisfaction statements used in the MSQ. There have been many studies of job satisfaction of superintendents including those by Brown (1978), Malanowski (1999), O'Malley (2004), Schoen (2006), Soloman (2004), and Whitsell (1987). Examining the job satisfaction of principals were Bournias (2006), Hull (1974), Lombardo (2005), Priskett (1988), J. Smith (1976), and Weiss (1968). Bledsoe and Hayward (1981), Parker (1974), Schaefer (1982), and Struble (1993) studied job satisfaction among teachers.

Data Analysis

The responses from the superintendents were analyzed to determine individual item scores, a general job satisfaction score, an intrinsic job satisfaction score, and an extrinsic job satisfaction score. Individual responses to questions range from a high of 5 to a low of 1. Mean and standard deviation scores were tabulated. The data were tested against multiple variables to determine the level of significance each posed in predicting job satisfaction levels.

Correlations were utilized by the researcher to determine if a relationship exists between the following variables to a general job satisfaction score, an intrinsic job satisfaction score, and an extrinsic job satisfaction: size of the school district where superintendent is currently employed, the age of the superintendent, and the years of experience as a superintendent. The researcher utilized *t* tests to evaluate the difference between males and females in general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction. Finally,

analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were used by the researcher to examine whether a relationship exists between the following variables and general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction: identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed, designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held.

Due to the small population number of this study, the researcher needed to address the possibility of Type I and Type II errors. Setting a region of rejection or alpha at .05 could have increased the possibility of a Type I error in the research. If a Type I error resulted, the results would not have been valid. Conversely, Type II errors may have occurred if the alpha was arbitrarily placed too low. Knowing the possibility of the resulting data being flawed, the researcher investigated strategies that would decrease the potential for error and raise the level of confidence that the results obtained were valuable. For those reasons, the researcher used a Bonferroni Test to set the alpha score for this study. By using a Bonferroni Test, the possibility of a Type I error decreased.

In sum, the researcher collected data from responses submitted by subjects and coded and entered these into the SPSS database. After data were coded and entered into the SPSS database, the researcher began significance testing.

Summary

Data from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlations, *t* tests, and ANOVAs. The data were collected from public school superintendents in counties in southwestern Ohio during the 2007-2008

school year. The variables for the study were as follows: size of the school district where superintendent is currently employed, identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed, designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed, gender of superintendent, age of superintendent, years of experience as a superintendent, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held. The data collected allowed the researcher to draw conclusions, make recommendations, and identify possible critical areas of need with the topic of public school superintendent job satisfaction. Chapter IV describes the survey results.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of superintendents while examining those aspects of the job that account for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This study also investigated the impact of the following variables: size of the school districts where superintendents were employed in terms of enrollment; classification of the type of school district as urban, suburban, rural, where superintendents were employed; designation of school districts as excellent, effective, in need of continuous improvement, in academic watch, or in academic emergency, where superintendents were employed; gender of superintendents; age of superintendents; years of experience as superintendents; most recent position held prior to becoming superintendents; and highest degrees held. At the same time, Chapter IV discusses the findings from the analysis of data obtained from the survey. The data analysis is divided into two sections. The first part reports on demographic data from the superintendents in the study. The second section addresses the research questions by reviewing the descriptive and inferential statistics derived from the results from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire that addressed their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of

job satisfaction scores.

Demographics

The researcher sent 81 surveys to all public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio. There were 59 complete and usable responses returned for a response rate of 72.83%.

The researcher collected data on the size of the school districts, age and gender of the superintendents, identification and designation of the school districts of the superintendents, as well as the position each held prior to becoming superintendent, highest degree held and years of experience as superintendent. Frequency tables were created to present the findings.

Size of School District

The researcher presented in Table 1 a frequency distribution on the size of the school districts of the responding superintendents. School district size ranged from smaller districts with less than 2,000 students to large districts with more than 8,000 students. Over half of the responding superintendents led districts of 3,000 or fewer students. Less than 7% of responding superintendents led districts with more than 8,000 students.

Table 1

Demographic Statistics for Size of School District

Total students	<i>n</i>	Total percent	State average*
< 2,000	19	32.2	56.0
2,001-3,000	11	18.6	18.6
3,001-5,000	14	23.7	14.3
5,001-8,000	11	18.6	6.6
> 8,000	4	6.8	4.5
Total	59	100.0	100.0

*Ohio Department of Education (2008)

Age

Table 2 represents the frequency distribution of the age of the responding superintendents. The respondents' ages varied from a low range of 35-45 years old ($n = 6$, 10.2%) to a high range of greater than 65 years old ($n = 2$, 3.3%). The largest group of superintendents responding to the survey was between the ages of 46-55 ($n = 28$, 47.4%). The largest percentage of responding superintendents was between the ages of 46-65 ($n = 51$, 86.4%).

Table 2

Demographic Statistics for Age

Age	<i>n</i>	Total percent
< 35	0	0.0
35-45	6	10.2
46-55	28	47.5
56-65	23	39.0
> 65	2	3.3
Total	59	100.0

Gender

The researcher computed a frequency distribution on the gender of responding superintendents in Table 3. Almost four fifths of the responding superintendents ($n = 47$, 79.9%) were male. The remaining one fifth of superintendents were female ($n = 12$, 20.3%). The average percent of female superintendents in Ohio was 18.2% (M. Danzuso, personal communication, March 7, 2008).

Table 3

Demographic Statistics for Gender

Gender	<i>n</i>	Total percent	State average*
Female	12	20.3	18.2
Male	47	79.7	81.8
Total	59	100.0	100.0

*Ohio Department of Education (2008)

Identification of School District

Table 4 represents the frequency distribution of the identification of the school districts from the responding superintendents. Over 50% of the superintendents ($n = 32$, 54.2%) worked in districts that the Ohio Department of Education classified as suburban while over 30% worked in rural systems ($n = 18$, 30.5%).

Table 4

Demographic Statistics for Identification of School District

Identification	<i>n</i>	Total percent	State average*
Rural	18	30.5	55.7
Urban	9	15.3	19.1
Suburban	32	54.2	25.2
Total	59	100.0	100.0

*Ohio Department of Education (2008)

Designation of School District

In Table 5 the researcher presented a frequency distribution on the designation of school districts of the responding superintendents. Almost half of the responding superintendents ($n = 28$, 47.5%) led school districts designated as effective by the Ohio Department of Education on the last School District Report Card. Over 30% of superintendents ($n = 19$, 32.2%) led school districts designated as excellent. These districts outperformed the state average by 13%. There were no responses from superintendents of districts designated as being in academic watch or on academic emergency.

Table 5

Demographic Statistics for Designation of School District

Designation	<i>n</i>	Total percent	State average*
Excellent	19	32.2	19.6
Effective	28	47.5	48.6
Continuous improvement	12	20.3	30.1
Academic watch	0	0.0	1.7
Academic emergency	0	0.0	0.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0

*Ohio Department of Education (2008)

Recent Position Held Prior to Superintendent

Table 6 represents the frequency distribution of the recent positions held prior to becoming superintendents. Over half of the superintendents ($n = 31$, 52.5%) were

assistant superintendents prior to obtaining the top position. Only 39% percent of superintendents went directly from being building level principals to leaders of school districts. Four respondents were not assistant superintendents, principals, or district supervisors prior to becoming superintendent. One respondent was an accountability officer, another a business manager, and two were directors of curriculum.

Table 6

Demographic Statistics for Recent Position Held Prior to Superintendent

Recent position	<i>n</i>	Total percent
Principal	23	39.0
Assistant superintendent	31	52.5
District supervisor	1	1.7
Other	4	6.8
Total	59	100.0

Highest Degree Attained

Table 7 presents a frequency distribution on the highest degree held at the time the superintendents completed the survey. Half of the responding superintendents ($n = 30$, 50.8%) had only a master's degree. A large percentage of superintendents ($n = 25$, 42.4%) completed doctorate degrees. The average for Ohio superintendents having a doctorate degree is 24.4% while 72.5% have a master's degree (M. Danzuso, personal communication, March 7, 2008). Only 2.9% of superintendents in Ohio hold an Educational Specialist degree.

Table 7

Demographic Statistics for Highest Degree Held

Degree	<i>n</i>	Total percent	State average*
Masters	30	50.8	72.5
Educational specialist	4	6.8	2.9
Doctorate	25	42.4	24.4
Other	0	0.0	0.2
Total	59	100.0	100.0

*Ohio Department of Education (2008)

Years of Experience as a Superintendent

Table 8 represents the frequency distribution of the years of experience of superintendents in their current positions. One fifth of the respondents ($n = 12$, 20.3%) had less than 3 years of experience as superintendents. Almost half of the superintendents ($n = 28$, 47.5%) had between 3 and 8 years of experience.

Table 8

Demographic Statistics for Years of Experience as a Superintendent

Years	<i>n</i>	Total percent
< 3	12	20.3
3-8	28	47.5
9-13	11	18.6
14-18	3	5.1
> 18	5	8.5
Total	59	100.0

Research Questions

Research Question 1

1. What is the perceived level of job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the southwestern Ohio counties of Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren?

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire consists of 20 questions, all of which made up the general satisfaction score. Of those counties identified, the researcher analyzed general satisfaction scores based on all 20 questions from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The frequency distribution of general satisfaction mean scores in Table 9 indicates mean scores ranging from 3.35 to 4.80 on a 5-point scale. The general satisfaction mean was 4.00, which indicates that the superintendents were very satisfied.

When examining the mean averages of individual questions, questions 3, 9, 11, 15, and 20 had mean averages over 4.50 with question 9, ("The chance to do for other people") resulting in a mean of 4.69. The lowest mean average came from question 10 ("The chance to tell others what to do") at 3.39. Additionally, over 16% of the superintendents completing a survey had a mean score of 3.95. As a result of these findings, one can conclude that general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio is positive.

Table 9

Distribution of General Satisfaction Mean Scores

General score	<i>n</i>	Percentage of total
3.35	1	1.7
3.40	1	1.7
3.45	3	5.1
3.50	1	1.7
3.55	1	1.7
3.60	2	3.4
3.70	1	1.7
3.75	1	1.7
3.80	2	3.4
3.85	3	5.1
3.95	10	16.9
4.00	4	6.8
4.05	1	1.7
4.10	5	8.5
4.15	4	6.8
4.20	4	6.8
4.25	5	8.5
4.30	3	5.1
4.35	1	1.7
4.40	2	3.4
4.50	1	1.7
4.75	1	1.7
4.80	1	1.7
Total	59	100.0

Table 10

Mean and Standard Deviations on General Questions

Content	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q9. The chance to do for other people	4.69	.500
Q3. The change to do different things	4.64	.550
Q11. The chance to use abilities	4.56	.534
Q15. Freedom to use judgment	4.53	.537
Q20. Feeling of accomplishment	4.53	.626
Q16. Chance to try own methods	4.42	.563
Q17. The working conditions	4.25	.733
Q1. Being able to keep busy	4.22	.984
Q7. Do things that don't go against my conscience	4.15	.738
Q4. The chance to be somebody	4.00	.871
Q18. The way my co-workers get along with each other	3.97	.870
Q8. The way the job provides steady employment	3.85	1.047
Q12. The way policies are practiced	3.83	.746
Q13. The amount of work	3.68	.918
Q2. The chance to work alone	3.58	.894
Q14. The chances for advancement	3.56	.749
Q5. The way my boss handles workers	3.53	.774
Q6. Competence of my superior	3.47	.953
Q19. The praise for doing a good job	3.44	.987
Q10. The chance to tell others what to do	3.39	.788

Research Question 2

2. What is the perceived level of intrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation?

The researcher obtained a total intrinsic satisfaction score by examining 12 items identified as intrinsic questions. The frequency distribution of intrinsic satisfaction mean scores in Table 11 reveals mean scores ranging from 3.33 to 5.00 on a 5-point scale. The researcher identified 12 questions, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 as intrinsic questions. The intrinsic satisfaction mean was 4.20, which indicates that the superintendents were very satisfied.

When examining the mean averages of individual questions, Table 12 demonstrates that questions 3, 9, 11, 15, and 20 had mean averages over 4.50 with question 9 ("The chance to do for other people") resulting in a mean of 4.69. The lowest mean average came from question 10 ("The chance to tell others what to do") at 3.39. Additionally, over 15% ($n = 9$, 15.2%) of the superintendents completing a survey had a mean score of 4.50.

The researcher examined further, specific responses to individual questions. Over 90% of public school superintendents responded that they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to one-half of the intrinsic satisfaction questions. Moreover, 96% of superintendents responded that they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 3 ("The chance to do different things") as illustrated in Table 13. Table 14 indicates 98% of superintendents responded that they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 9 ("The chance to do for other people"). Ninety-eight percent of superintendents responded that they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 11 ("The chance to use abilities") as shown in Table 15. Ninety-eight percent of superintendents responded that they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 15 ("The freedom to use judgment") as reflected in Table 16. Further, 96% of superintendents responded that they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 16 ("The chance to try own methods") as shown in Table 17. Ninety-six percent of superintendents responded *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 20 ("The feeling of accomplishment") as revealed in Table 18. Interestingly, over half of the superintendents ($n = 32$, 54.2%) were neutral on question 10 ("The chance to tell others what to do") shown in Table 19.

Table 11

Distribution of Intrinsic Satisfaction Mean Scores

General score	<i>n</i>	Percentage of total
3.33	1	1.7
3.41	2	3.4
3.50	1	1.7
3.58	2	3.4
3.75	1	1.7
3.83	3	5.1
3.91	3	5.1
4.00	4	6.8
4.08	7	11.9
4.16	2	3.4
4.25	6	10.2
4.33	4	6.8
4.41	6	10.2
4.50	9	15.3
4.58	3	5.1
4.66	1	1.7
4.75	2	3.4
4.91	1	1.7
5.00	1	1.7
Total	59	100.0

Table 12

Mean and Standard Deviations on Intrinsic Questions

Content	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q9. The chance to do for other people	4.69	.500
Q3. The chance to do different things	4.64	.550
Q11. The chance to use abilities	4.56	.534
Q15. Freedom to use judgment	4.53	.537
Q20. Feeling of accomplishment	4.53	.626
Q16. Chance to try own methods	4.42	.563
Q1. Being able to keep busy	4.22	.984
Q7. Do things that don't go against my conscience	4.15	.738
Q4. The chance to be somebody	4.00	.871
Q8. The way the job provides steady employment	3.85	1.047
Q2. The chance to work alone	3.58	.894
Q10. The chance to tell others what to do	3.39	.788

As a result of these findings, one can conclude that intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio is positive.

Table 13

Frequency Table for Question 3(The chance to do different things)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	2	3.4	3.4	3.4
Satisfied	17	28.8	28.8	32.2
Very satisfied	40	67.8	67.8	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 14

Frequency Table for Question 9 (The chance to do for other people)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Satisfied	16	27.1	27.1	28.8
Very satisfied	42	71.2	71.2	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 15

Frequency Table for Question 11 (The chance to use abilities)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Satisfied	24	40.7	40.7	42.4
Very satisfied	34	57.6	57.6	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 16

Frequency Table for Question 15 (Freedom to use judgment)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Satisfied	26	44.1	44.1	45.8
Very satisfied	32	54.2	54.2	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 17

Frequency Table for Question 16 (Chance to try own methods)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	2	3.4	3.4	3.4
Satisfied	30	50.8	50.8	54.2
Very satisfied	27	45.8	45.8	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 18

Frequency Table for Question 20 (Feeling of accomplishment)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Neutral	1	1.7	1.7	3.4
Satisfied	23	39.0	39.0	42.4
Very satisfied	34	57.6	57.6	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 19

Frequency Table for Question 10 (The chance to tell others what to do)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Dissatisfied	3	5.1	5.1	6.8
Neutral	32	54.2	54.2	61.0
Satisfied	18	30.5	30.5	91.5
Very satisfied	5	8.5	8.5	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Research Question 3

3. What is the perceived level of extrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation?

The MSQ authors identified six of the questions as extrinsic questions and gave the researcher a total extrinsic satisfaction score. The frequency distribution of general satisfaction mean scores in Table 20 indicates mean scores ranging from 2.16 to 5.00 on a 5-point scale. The six questions identified as extrinsic were 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, and 19. The extrinsic satisfaction mean was 3.56, which indicates the satisfaction level was *satisfied*.

Table 20

Distribution of Extrinsic Satisfaction Mean Scores

General score	<i>n</i>	Percentage of total
2.16	1	1.7
2.50	1	1.7
2.66	1	1.7
2.83	2	3.4
3.00	4	6.8
3.16	6	10.2
3.33	6	10.2
3.50	6	10.2
3.66	13	22.0
3.83	5	8.5
4.00	8	13.6
4.16	1	1.7
4.33	3	5.1
4.50	1	1.7
5.00	1	1.7
Total	59	100.0

Table 21

Mean and Standard Deviations on Extrinsic Satisfaction Questions

Content	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q12. The way policies are practiced	3.83	.746
Q13. The amount of work	3.68	.918
Q14. The chances for advancement	3.56	.749
Q5. The way my boss handles workers	3.53	.774
Q6. Competence of my superior	3.47	.953
Q19. The praise for doing a good job	3.44	.987

Over 54% of public school superintendents responded *neutral* to question 5 (“The way my boss handles workers”) while over 44% responded *satisfied* or *very satisfied* as shown in Table 22.

Table 22

Frequency Table for Question 5 (The way my boss handles workers)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neutral	32	54.2	54.2	55.9
Satisfied	19	32.2	32.2	88.1
Very satisfied	7	11.9	11.9	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

As illustrated in Table 23, question 6 (“The competence of my superior”) produced the same results as question 5 as illustrated in Table 23. Seventy-six percent of superintendents responded that they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 12 (“The way policies are practiced”) as shown in Table 24.

Table 23

Frequency Table for Question 6 (Competence of my superior)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	2	3.4	3.4	3.4
Dissatisfied	4	6.8	6.8	10.0
Neutral	26	44.1	44.1	54.2
Satisfied	18	30.5	30.5	84.7
Very satisfied	9	15.3	15.3	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 24

Frequency Table for Question 12 (The way policies are practiced)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	4	6.8	6.8	6.8
Neutral	10	16.9	16.9	23.7
Satisfied	37	62.7	62.7	86.4
Very satisfied	8	13.6	13.6	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 25 illustrates 74% ($n = 44$, 74.6%) of superintendents responded *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 13 ("The amount of work"); however, it also produced the highest *dissatisfied* percentage at over 18% ($n = 11$, 18.6%).

Table 25

Frequency Table for Question 13 (My pay and the amount of work I do)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	11	18.6	18.6	18.6
Neutral	4	6.8	6.8	25.4
Satisfied	37	62.7	62.7	88.1
Very satisfied	7	11.9	11.9	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 26

Frequency Table for Question 14 (The chances for advancement on this job)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Neutral	32	54.2	54.2	55.9
Satisfied	18	30.5	30.5	86.4
Very satisfied	8	13.6	13.6	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.0	

Table 26 illustrates 98% ($n = 58$, 98.3%) of superintendents responded *neutral*, *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 14 ("The chances for advancement on this job").

Table 27 illustrates 59% ($n = 35$, 59.3%) of superintendents responded *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 19 ("The praise I get for doing a good job").

Table 27

Frequency Table for Question 19 (The praise I get for doing a good job)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Very dissatisfied	2	3.4	3.4	3.4
Dissatisfied	10	16.9	16.9	20.3
Neutral	12	20.3	20.3	40.7
Satisfied	30	50.8	50.8	91.5
Very satisfied	5	8.5	8.5	100.0
Total	59	100.0	100.	

Research Question 4

4. Is there a relationship between the perceived general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation and the variables of size of the school district where respondents are currently employed, their ages, years of experience as superintendents, genders, identification of the school district (i.e., urban, suburban, rural) where superintendent is currently employed, designation of the school district (i.e., excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency) where superintendent is currently employed, most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent, and highest degree held?

Size of the school district. The researcher computed Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the relationship between the size of the school districts of each superintendent and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. These results, presented in Table 31, reveal that no significant relationship exists between district size and intrinsic satisfaction ($r = -.03, p = .79$), extrinsic satisfaction ($r = .22, p = .08$), and general job satisfaction ($r = .11, p = .38$). As a result of these findings, one can conclude that job satisfaction was not significantly related to the size of the school district.

Table 28

Size of School District Means Table

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	< 2,000	19	4.63	.496
	2,001-3,000	11	3.73	1.272
	3,001-5,000	14	3.93	1.207
	5,001-8,000	11	4.64	.505
	> 8,000	4	3.50	1.00
	Total	59	4.22	.984
Q2	< 2,000	19	3.47	.905
	2,001-3,000	11	3.64	.674
	3,001-5,000	14	3.21	1.051
	5,001-8,000	11	4.09	.831
	> 8,000	4	3.75	.500
	Total	59	3.58	.894
Q3	< 2,000	19	4.63	.658
	2,001-3,000	11	4.82	.405
	3,001-5,000	14	4.43	.646
	5,001-8,000	11	4.91	.302
	> 8,000	4	4.25	.957
	Total	59	4.64	.550
Q4	< 2,000	19	4.11	.658
	2,001-3,000	11	4.18	.874
	3,001-5,000	14	3.57	1.016
	5,001-8,000	11	4.45	.688
	> 8,000	4	3.25	.957
	Total	59	4.00	.871
Q5	< 2,000	19	3.47	.697
	2,001-3,000	11	3.27	1.009
	3,001-5,000	14	3.79	.802
	5,001-8,000	11	3.64	.674
	> 8,000	4	3.25	.500
	Total	59	3.53	.774
Q6	< 2,000	19	3.21	1.032
	2,001-3,000	11	3.27	.905
	3,001-5,000	14	3.64	.929
	5,001-8,000	11	3.82	.874
	> 8,000	4	3.75	.957
	Total	59	3.47	.953

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q7	< 2,000	19	3.95	.705
	2,001-3,000	11	4.36	.674
	3,001-5,000	14	4.29	.914
	5,001-8,000	11	4.27	.647
	> 8,000	4	3.75	.500
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	< 2,000	19	4.11	.875
	2,001-3,000	11	4.00	1.00
	3,001-5,000	14	3.50	1.286
	5,001-8,000	11	3.91	1.044
	> 8,000	4	3.25	.957
	Total	59	3.85	1.047
Q9	< 2,000	19	4.74	.452
	2,001-3,000	11	4.73	.467
	3,001-5,000	14	4.57	.514
	5,001-8,000	11	4.73	.647
	> 8,000	4	4.75	.500
	Total	59	4.69	.788
Q10	< 2,000	19	3.42	.692
	2,001-3,000	11	3.27	.647
	3,001-5,000	14	3.21	1.051
	5,001-8,000	11	3.64	.809
	> 8,000	4	3.50	.577
	Total	59	3.39	.788
Q11	< 2,000	19	4.63	.496
	2,001-3,000	11	4.73	.467
	3,001-5,000	14	4.29	.611
	5,001-8,000	11	4.73	.467
	> 8,000	4	4.25	.500
	Total	59	4.56	.534
Q12	< 2,000	19	3.95	.524
	2,001-3,000	11	3.91	.701
	3,001-5,000	14	3.71	.914
	5,001-8,000	11	3.64	1.027
	> 8,000	4	4.00	.000
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	< 2,000	19	3.47	.905
	2,001-3,000	11	3.45	.934
	3,001-5,000	14	4.00	.784
	5,001-8,000	11	3.64	1.120
	> 8,000	4	4.25	.500
	Total	59	3.68	.918

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q14	< 2,000	19	3.47	.612
	2,001-3,000	11	3.64	.924
	3,001-5,000	14	3.64	.745
	5,001-8,000	11	3.64	.924
	> 8,000	4	3.25	.500
	Total	59	3.56	.749
Q15	< 2,000	19	4.32	.478
	2,001-3,000	11	4.73	.467
	3,001-5,000	14	4.57	.514
	5,001-8,000	11	4.73	.467
	> 8,000	4	4.25	.957
	Total	59	4.53	.537
Q16	< 2,000	19	4.21	.419
	2,001-3,000	11	4.73	.467
	3,001-5,000	14	4.43	.514
	5,001-8,000	11	4.55	.688
	> 8,000	4	4.25	.957
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	< 2,000	19	4.11	.658
	2,001-3,000	11	4.09	.944
	3,001-5,000	14	4.50	.519
	5,001-8,000	11	4.36	.809
	> 8,000	4	4.25	.957
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	< 2,000	19	3.74	.872
	2,001-3,000	11	3.91	.831
	3,001-5,000	14	4.00	.961
	5,001-8,000	11	4.36	.809
	> 8,000	4	4.00	.816
	Total	59	3.97	.870
Q19	< 2,000	19	3.21	.918
	2,001-3,000	11	3.36	1.027
	3,001-5,000	14	3.50	1.019
	5,001-8,000	11	3.73	1.104
	> 8,000	4	3.75	.957
	Total	59	3.44	.987
Q20	< 2,000	19	4.37	.761
	2,001-3,000	11	4.64	.505
	3,001-5,000	14	4.57	.514
	5,001-8,000	11	4.73	.467
	> 8,000	4	4.25	.957
	Total	59	4.53	.626

Age of the Superintendent. The researcher computed Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the relationship between the ages of the superintendent and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. These results, presented in Table 31, indicate that no significant relationship exists between the age of the superintendent and intrinsic satisfaction ($r = -.07, p = .56$), extrinsic satisfaction ($r = .01, p = .93$), and general job satisfaction ($r = -.05, p = .68$). Table 29 is the means table for the age of the responding superintendents.

Table 29

Age of Superintendent Means Table

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.50	.547
	46-55	28	4.32	.862
	56-65	23	4.04	1.186
	> 65	2	4.00	1.414
	Total	59	4.22	.983
Q2	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	2.83	.983
	46-55	28	4.32	.862
	56-65	23	4.04	1.186
	> 65	2	4.00	1.414
	Total	59	3.57	.894
Q3	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.83	.408
	46-55	28	4.64	.558
	56-65	23	4.60	.583
	> 65	2	4.50	.707
	Total	59	4.64	.549
Q4	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.16	.752
	46-55	28	4.14	.803
	56-65	23	3.82	.984
	> 65	2	3.50	.707
	Total	59	4.00	.870
Q5	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.83	.983
	46-55	28	3.46	.792
	56-65	23	3.56	.727
	> 65	2	3.00	0.000
	Total	59	3.52	.773
Q6	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.00	1.095
	46-55	28	3.50	.962
	56-65	23	3.34	.934
	> 65	2	3.00	0.000
	Total	59	3.47	.953

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q7	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.16	.408
	46-55	28	4.07	.857
	56-65	23	4.21	.671
	> 65	2	4.50	.707
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.50	1.048
	46-55	28	3.92	1.152
	56-65	23	3.78	.951
	> 65	2	4.50	.707
	Total	59	3.84	1.047
Q9	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.50	.547
	46-55	28	4.82	.390
	56-65	23	4.69	.470
	> 65	2	3.50	.707
	Total	59	4.69	.500
Q10	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.83	.752
	46-55	28	3.50	.745
	56-65	23	3.17	.834
	> 65	2	3.00	0.000
	Total	59	3.38	.788
Q11	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.33	.816
	46-55	28	4.57	.503
	56-65	23	4.60	.499
	> 65	2	4.50	.707
	Total	59	4.55	.534
Q12	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.50	.836
	46-55	28	3.85	.705
	56-65	23	3.86	.814
	> 65	2	4.00	0.000
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.50	.836
	46-55	28	3.60	.956
	56-65	23	3.73	.915
	> 65	2	4.50	.707
	Total	59	3.67	.918

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q14	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.66	.516
	46-55	28	3.60	.831
	56-65	23	3.52	.730
	> 65	2	3.00	0.000
	Total	59	3.55	.749
Q15	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.83	.408
	46-55	28	4.42	.503
	56-65	23	4.52	.593
	> 65	2	5.00	0.000
	Total	59	4.52	.536
Q16	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.83	.408
	46-55	28	4.35	.487
	56-65	23	4.34	.647
	> 65	2	5.00	0.000
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.50	.547
	46-55	28	4.21	.832
	56-65	23	4.17	.650
	> 65	2	5.00	0.000
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.66	.816
	46-55	28	4.03	.637
	56-65	23	3.91	1.124
	> 65	2	4.50	.707
	Total	59	3.96	.870
Q19	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	3.66	.816
	46-55	28	3.25	1.004
	56-65	23	3.52	.994
	> 65	2	4.50	.707
	Total	59	3.44	.987
Q20	< 35	0	0.00	.000
	35-45	6	4.50	.547
	46-55	28	4.50	.693
	56-65	23	4.52	.593
	> 65	2	5.00	0.000
	Total	59	4.52	.625

Years of Experience as Superintendent. The researcher computed Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the relationship between the years of experience as superintendents and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. These results, presented in Table 31, indicate that no significant relationship exists between the years of experience as superintendent and intrinsic satisfaction ($r = .09, p = .47$), extrinsic satisfaction ($r = .11, p = .38$), and general job satisfaction ($r = .18, p = .17$).

Table 30 is the Years of Experience as Superintendent Means Table. By question, it compares the mean of the response of the respondents to their years of experience as superintendents.

Table 30

Demographic Statistics for Years of Experience as a Superintendent

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	< 3	12	4.50	.904
	3-8	28	4.14	.803
	9-13	11	3.81	1.470
	14-18	3	4.66	.577
	> 18	5	4.60	.894
	Total	59	4.22	.983
Q2	< 3	12	3.66	.887
	3-8	28	3.57	.741
	9-13	11	3.18	1.167
	14-18	3	4.00	1.000
	> 18	5	4.00	1.000
	Total	59	3.57	.894
Q3	< 3	12	4.75	.621
	3-8	28	4.57	.572
	9-13	11	4.54	.522
	14-18	3	5.00	0.000
	> 18	5	4.80	.447
	Total	59	4.64	.549
Q4	< 3	12	3.83	1.029
	3-8	28	4.07	.766
	9-13	11	3.90	1.136
	14-18	3	4.00	0.000
	> 18	5	4.20	.836
	Total	59	4.00	.870
Q5	< 3	12	3.33	.651
	3-8	28	3.53	.838
	9-13	11	3.72	.786
	14-18	3	4.33	.577
	> 18	5	3.00	0.000
	Total	59	3.52	.773
Q6	< 3	12	3.25	1.215
	3-8	28	3.53	.999
	9-13	11	3.72	.786
	14-18	3	3.66	.577
	> 18	5	3.00	0.000
	Total	59	3.47	.953

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q7	< 3	12	4.25	.621
	3-8	28	4.07	.766
	9-13	11	4.00	.774
	14-18	3	5.00	0.000
	> 18	5	4.20	.836
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	< 3	12	3.66	1.073
	3-8	28	3.96	1.035
	9-13	11	3.63	1.527
	14-18	3	3.66	1.527
	> 18	5	4.20	.836
	Total	59	3.84	1.047
Q9	< 3	12	4.75	.452
	3-8	28	4.71	.460
	9-13	11	4.63	.504
	14-18	3	5.00	0.000
	> 18	5	4.40	.894
	Total	59	4.69	.500
Q10	< 3	12	3.41	.792
	3-8	28	3.46	.637
	9-13	11	3.36	1.206
	14-18	3	2.66	.577
	> 18	5	3.40	.547
	Total	59	3.38	.788
Q11	< 3	12	4.50	.522
	3-8	28	4.46	.576
	9-13	11	4.72	.467
	14-18	3	4.66	.577
	> 18	5	4.80	.447
	Total	59	4.55	.534
Q12	< 3	12	3.83	.834
	3-8	28	3.75	.700
	9-13	11	4.09	.700
	14-18	3	4.00	1.000
	> 18	5	3.60	.894
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	< 3	12	3.50	1.087
	3-8	28	3.50	.922
	9-13	11	4.09	.831
	14-18	3	4.00	0.000
	> 18	5	4.00	.707
	Total	59	3.67	.918

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q14	< 3	12	3.33	.492
	3-8	28	3.64	.826
	9-13	11	3.81	.873
	14-18	3	3.33	.577
	> 18	5	3.20	.447
	Total	59	3.55	.749
Q15	< 3	12	4.41	.668
	3-8	28	4.57	.503
	9-13	11	4.36	.504
	14-18	3	4.66	.577
	> 18	5	4.80	.447
	Total	59	4.52	.536
Q16	< 3	12	4.41	.668
	3-8	28	4.50	.509
	9-13	11	4.18	.603
	14-18	3	4.00	.000
	> 18	5	4.80	.447
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	< 3	12	4.16	.577
	3-8	28	4.35	.731
	9-13	11	4.00	1.00
	14-18	3	4.00	.000
	> 18	5	4.60	.547
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	< 3	12	3.41	1.083
	3-8	28	4.07	.766
	9-13	11	4.18	.603
	14-18	3	3.66	1.527
	> 18	5	4.40	.547
	Total	59	3.96	.870
Q19	< 3	12	3.41	1.083
	3-8	28	3.42	.835
	9-13	11	3.18	1.328
	14-18	3	4.00	0.000
	> 18	5	3.80	1.095
	Total	59	3.44	.987
Q20	< 3	12	4.50	.674
	3-8	28	4.46	.692
	9-13	11	4.45	.522
	14-18	3	5.00	.000
	> 18	5	4.80	.447
	Total	59	4.52	.625

Table 31

Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Size of the School District, Age of the Superintendent, and Years of Experience as a Superintendent

		Size	Age	Exp
Intrinsic	<i>r</i>	-.034	-.076	.095
	sig	.798	.568	.475
Extrinsic	<i>r</i>	.224	.011	.115
	sig	.089	.932	.384
General	<i>r</i>	.116	-.053	.180
	sig	.381	.688	.174

Gender of the superintendents. The researcher computed *t* tests to examine the relationship between gender and the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction of responding superintendents. The researcher used *t* tests to compare the male and female superintendents to determine whether a relationship exists. These results, presented in Table 32, reveal that no significant relationship exists between gender and intrinsic satisfaction ($t(57) = .68, p = .49$). The intrinsic mean of 4.22 for males was not significantly different from the mean of 4.14 for females. In addition, the results for extrinsic satisfaction indicate no significant differences for the males and females ($t(57) = .51, p = .61$). The extrinsic satisfaction mean of 3.58 for males was not significantly different from the mean of 3.49 for females.

The results for general satisfaction indicate that no significant differences were found between males and females ($t(57) = .85, p = .39$). The mean of 4.02 for males was not significantly different from the mean of 3.93 for females.

Table 32

t Tests Comparing Males and Females on Job Satisfaction

Variable	Gender	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	sig
Intrinsic	Male	4.22	.343	.689	57	.494
	Female	4.14	.472			
Extrinsic	Male	3.58	.488	.513	57	.610
	Female	3.49	.573			
General	Male	4.02	.286	.857	57	.395
	Female	3.93	.409			

Table 33 is the Gender of the Superintendent Means Table. By question, it compares the means of the responses of the superintendents to their gender. Questions 1 ("Being able to keep busy"), 6 ("Competence of my superior"), and 7 ("Do things that do not go against my conscience") represented the largest differences in mean scores of males and females. Question 1 had a male mean score of 4.31 and a female mean score of 3.83 resulting in a difference of .48. Question 6 had a male mean score of 3.55 and a female mean score of 3.16 resulting in a difference of .39. Question 7 had a male mean score of 4.08 and a female mean score of 4.41 resulting in a difference of .33. Question 9 ("The chance to do for other people") represented the highest mean score for males at 4.70 and females at 4.66. However, these results were not significant.

Table 33

Gender of the Superintendent Means Table

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	Male	47	4.31	.810
	Female	12	3.83	1.46
	Total	59	4.22	.983
Q2	Male	47	3.63	.895
	Female	12	3.33	.887
	Total	59	3.57	.894
Q3	Male	47	4.68	.471
	Female	12	4.50	.797
	Total	59	4.64	.549
Q4	Male	47	4.04	.858
	Female	12	3.83	.937
	Total	59	4.00	.870
Q5	Male	47	3.51	.776
	Female	12	3.58	.792
	Total	59	3.52	.773
Q6	Male	47	3.55	.928
	Female	12	3.16	1.029
	Total	59	3.47	.953
Q7	Male	47	4.08	.746
	Female	12	4.41	.668
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	Male	47	3.85	1.062
	Female	12	3.83	1.029
	Total	59	3.84	1.047
Q9	Male	47	4.70	.507
	Female	12	4.66	.492
	Total	59	4.69	.500
Q10	Male	47	3.40	.798
	Female	12	3.33	.778
	Total	59	3.38	.788
Q11	Male	47	4.57	.541
	Female	12	4.50	.522
	Total	59	4.55	.534
Q12	Male	47	3.85	.721
	Female	12	3.75	.866
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	Male	47	3.70	.882
	Female	12	3.58	1.083
	Total	59	3.67	.918

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q14	Male	47	3.57	.744
	Female	12	3.50	.797
	Total	59	3.55	.749
Q15	Male	47	4.51	.546
	Female	12	4.58	.514
	Total	59	4.52	.536
Q16	Male	47	4.40	.577
	Female	12	4.50	.522
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	Male	47	4.29	.688
	Female	12	4.08	.900
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	Male	47	4.02	.765
	Female	12	3.75	1.215
	Total	59	3.96	.870
Q19	Male	47	3.42	.949
	Female	12	3.50	1.167
	Total	59	3.44	.987
Q20	Male	47	4.53	.654
	Female	12	4.50	.522
	Total	59	4.52	.625

Identification of school districts. Table 34 is the Identification of the School District Means Table. By question, it compares the means of the responses of the superintendents to the identification of their school districts by the Ohio Department of Education as of the 2007-2008 school year. Urban superintendents had the lowest mean score on 10 of 20 questions including 5 ("The way my boss handles workers"), 6 ("Competence of my superior"), 9 ("The chance to do for other people"), 13 ("The amount of work"), 14 ("The chances for advancement"), 15 ("Freedom to use judgment"), 16 ("The chance to try own methods"), 17 ("The working conditions"), 18 ("The way my co-workers get along with each other"), and 19 ("The praise for doing a good job").

Table 34

Identification of the School District Means Table

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	Rural	18	4.33	.970
	Urban	9	4.22	.972
	Suburban	32	4.16	1.019
	Total	59	4.22	.984
Q2	Rural	18	3.28	.895
	Urban	9	4.11	.601
	Suburban	32	3.59	.911
	Total	59	3.58	.894
Q3	Rural	18	4.72	.461
	Urban	9	4.89	.333
	Suburban	32	4.53	.621
	Total	59	4.64	.550
Q4	Rural	18	4.17	.707
	Urban	9	4.11	.782
	Suburban	32	3.88	.976
	Total	59	4.00	.871
Q5	Rural	18	3.56	.784
	Urban	9	3.22	.972
	Suburban	32	3.59	.712
	Total	59	3.53	.774
Q6	Rural	18	3.39	.916
	Urban	9	3.11	1.364
	Suburban	32	3.63	.833
	Total	59	3.47	.953
Q7	Rural	18	4.00	.907
	Urban	9	4.22	.833
	Suburban	32	4.22	.608
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	Rural	18	3.83	1.098
	Urban	9	3.89	.928
	Suburban	32	3.84	1.081
	Total	59	3.85	1.047
Q9	Rural	18	4.72	.461
	Urban	9	4.67	.500
	Suburban	32	4.69	.535
	Total	59	4.69	.500

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q10	Rural	18	3.17	.707
	Urban	9	3.56	.726
	Suburban	32	3.47	.726
	Total	59	3.39	.788
Q11	Rural	18	4.72	.461
	Urban	9	4.56	.527
	Suburban	32	4.47	.567
	Total	59	4.56	.534
Q12	Rural	18	3.89	.583
	Urban	9	3.89	.601
	Suburban	32	3.78	.870
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	Rural	18	3.44	.856
	Urban	9	3.44	.882
	Suburban	32	3.88	.942
	Total	59	3.68	.918
Q14	Rural	18	3.61	.608
	Urban	9	3.33	.866
	Suburban	32	3.59	.798
	Total	59	3.56	.749
Q15	Rural	18	4.50	.514
	Urban	9	4.44	.527
	Suburban	32	4.56	.564
	Total	59	4.53	.537
Q16	Rural	18	4.44	.511
	Urban	9	4.33	.500
	Suburban	32	4.44	.619
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	Rural	18	4.11	.758
	Urban	9	4.11	.601
	Suburban	32	4.38	.751
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	Rural	18	3.89	.832
	Urban	9	3.78	1.202
	Suburban	32	4.06	.801
	Total	59	3.97	.870
Q19	Rural	18	3.44	.856
	Urban	9	3.22	.972
	Suburban	32	3.50	1.078
	Total	59	3.44	.987
Q20	Rural	18	4.67	.485
	Urban	9	4.67	.500
	Suburban	32	4.41	.712
	Total	59	4.53	.626

Designation of school districts. Table 35 is the Designation of the School District Means Table. By question, it compares the mean of the response of the superintendents to the designation of their school district by the Ohio Department of Education.

Superintendents leading school districts ranked Excellent by the Ohio Department of Education had the highest mean score in all but three survey questions. The three questions where those superintendents did not score the highest were 2 ("The chance to work alone"), 14 ("The chances for advancement"), and 16 ("The chance to try own methods").

Table 35

Demographic Statistics for Designation of School District

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	Excellent	19	4.42	.961
	Effective	28	4.41	1.044
	Continuous improvement	12	4.08	.900
	Total	59	4.22	.983
Q2	Excellent	19	3.63	.955
	Effective	28	3.42	.920
	Continuous improvement	12	3.83	.717
	Total	59	3.57	.894
Q3	Excellent	19	4.73	.452
	Effective	28	4.57	.634
	Continuous improvement	12	4.66	.492
	Total	59	4.64	.549
Q4	Excellent	19	4.21	.630
	Effective	28	3.78	1.066
	Continuous improvement	12	4.16	.577
	Total	59	4.00	.870
Q5	Excellent	19	3.84	.764
	Effective	28	3.42	.690
	Continuous improvement	12	3.25	.866
	Total	59	3.52	.773
Q6	Excellent	19	3.63	.830
	Effective	28	3.42	.878
	Continuous improvement	12	3.33	1.302
	Total	59	3.47	.953
Q7	Excellent	19	4.36	.597
	Effective	28	4.00	.816
	Continuous improvement	12	4.16	.717
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	Excellent	19	4.05	.970
	Effective	28	3.75	1.142
	Continuous improvement	12	3.75	.965
	Total	59	3.84	1.047
Q9	Excellent	19	4.73	.561
	Effective	28	4.71	.460
	Continuous improvement	12	4.58	.514
	Total	59	4.69	.500

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q10	Excellent	19	3.57	.768
	Effective	28	3.28	.809
	Continuous improvement	12	3.33	.778
	Total	59	3.38	.788
Q11	Excellent	19	4.57	.606
	Effective	28	4.57	.503
	Continuous improvement	12	4.50	.522
	Total	59	4.55	.534
Q12	Excellent	19	3.84	.764
	Effective	28	3.82	.862
	Continuous improvement	12	3.83	.389
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	Excellent	19	3.73	.871
	Effective	28	3.67	.944
	Continuous improvement	12	3.58	.996
	Total	59	3.67	.918
Q14	Excellent	19	3.57	.768
	Effective	28	3.64	.731
	Continuous improvement	12	3.33	.778
	Total	59	3.55	.749
Q15	Excellent	19	4.57	.507
	Effective	28	4.50	.577
	Continuous improvement	12	4.50	.522
	Total	59	4.52	.536
Q16	Excellent	19	4.42	.606
	Effective	28	4.46	.576
	Continuous improvement	12	4.33	.492
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	Excellent	19	4.36	.683
	Effective	28	4.14	.803
	Continuous improvement	12	4.33	.651
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	Excellent	19	4.31	.582
	Effective	28	3.85	.848
	Continuous improvement	12	3.66	1.154
	Total	59	3.96	.870
Q19	Excellent	19	3.57	1.017
	Effective	28	3.32	1.055
	Continuous improvement	12	3.50	.797
	Total	59	3.44	.987

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q20	Excellent	19	4.63	.495
	Effective	28	4.42	.741
	Continuous improvement	12	4.58	.514
	Total	59	4.52	.625

Positions held prior to becoming superintendents. Table 36 is the Position Held Prior to Becoming Superintendent Means Table. By question, it compares the means of the responses of the superintendents to the positions they held prior to taking their current position. After analyzing each score, the results were spread out fairly equally among each prior position. There was only one respondent for the category District Supervisor, resulting in the researcher placing the responses in the Other category to protect the identity of the respondent.

Table 36

Position Held Prior to Becoming Superintendent Means Table

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	Principal	23	4.21	1.126
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.25	.855
	Other	5	4.00	1.225
	Total	59	4.22	.983
Q2	Principal	23	3.26	1.009
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.77	.804
	Other	5	3.80	.447
	Total	59	3.57	.894
Q3	Principal	23	4.73	.448
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.61	.558
	Other	5	4.40	.894
	Total	59	4.64	.549
Q4	Principal	23	4.00	.904
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.09	.870
	Other	5	3.40	.548
	Total	59	4.00	.870
Q5	Principal	23	3.78	.795
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.35	.754
	Other	5	3.40	.548
	Total	59	3.52	.773
Q6	Principal	23	3.60	1.033
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.32	.908
	Other	5	3.80	.837
	Total	59	3.47	.953
Q7	Principal	23	4.30	.558
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.03	.836
	Other	5	4.20	.837
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	Principal	23	3.91	1.083
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.80	1.077
	Other	5	3.80	.837
	Total	59	3.84	1.047
Q9	Principal	23	4.69	.470
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.70	.528
	Other	5	4.60	.548
	Total	59	4.69	.500

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q10	Principal	23	3.30	.875
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.48	.769
	Other	5	3.20	.447
	Total	59	3.38	.788
Q11	Principal	23	4.52	0.593
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.61	.495
	Other	5	4.40	.548
	Total	59	4.55	.534
Q12	Principal	23	3.91	.733
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.77	.716
	Other	5	3.80	1.095
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	Principal	23	3.56	.895
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.80	.945
	Other	5	3.40	.894
	Total	59	3.67	.918
Q14	Principal	23	3.60	.656
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.51	.811
	Other	5	3.60	.894
	Total	59	3.55	.749
Q15	Principal	23	4.47	.510
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.54	.567
	Other	5	4.60	.548
	Total	59	4.52	.536
Q16	Principal	23	4.34	.572
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.48	.569
	Other	5	4.40	.548
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	Principal	23	4.17	.576
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.32	.871
	Other	5	4.20	.447
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	Principal	23	3.73	.963
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.16	.734
	Other	5	3.80	1.095
	Total	59	3.96	.870
Q19	Principal	23	3.21	1.085
	Assistant Superintendent	31	3.54	.925
	Other	5	3.80	.837
	Total	59	3.44	.987

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q20	Principal	23	4.47	.730
	Assistant Superintendent	31	4.54	.567
	Other	5	4.60	.548
	Total	59	4.52	.625

Highest Degree Attained. Table 37 is the Highest Degree Attained Means Table.

By question, it compares the means of the responses of the superintendents to their highest degrees attained. After analyzing each score, the results were spread out fairly equally among each prior position. However, question 19 ("The praise I get for doing a good job") produced the only *dissatisfied* mean score of 2.25 for Educational Specialist.

Table 37

Demographic Statistics for Highest Degree Attained

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1	Masters	30	4.13	.973
	Educational specialist	4	4.75	.500
	Doctorate	25	4.24	1.051
	Total	59	4.22	.983
Q2	Masters	30	3.53	.776
	Educational specialist	4	3.00	1.154
	Doctorate	25	3.72	.979
	Total	59	3.57	.894
Q3	Masters	30	4.56	.568
	Educational specialist	4	4.75	.500
	Doctorate	25	4.72	.541
	Total	59	4.64	.549
Q4	Masters	30	4.00	.909
	Educational specialist	4	4.25	.500
	Doctorate	25	3.96	.888
	Total	59	4.00	.870
Q5	Masters	30	3.36	.764
	Educational specialist	4	4.00	.816
	Doctorate	25	3.64	.757
	Total	59	3.52	.773
Q6	Masters	30	3.33	.802
	Educational specialist	4	3.75	.957
	Doctorate	25	3.6	1.118
	Total	59	3.47	.953
Q7	Masters	30	4.06	.583
	Educational specialist	4	3.75	1.258
	Doctorate	25	4.32	.802
	Total	59	4.15	.738
Q8	Masters	30	4.06	.907
	Educational specialist	4	3.00	1.154
	Doctorate	25	3.72	1.137
	Total	59	3.84	1.047
Q9	Masters	30	4.63	.490
	Educational specialist	4	5.00	0.000
	Doctorate	25	4.72	.541
	Total	59	4.69	.500

(table continues)

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q10	Masters	30	3.36	.668
	Educational specialist	4	4.00	1.414
	Doctorate	25	3.32	.802
	Total	59	3.38	.788
Q11	Masters	30	4.60	.498
	Educational specialist	4	4.25	.957
	Doctorate	25	4.56	.506
	Total	59	4.55	.534
Q12	Masters	30	3.93	.520
	Educational specialist	4	3.75	1.258
	Doctorate	25	3.75	.890
	Total	59	3.83	.746
Q13	Masters	30	3.80	.714
	Educational specialist	4	3.75	1.258
	Doctorate	25	3.52	1.084
	Total	59	3.67	.918
Q14	Masters	30	3.60	.723
	Educational specialist	4	3.75	.957
	Doctorate	25	3.48	.770
	Total	59	3.55	.749
Q15	Masters	30	4.43	.568
	Educational specialist	4	4.25	.500
	Doctorate	25	4.68	.476
	Total	59	4.52	.536
Q16	Masters	30	4.33	.606
	Educational specialist	4	4.25	.500
	Doctorate	25	4.56	.506
	Total	59	4.42	.563
Q17	Masters	30	4.26	.639
	Educational specialist	4	3.75	1.258
	Doctorate	25	4.32	.748
	Total	59	4.25	.733
Q18	Masters	30	3.83	.833
	Educational specialist	4	4.00	0.000
	Doctorate	25	4.12	.971
	Total	59	3.96	.870
Q19	Masters	30	3.53	.860
	Educational specialist	4	2.25	.500
	Doctorate	25	3.52	1.084
	Total	59	3.44	.987
Q20	Masters	30	4.43	.727
	Educational specialist	4	4.75	.500
	Doctorate	25	4.60	.500
	Total	59	4.52	.625

ANOVA results for identification of school districts. The researcher conducted an analysis of variance to examine the relationship between the identification of the school district of each superintendent surveyed and the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction of superintendents. These results, presented in Table 38, indicate that no significant relationship exists between the identification of the school district and intrinsic satisfaction $F(2, 58) = .375, p = .689$.

The results for extrinsic satisfaction indicate no significant differences were found for the identification of the school districts and extrinsic satisfaction $F(2, 58) = .950, p = .393$. When examining the results for general satisfaction, the researcher found no significant differences for the identification of the school district and general satisfaction $F(2, 58) = .174, p = .841$. However, these results were not significant.

ANOVA results for designation of school districts. The researcher conducted an analysis of variance to examine the relationship between the designation of the school districts of the superintendents surveyed and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. These results, presented in Table 38, reveal that no significant relationship exists between the designation of the school district and intrinsic satisfaction $F(2, 58) = 1.537, p = .224$.

The results for extrinsic satisfaction uncover no significant differences for the designation of the school district and extrinsic satisfaction $F(2, 58) = .924, p = .403$. A Bonferroni Test was conducted for general satisfaction since the alpha was lower than .05. The new alpha score was set at .017. Thus, the results maintain that no significant differences for the designation of the school district and general satisfaction $F(2, 58) =$

3.447, $p = .039$. As a result of these findings, one can conclude that job satisfaction was not significantly related to the designation of school districts of the superintendents.

ANOVA results for positions held prior to becoming superintendents. The researcher conducted an analysis of variance to examine the relationship between the most recently held positions of responding superintendents and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. These results, presented in Table 38, point to no significant relationship between the position the superintendents held prior to assuming their jobs and intrinsic satisfaction $F(3, 58) = .414, p = .744$. Further, the results for extrinsic satisfaction show no significant differences for the positions that the superintendents held prior to taking their current positions and extrinsic satisfaction $F(3, 58) = .279, p = .840$. The results for general satisfaction indicate that there were no significant differences for the positions superintendents held prior to assuming their jobs and extrinsic satisfaction $F(3, 58) = .736, p = .535$.

ANOVA results for highest degree attained. The researcher conducted an analysis of variance to examine the relationship between the highest degrees attained of responding superintendents surveyed and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. These results, presented in Table 38, indicate that no significant relationship exists between the highest degree attained and intrinsic satisfaction $F(2, 58) = .285, p = .753$. The results for extrinsic satisfaction reveal no significant differences for the highest degree attained and extrinsic satisfaction $F(2, 58) = .016, p = .984$. The results for general satisfaction demonstrate that there are no significant differences for the highest degree attained and extrinsic satisfaction $F(2, 58) = .350, p = .706$.

Table 38

Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Type of School District, Rating of the School District, Most Recent Position Held, and Highest Degree Attained

		Intrinsic	Extrinsic	General
Type	<i>f</i>	.375	.950	.174
	sig	.689	.393	.841
Rating	<i>f</i>	1.537	.924	3.447
	sig	.224	.403	.039
Position	<i>f</i>	.414	.279	.736
	sig	.744	.840	.535
Degree	<i>f</i>	.285	.016	.350
	sig	.753	.984	.706

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of superintendents and examine those aspects of the job that account for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This study also investigated the impact of the following variables: sizes of the school districts where superintendents are currently employed; identification of the school districts as urban, suburban, or rural; where superintendent is currently employed; designation of the districts as excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, or academic emergency; where superintendents are currently employed; gender of superintendents; ages of superintendents; years of experience as superintendents; most recent positions held prior to becoming superintendents; and highest degrees earned.

In order to address the questions, the researcher administered the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to 81 public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio. The researcher received and used for analysis 59 responses, representing a 72.8% return. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Results reveal that superintendents in southwestern Ohio were positive with regard to those aspects of the job that measure their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction.

Chapter V includes a summary of this study, conclusions drawn from the study, recommendations based on the results of this study, and recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio along with the impact of the following variables: size of the school districts where superintendents were currently employed; identification of the school district as urban, suburban, rural; where superintendents were currently employed; designation of the school district as excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency; where superintendents were currently employed; gender of superintendents, age of superintendents; years of experience as superintendents; most recent positions held prior to becoming superintendents; and highest degrees held. Chapter I provided an introduction of job satisfaction including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as well as a statement of the problem, significance of the study, research questions, definition of terms, limitations of the study, assumptions, limitations, rationale of the study, and organization of the study. Chapter II reviewed the literature related to job satisfaction including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Chapter III described the survey instrument and procedures used in this study. Chapter IV included the findings of the study. Chapter V offers a summary of the study, including conclusions and

recommendations regarding job satisfaction among Ohio public school superintendents.

The study asked four research questions: What is the perceived level of job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren Counties? What is the perceived level of intrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation? What is the perceived level of extrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation? Is there a relationship between the perceived general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction of Ohio public school superintendents in the counties under investigation where superintendent is currently employed and the size of the school district, identification of school districts as urban, suburban, rural, designation of the school district as excellent, effective, continuous improvement, academic watch, academic emergency, gender of superintendents, age of superintendents, years of experience as a superintendent, most recent positions held prior to becoming superintendents, and highest degree held.

In order to address the questions, the researcher mailed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to all 81 public school superintendents in the southwestern counties of Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren. Fifty-nine superintendents completed the demographic survey and the MSQ ($n = 59$).

The researcher analyzed responses from the MSQ and demographic surveys to determine intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction scores as well as the size of the school districts where superintendents were currently employed; identification of the school district as urban, suburban, rural where superintendents were currently employed; designation of the school district as excellent, effective, continuous improvement,

academic watch, academic emergency where superintendents were currently employed; gender of superintendents; age of superintendents; years of experience as superintendents; most recent positions held prior to becoming superintendents; and highest degrees held.

Demographic Data

The researcher collected data on the size of the school districts, ages and genders of the superintendents, identification and designation of the school districts of the superintendents, as well as the positions each filled prior to becoming superintendents, highest degrees held and years of experience as superintendents. The researcher created frequency tables to present the findings.

Responding superintendents from districts with less than 2,000 students represented the largest group in this study. Over half of the responding superintendents led districts of 3,000 or fewer students. Less than 7% of responding superintendents represented districts with more than 8,000 students. The nature of this distribution suggests that southwestern Ohio is filled with small towns with local or small city schools.

Responding superintendents between the ages of 46-55 represented the largest grouping in this study. These findings were consistent with the Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) study of which found the median age of the school superintendent was 52.5 years. When combined with the age group 56-65, the percentage is very high at 86.4% (n=51). The nature of this distribution suggests that there will be a need for an influx of new, young superintendents over the next 10 to 15 years.

Male superintendents made up over 79.6% ($n = 47$) of the respondents to the survey questionnaire. Over 20% (20.3%; $n = 12$) of the responses came from female superintendents. The percentage of superintendents in southwestern Ohio responding to the survey was a higher percentage than the state average of superintendents who are female (M. Danzuso, personal communication, March 7, 2008). The Glass et al. (2000) study found the national average for female superintendents to be 13.2%. Although southwestern Ohio does have a higher than average percentage of female superintendents, the typical superintendent is male.

More than 54% (54.2%; $n = 32$) of responding superintendents worked in districts that were classified as suburban (Group 6 and 7 Schools) by the Ohio Department of Education; 30.5% ($n = 18$) of respondents worked in rural districts (Group 1, 2, and 3 Schools) while 15.2% ($n = 9$) worked in urban districts (Group 4 and 5 Schools). Again, the nature of this distribution reveals that southwestern Ohio is filled with small towns with local or small city schools. However, the area has a mix of rural farm towns, small bedroom communities, rapidly growing suburban areas, large urban areas heavy in industry, and, of course, two large cities in Cincinnati and Dayton.

Responding superintendents from districts designated by the Ohio Department of Education as effective was the largest demographic group in this survey at 47.4% ($n = 28$); 32.2% ($n = 19$) of superintendents led a school district designated as excellent. Consequently, there were no public school districts designated as academic watch or academic emergency of responding superintendents in southwestern Ohio. Since the designation is heavy on student achievement, the nature of this distribution suggests that

southwestern Ohio's school districts are successful. Of course, some districts are more successful than others.

Over 52% (52.5%) of superintendents were assistant superintendents ($n = 31$) while 38.9% were building principals ($n = 23$) prior to serving as superintendent. Glass et al. (2000) found the most common path to the superintendency is through the central office. The nature of this distribution suggests that board members and stakeholders are satisfied with the traditional path to the superintendency and are not as willing to venture out and hire a non-educator for the top position.

A master's degree was held by 50.8% of the responding superintendents in this study compared with the state average of 72.5% (M. Danzuso, personal communication, March 7, 2008). A doctorate degree was held by 42.3% ($n = 25$) of responding superintendents, which is far greater than the state average of 24.4% (M. Danzuso, personal communication, March 7, 2008). The Educational Specialist degree was held by 6.9% ($n = 4$) of respondents. The nature of this distribution suggests that southwestern Ohio has an older superintendent population and with certificate and licensing requirements comes more educational requirements.

The largest group of responding superintendents had between 3 and 8 years of experience in that role. This group represented 47.5% ($n = 28$) of the responses. The nature of this distribution suggests that while the age of the superintendents in southwestern Ohio reflects their long-time status as an educator, it does not translate into experience as superintendents. Rather the data suggest that these men and women are coming into the positions late in their careers.

The demographic data portray the typical southwestern Ohio public school superintendent as a male in his 50s. The national average for superintendent age is 55 years old and 79% are male according to the 2006 American Association of School Administrators survey. This would be a person near the end of his or her career as an educator. Boards of education may feel more comfortable with an experienced leader in charge of every facet of the school operation. The data also portray the typical southwestern Ohio public school superintendent as a former assistant superintendent. A person in this position works in district level administrative offices and is a close advisor to both the superintendent and the board of education. Boards of education would look favorably at this kind of experience when selecting a new leader. The typical superintendent in southwestern Ohio possesses a master's degree and has less than 8 years of experience at the top job. Nationwide, 60% of superintendents hold a doctorate degree (American Association of School Administrators, 2008). This confirms that educators are taking the job on average near the end of their careers and does not allow superintendents to post long years of service in the position before reaching retirement age. Finally, the typical southwestern Ohio public school superintendent is employed in a small, rural district of less than 2,000 students.

Job Satisfaction Data

Responding superintendents from southwestern Ohio had general satisfaction mean scores that ranged from 3.35 to 4.80 on a 5-point scale. More than half of the general satisfaction responses were at 4.00 or above ($n = 12$, 52.1%). In light of these findings, one can conclude that general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio is positive. Previous studies of Borquist (1987), Lindstrom (1989),

Malanowski (1999), Nelson (1987), O'Malley (2004), Schoen (2006), Soloman (2004), and Whitsell (1987) are consistent with these results. The results contradict the opinions of Sharp, Malone, and Walter (2002) who wrote, "Deep sea diving and structural steel work have nothing on the business of school superintending" (p. 1).

Responding superintendents from southwestern Ohio had intrinsic satisfaction mean scores that ranged from 3.33 to 5.00 on a 5-point scale and a mean of 4.20. All intrinsic satisfaction questions except numbers 2 ("The chance to work alone"), 8 ("The way the job provides steady employment"), and 10 ("The chance to tell others what to do") were above 4.00. One could conclude from the results of the data that the responding superintendents valued working for others and utilizing their abilities to create good for their organization. These data reveal superintendents placed less emphasis on working alone and being able to delegate work. Based on these findings, one can conclude that the intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio is positive. Moreover, the results were consistent with Soloman (2004) who found that superintendents derived satisfaction from achievement, autonomy, and service to others.

Responding superintendents from southwestern Ohio had extrinsic satisfaction mean scores that ranged from 2.16 to 5.00 on a 5-point scale and a mean of 3.56. When examining the mean averages of individual questions, all six extrinsic satisfaction questions had mean averages under 4.00. Question 12 ("The way policies are practiced") had the highest mean average with 3.83 while question 19 ("The praise for doing a good job") had the lowest mean of 3.44. Only 44% of superintendents responded *satisfied* or *very satisfied* to question 14 ("The chance for advancement") as shown in Table 26 while

over 54% were *neutral*. Question 19 ("The praise for doing a good job") had over 20% respond *dissatisfied* or *very dissatisfied*, over 20% respond as *neutral*, and over 50% as *satisfied* as shown in Table 27. As a result of these findings, one can conclude that the extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio is positive. However, when compared to the results of general and intrinsic satisfaction scores, extrinsic satisfaction is at a much lower mean average although remaining in the *satisfied* range. Brubaker and Coble (1995) explained that "learning to accept that the district will never have adequate resources to accomplish everything people in the system want to do, makes the job frustrating" (p. 35).

The Size of the School District Means Table is reported in Table 28. By question, this table compares the mean of the responses of the superintendents to the size of their school districts. Superintendents representing districts with enrollments between 5,001 and 8,000 students had the highest mean average on 11 of 20 questions. Superintendents representing districts with enrollments above 8,001 students had the lowest mean average on 10 of 20 questions. Goldstein (1992) found that large school systems often have rough politics, little money, and poor staff morale and student achievement which may contribute to lower than average job satisfaction levels. Glass (1992) found that lack of community support and financial matters were likely causes of superintendents leaving large districts after a short amount of time. The researcher computed Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the relationship between the size of the school districts of each superintendent and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. As a result of the Pearson correlation coefficients, there was no evidence of a significant

relationship between general, intrinsic, and/or extrinsic job satisfaction and the size of the school district.

At the same time, the researcher computed Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the relationship between the ages of superintendents and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. Superintendents over the age of 65 ($n = 2$) had the highest mean average on 10 of 20 questions. Interestingly, this age group also had the lowest mean average in 8 of the 20 questions. Superintendents between the ages of 35 and 45 ($n = 6$) had the lowest mean average on 8 of 20 questions. Question 2 ("The chance to work alone") for this age group was 2.83 and represented the only *dissatisfied* mean average for age of the superintendent variable. As a result of the Pearson correlation coefficients, there was no evidence of a significant relationship between general, intrinsic, and/or extrinsic job satisfaction and the ages of the responding superintendents.

Superintendents with between 14 and 18 years of experience ($n = 3$) had the highest mean average on 9 of 20. Question 10 ("The chance to tell others what to do") for this age group was 2.66 and represented the only *dissatisfied* mean average for age of the superintendent variable. Superintendents with years of experience between the 9 and 13 years ($n = 11$) had the lowest mean average on 9 of 20 questions. The researcher computed Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the relationship between the years of experience as superintendent and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. Based on the Pearson correlation coefficients, there was no evidence of a significant relationship between general, intrinsic, and/or extrinsic job satisfaction and years of experience as superintendent.

Along with Pearson correlations, the researcher computed t tests to examine the relationship between gender and the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction of responding superintendents. The researcher used these t tests to compare the male and female superintendents to determine whether a relationship exists. The data from the t tests reveal that there was no evidence of a significant relationship between general, intrinsic, and/or extrinsic job satisfaction and the gender of the responding superintendents.

The researcher conducted an analysis of variance to examine the relationship between the identification of the school district (rural, urban, and suburban) of each responding superintendent and the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction of responding superintendents. The analysis of variance indicated that there was no significant relationship between the identification of the school district and intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of satisfaction of responding superintendents. The research indicates that superintendents of each type of district experience similar levels of satisfaction and frustration. Therefore, superintendents seeking employment could select any type of district and experience an equal amount of satisfaction.

An analysis of variance was conducted to examine the relationship between the designation of the school district of the superintendents surveyed and their intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction. In light of these findings, one can conclude that job satisfaction was not significantly related to the designation of the school district of the superintendent. No responding superintendent was employed in a district designated with the lowest two rankings, academic watch and academic

emergency. All districts were designed continuous improvement, effective, or excellent, rankings that are the most desired of the five.

The researcher conducted an analysis of variance to examine the relationship between the most recently held position of each superintendent surveyed and the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction of superintendents. After analyzing each score, the results were spread out fairly equally among each prior position. Therefore, one can conclude that job satisfaction was not significantly related to the most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent. Assistant superintendents and building principals have many of the same job responsibilities. With the position of assistant superintendent, the duties are more specific and greater responsibility is granted while principals are responsible for every aspect of their building, both of which are excellent training for the position of superintendent.

An analysis of variance was conducted to examine the relationship between the highest degree attained of each superintendent surveyed and the intrinsic, extrinsic, and general levels of job satisfaction of superintendents. These findings reveal that the highest degree attained of superintendents was not significant in relation to job satisfaction. The percentage of responding superintendents is 18% lower than the national average in holding a doctorate degree. Most superintendents taking part in the study hold a Masters in Education. One could conclude that holding a doctorate does not raise satisfaction in the position, but may make the superintendent lead differently in ways that not result in increased or decreased satisfaction but improvement of their organization (American Association of School Administrators, 2008).

Conclusions

In sum, the conclusions for this study were encouraging for public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio. Superintendents reported degrees of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction from *satisfied* to *very satisfied* with all aspects of their jobs.

The lack of significant correlation of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction with any of the demographic variables suggests that these factors are not sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio. Many view the position of superintendent as filled with stress, long hours, and rigid accountability. For those reasons, the average person would believe the job satisfaction levels of the individuals occupying these positions to be quite low. However, superintendents may go into their positions with their eyes wide open since they have been in education and have worked for superintendents either indirectly as classroom teachers or directly as building or district level administrators most of their adult lives. If that is the case, superintendents should know what the job entails, should understand the complexities, and should appreciate the commitments involved. Superintendent candidates should thus seek out advice from different superintendents and be sure they are ready for the challenges they will face in the position.

This study suggests that superintendents do perceive the importance of school board members and stakeholders recognizing their efforts in leading their school districts. The lowest ranked extrinsic variable was "the praise for doing a good job." Glass et al. (2000) found that superintendents ranked conflict with their boards of education as the second most difficult problem they face. Castle (2004) declared that superintendents

experienced periods of conflict with board members both individually and collectively but found the overall relationship to be satisfactory. He postulated that superintendent and board problems may be more of a "generic problem rather than one that is specific" (p. 108). School board members and stakeholders must find ways to foster communications between themselves and superintendents, being sure to recognize successes as well as areas in need of improvement. School boards can accomplish this by providing extensive training for new superintendents and board members. Locally, the Ohio School Boards Association is an excellent resource for identifying roles, providing training, and enhancing relationships among superintendents and board members.

This study also suggests that boards may not necessarily have to add to their financial burden to increase job satisfaction for their superintendent. Adcock (1991) suggests that extrinsic rewards such as pay are no longer satisfactory and most workers are now demanding intrinsic rewards. Intrinsic satisfiers such as keeping busy, being able to use one's abilities, methods, and judgment are all factors which can be fostered through non-fiscal means. Carter and Cunningham (1997) uncovered a significant gap between the compensation of upper level executive positions in the business world and superintendents. Responding superintendents in this study found aspects of their job that produced high levels of satisfaction that did not involve money and benefits. With the ability to work with children each day, the opportunities for intrinsic satisfaction are endless.

The lack of significant correlation of job satisfaction with any of the demographic variables would not result in a greater or lesser sense of job satisfaction of public school superintendents in southwestern Ohio. Malanowski (1999), O'Malley (2004), and

Soloman (2004) also found that demographics had no significant role in job satisfaction. In sum, superintendents of differently sized and rated districts (excluding Academic Watch and Academic Emergency), ages and genders, and education and experience levels all are similarly satisfied with their jobs.

This study further suggests that a pat on the back may have more of a significant impact on superintendents than higher salary and benefits. The researcher concluded that salary and benefits must be competitive, but the ability for boards to communicate their appreciation for the work superintendents do may hold a value that is indeterminable. The lowest ranked extrinsic variable was "the praise for doing a good job." It is easy for superiors, in this case, boards of education, to overlook the need to let their school leaders know they are valued and appreciated. Other than the annual evaluation process, boards should commend their superintendents on their hard work and dedication to the children and community members. Castle (2004) comments that superintendents play a critical role in shaping public education for future generations. The names may not be remembered, but the policies put into place may last for a long time in some edited fashion. Therefore, superintendents are rewarded with the understanding that their legacy may last long into the future-a-feat that many executives in business may not be able to replicate and one that leads to satisfaction in their work.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study examined the levels of general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction of superintendents. The results of this study can be added to the literature on the public school superintendency. Due to the importance of the role superintendents play in the education of children, additional research must continue to help prepare and retain

current and future school leaders. The researcher thus offers the following recommendations to encourage further studies on job satisfaction for public school superintendents.

A future study utilizing a qualitative instrument may provide a different perspective on the job satisfaction of superintendents. Through interviews, the research could not only determine whether superintendents are satisfied or dissatisfied but could find out why. The MSQ limits responding superintendents to specific questions without the opportunity to expand on their thoughts.

This study examined the job satisfaction of superintendents without much data regarding their boards of education. A study could be completed comparing the satisfaction levels of superintendents with experienced versus inexperienced boards of education. Newly elected board members with specific agendas may make for an interesting tenure for superintendents. Seasoned boards tend to work smoothly with their superintendents. An extension of the proposed study could be satisfaction levels of superintendents who work with the board that hired them and boards that have come on in subsequent years.

State and federal mandates are a part of life as superintendent. A study of the impact No Child Left Behind had on the role as chief executive officer of the school district may be beneficial to see the impact the legislation has on job satisfaction levels. Specifically, how unfunded mandates from the state and federal levels of government impact satisfaction would be a valuable addition to the knowledge base.

Results from this and other studies show that women are underrepresented in the position of superintendent. The total number of responding superintendents who were

female was more similar to the national average of 21% than the Ohio average of 18%; however, the differences are not vast. Research on attracting and retaining women in the role of superintendent would add much needed diversity in the profession.

The researcher did receive data regarding the years of experience of the surveyed superintendents. A specific comparison between first time and experienced superintendents may provide additional information for boards of education wanting to maintain the job satisfaction levels of their superintendent. Additionally, one may want to examine the phenomenon of superintendents lacking a teaching background coming into leadership positions, especially in large, urban settings where change and out of the box thinking is sought after much more than in smaller districts.

The researcher recommends a replicated study in 5 to 10 years to determine whether changes in working conditions, regulations, and/or lapse of time have altered the results significantly. Replicated studies add much to the knowledge base and help strengthen the original information either by holding up the conclusions or proving them false. Of course, all data collected for a study are specific to that time, place, environment, and people involved. However, the more information and data provided on a subject the greater the chance to have a quality study.

There have been many successful studies on superintendent job satisfaction using the MSQ. Even so, a study that utilizes a different instrument may be beneficial to the literature. Although the researcher believes the MSQ served him well for this dissertation, it would be prudent for future researchers to examine all survey instruments available when the researcher is ready to proceed for data collection. A survey specifically designed for superintendent job satisfaction would be ideal.

Based on the results of this study, research could be conducted to examine why men and women are becoming superintendents late in their career. One could assume it to be a difficult proposition to become a superintendent early in a career and have to maintain employment as a superintendent until retirement age, meaning there are few opportunities beyond that of school superintendent. This may cause educational leaders to plan their entrance into the arena of the superintendency wisely and take their time doing so.

The researcher recommends examining the role of mentoring for superintendents since such support structures are in place for every level of public school instruction and management. For example, teachers are paired with veteran teachers and move through a series of activities designed to make the transition from pre-service teacher to first year teacher a smooth one. Further, principals, under the new licensure requirements, are paired with an experienced administrator to help weather the storm of the first year in administration. Yet, in Ohio, it is left up to associations like the Buckeye Association of School Administrators to provide mentoring programs if new superintendents so choose to participate. In fact, more than 150 superintendents have participated in this program over the past 5 years. Thus, a study focusing on the states' different attempts at providing this valuable resource for their chief executives in public schools may be beneficial to their success.

Finally, the researcher recommends a study to examine the extremes of school accountability and their impact on job satisfaction levels of superintendents. Specifically, a researcher should examine whether a relationship exists between the highest and lowest achieving schools in Ohio and the satisfaction levels of their

superintendents. In this study, there were no responses from superintendents of school districts labeled Academic Watch or Academic Emergency. Consequently, delving deeper into the area of accountability may reveal interesting information about job satisfaction levels and factors of public school superintendents in Ohio.

Conclusion

In sum, the purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of superintendents and examine those aspects of the job that account for intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. The role of the public school superintendent is both frustrating and challenging and school districts across the nation are finding it difficult to attract people to the role. The job is laden with problems but limitless possibilities. This study sought to enlighten to educators and non-educators alike that although the role presents many challenges, it still offers satisfaction to those few individuals who aspire to this incredible leadership opportunity in helping to prepare children for the future.

REFERENCES

- Adcock, P. (1991). *A comprehensive study concerning the job satisfaction of Arkansas school superintendents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Texas State University, Commerce, TX.
- American Association of School Administrators. (1993). *Professional standards for the superintendency*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- American Association of School Administrators. (2008). *Superintendent and district data*. Retrieved September 12, 2008, from <http://www.aasa.org/StandUp/content.cfm?ItemNumber=9564>
- Anthes, K. (2003). *No child left behind policy brief: School and district leadership*. Retrieved March 3, 2006, from <http://edres.org/eric/ED468186.htm>
- Argyris, C. (1962). *Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Bartlett, C., & Ghoshal, S. (1995). Changing the role of top management: Beyond systems to people. *Long Range Planning*, 28(4), 126.
- Basom, M., Young, S., & Adams, T. (1999). Getting better at building superintendent school board relations. *ERS Spectrum*, 17(3), 23-26.

- Batchler, M. (1981). Motivating staff: A problem for the school administrator. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 19, 44-54.
- Bennett, D. (1991). Big city blues. *American School Board Journal*, 178(4), 22-24.
- Bledsoe, J., & Hayward, G. (1981). Prediction of job satisfactoriness and job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *Psychological Reports*, 49, 455-458.
- Blumberg, A. (1985). *The school superintendent: Living with conflict*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borquist, L. (1987). *Job satisfaction of administrators in a public suburban school district*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Bournias, B. (2006). *A study of perceived job satisfaction among middle school and high school principals in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Brandt, R. (1993). On restructuring roles and relationships: A conversation with Phil Schlechty. *Educational Leadership*, 51(2), 8-11.
- Brown, D. (1978). Job satisfaction of school superintendents as related to perceptions of leader behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 42(1), 171-174.
- Brubaker, D., & Coble, L. (1995). The derailed superintendent. *The Executive Educator*, 10(1), 34-36.

- Burns, C. (1993, November 17). *Requiem for the superintendency*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.edweek.org/login.html?source=http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1993/11/17/11cody.h13.html&destination=http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1993/11/17/11cody.h13.html&levelId=2100>
- Carter, G., & Cunningham, W. (1997). *The American school superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Castello, R., Creco, J., & McGowan, T. (1992). Clear signals: Reviewing working relationships keeps board and superintendent on course. *American School Board Journal*, 179(2), 32-24.
- Castle, S. (2004). *Job satisfaction of Ohio city, local, and exempted village school superintendents and their perceptions of a career crisis in the school superintendency*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bowling Green State University, OH.
- Chaddock, G. (1999). In U.S. education: The buck stops here. *Christian Science Monitor*, 91(41). Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.csmonitor.com/1999/0126/p18s1.html>
- Crowson, R. (1987). The local school district superintendent: A puzzling administrative role. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23(3), 49-69.
- Cryss, B., Grogan, M., & Bjork, L. (2002). Shifts in the discourse defining the superintendency: Historical and current foundations of the position. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 101(1), 211-238.
- Cuban, L. (1976). *The urban superintendency*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

- Cuban, L. (1985). Conflict and leadership in the superintendency. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67(1), 28-30.
- Cuban, L. (1998). The superintendent contradiction: Facing the myths and dilemmas surrounding school chiefs' role in reform. *Education Week*, 18(7), 56-57.
- Cubberley, E. (1916). *Public school administration*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cunningham, L., Hack, W., & Nystrand, R. (1977). *Educational administration: The developing decades*. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University.
- Daley, D. (1990, December 26). School chiefs dropping out, plagued by urban problems. *New York Times*. Retrieved April 7, 2008, from <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C0CEFDE1E3CF935A15751C1A966958260&sec=&spon=>
- Dareh, J., & Playko, M. (1992). *Aspiring administrators' perceptions of the superintendency as a viable career choice*. San Francisco: American Education Research Association.
- DeRolph vs. State, 677 N.E.2d 733 (Ohio 1997)
- Else, D. (1993). *Strengthening board of education/superintendent relationships in America's schools*. Monograph Series No. 4 (1), 1-7. University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.
- Fore, B. (1999). Your 1st superintendency: What you need to know. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 28(5), 15-17.
- Glass, T. (1992). *The 1992 study of the American school superintendency*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Glass, T. (2000). The shrinking applicant pool. *Education Week*, 20(10), 50-51.

- Glass, T., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). *The 2000 study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/2d/e9.pdf
- Goldstein, A. (1992). Stress in the superintendency: School leaders confront the daunting pressures of the job. *School Administrator*, 49(9), 8-11.
- Gruneberg, M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1975). Development of job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159-170.
- Hall, N. (1991). Job satisfaction of school superintendents in South Dakota. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 25, 4605A.
- Hanson, E. (2003). *Educational administration and organizational behavior*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hayes, W. (2001). *So you want to be a superintendent?* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: Crowell.
- Herzberg, F. (1976). *The managerial choice*. Homewood, IL; Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- Hess, F. (2002). *School boards at the dawn of the 21st century: Conditions and challenges of district governance*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.

- Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Beckhard, R. (1996). *The Drucker foundations: The leader of the future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hicks, S. (2007). *AASA survey yields clues of today's superintendency*. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/cdarticledetailfriday.cfm?ItemNumber=8503>
- Homans, G. (1950). *The human group*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper.
- Houston, P. (2001). Superintendents for the 21st century: It's not just a job, it's a calling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 428-433.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (1978). *Educational administration theory, research and practice*. New York: Random House.
- Hoyle, J. (1989). Preparing the 21st century superintendent. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70(1), 376-379.
- Hull, W. (1974). *Identification of various related to job satisfaction of California elementary school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of the Pacific, CA.
- Jackson, B. (1995). *Balancing act: The political role of the urban school superintendent*. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.
- Johnson, S. (1996). *Leading to change: The challenge of the new superintendency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jones, R. (1994). Instant superintendent. *American School Board Journal*, 181(4), 22-26.
- Kelly, D. (1997). Turnover at the top. *American School Board Journal*, 184(4), 46, 48.

- Kerr, R. (1988). Superintendents best serve their schools by staying put. *Executive Educator*, 10, 20-21.
- Knezevich, S. (1971). *The American school superintendent*. Washington, DC: American Association of School Administrators.
- Konnert, M., & Augenstein, J. (1995). *The superintendency in the nineties: What superintendents and board members need to know*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Kowalski, T. (1995). *Keepers of the flame: Contemporary urban superintendents*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kowalski, T. (1999). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice, and cases*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lashway, L. (2002). Holding schools accountable for achievement. Retrieved October 1, 2003, from <http://www.wericdigests.org/2002-2/holding.htm> *ERIC Digest*, 130. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 434381)
- Locke, E. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309-336.
- Lofquist, L., & Dawis, R. (1991). *Essentials of person-environment correspondence counseling*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lombardo, R. (2005). *A study of job satisfaction among high school principals in Pennsylvania*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Lutz, F., & Iannaccone, L. (1986). *The dissatisfaction theory of American democracy: A guide for politics in local school districts*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 041)

- Malanowski, R. (1999). *A study of job satisfaction among urban superintendents in New Jersey*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Marinelli, J. (1996). Effective legislative advocacy for local school leaders. *School Administrator*, 53(11), 6-11.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York: MacMillan.
- McAdams, R., & Cressman, B. (1997). The roles of Pennsylvania superintendents and school board members as perceived by superintendents and school board members. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 21(1), 44-57.
- McCurdy, J. (1992). *Building better school boards*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Moore, G. (2001). *Supervision and evaluation of high school principals as described by central office administrators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oklahoma, Norman.
- Mountford, M. (2004). Motives and power of school board members: Implications for school board-superintendent relationships. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 704-741.
- Murphy, J. (1991). Superintendents as saviors: From the terminator to pogo. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, 507-513.

- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for tomorrow's schools*. Mesa, AZ: Author.
- Nelson, K. (1987). *A study of job satisfaction of Nebraska superintendents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Newby, J. (1999). *Job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.
- Norton, M., Webb, L., Duugosh, L., & Sybouts, W. (1996). *The school superintendency: New responsibilities, new leadership*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ohio Department of Education (2006a). *School district rating classifications*. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=1266&ContentID=13571&Content=14797>
- Ohio Department of Education (2006b). *Typology of school districts*. Retrieved August 22, 2006 from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=1266&ContentID=12833&Content=16473>
- Ohio School Boards Association. (2006). *Communiqué*. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.osba-ohio.org/rrc.htm>
- Olson, D. (1995). Community development through indigenous leadership. *Notes on Anthropology and Intercultural Community Work*, 18, 30-37.

- O'Malley, R. (2004). *A study of perceived job satisfaction factors among superintendents in two New Jersey counties*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory Z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Parker, T. (1974). *The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Virginia.
- Patterson, J. (1993). *Leadership for tomorrow's schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Price, W. (2001). *When roles are scripted, will school boards and superintendents get snared in a role conflict paradox?* Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=3945>
- Priskett, K. (1988). *Stress, coping and job satisfaction of managers in education and business*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Rickabaugh, J., & Kremer, M. (1997). *Six habits to make you a hit with your school board*. Retrieved March 27, 2007, from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=4753>
- Schaefer, B. (1982). *A summary of the teacher satisfaction survey conducted in December, 1980*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northern Illinois University, DeKalb.
- Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scherer, R. (1995). Big city school superintendents are posting high dropout rates. *Christian Science Monitor*, 87(142). Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.csmonitor.com/1995/0619/19013.html>

- Schlechty, P. (1997). *Inventing better schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schoen, L. (2006). *Perceptions of job satisfaction of k-8 superintendents in Bergen County, New Jersey public school districts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Schultz, D. (1982). *Psychology and industry today*. New York: Macmillan.
- Scott, M. (2006). *Districts fight phantom*. Retrieved April 9, 2006, from http://www.zwire.com/site/index.cfm?newsid=16452928&BRD=1698&PAG=461&dept_id=21849&rft=8
- Sergiovanni, T. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 41-45.
- Sharp, W. L., Malone, B. G., & Walter, J. K. (2002, December). What's right about the superintendency? *The School Administrator*. Retrieved April 9, 2006, from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=2793>
- Smith, C. (1981). *Attitude congruency and superintendent service: A modest relationship*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Science No. ED202155).
- Smith, J. (1976). *Job satisfaction of Connecticut public senior high school principals as related to school location and school size*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Soloman, G. (2004). *A study of perceived job satisfaction among superintendents in affluent public school districts in New Jersey*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.

- Speer, T. (1995). Tacoma's board is left in the lurch. *American School Board Journal*, 182(12), 14-19.
- Steel, B. (1991). Job satisfaction. *The Bureaucrat*, 20(3), 57-59.
- Struble, H. (1993). *Relationship among Herzberg's satisfaction/dissatisfaction factors, five selected school restructuring measures, and motivation of suburban teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Usdan, M., McCloud, B., Podmostko, M., & Cuban, L. (2001). *Leadership for student learning: Restructuring school district leadership*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Vail, K. (2001). Teamwork at the top: Keeping the board-superintendent relationship healthy and happy. *American School Board Journal*, 188(11), 1-8.
- Vaughn, W. & Dunn, J. (1972). *An investigation into the relationships between education and job satisfaction in an on-going organization*. Denton, TX: Research Studies in Job Satisfaction, University of North Texas.
- Weiss, D. (1968). *A study of the relationship of participation in decision-making, selected personality variables and job satisfaction of the Education Research and Development Council of Elementary School Principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota.
- Weiss, D., Davis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1977). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press of Industrial Relations Center.
- Whitsell, G. (1987). *A study of factors which relate to superintendents' job satisfaction*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Texas State University, Johnson City.

Whyte, W. (1955). *Money and motivation*. New York: Harper and Row.

Wilson, W. (1978). Race and job satisfaction in the military. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 19, 626-638.

Witt, L. (1989). Sex differences among bank employees in the relationships of commitment with psychological climate and job satisfaction. *Journal of General Psychology*, 116, 419-426.

APPENDIX A

<u>County</u>	<u>School District</u>	<u># Students</u>	<u>Identification</u>
Butler	Edgewood	3,865	Suburban
Butler	Fairfield	10,083	Suburban
Butler	Hamilton	9,438	Urban
Butler	Lakota	17,782	Suburban
Butler	Madison	1,566	Suburban
Butler	Middletown	6,901	Urban
Butler	Monroe	2,124	Suburban
Butler	New Miami	853	Urban
Butler	Ross	2,922	Rural
Butler	Talawanda	3,029	Rural
Clermont	Batavia	2,074	Suburban
Clermont	Bethel-Tate	1,994	Rural
Clermont	Clermont-Northeastern	1,840	Rural
Clermont	Felicity-Franklin	1,200	Rural
Clermont	Goshen	2,561	Suburban
Clermont	Milford	6,606	Suburban
Clermont	New Richmond	2,561	Rural
Clermont	West Clermont	9,241	Suburban
Clermont	Williamsburg	1,046	Rural
Clinton	Blanchester	1,804	Rural
Clinton	Clinton-Massie	1,897	Rural
Clinton	East Clinton	1,554	Rural

Clinton	Wilmington	3,288	Rural
Greene	Beavercreek	7,671	Suburban
Greene	Cedar Cliff	664	Rural
Greene	Fairborn	4,576	Urban
Greene	Greeneview	1,562	Rural
Greene	Sugarcreek	2,817	Suburban
Greene	Xenia	5,132	Urban
Greene	Yellow Springs	686	Suburban
Hamilton	Cincinnati	36,008	Urban
Hamilton	Deer Park	1,384	Suburban
Hamilton	Finneytown	1,761	Suburban
Hamilton	Forest Hills	7,734	Suburban
Hamilton	Indian Hill	2,273	Suburban
Hamilton	Lockland	712	Urban
Hamilton	Loveland	4,693	Suburban
Hamilton	Madeira	1,556	Suburban
Hamilton	Mariemont	1,688	Suburban
Hamilton	Mount Healthy	3,624	Urban
Hamilton	North College Hill	1,583	Urban
Hamilton	Northwest	10,370	Suburban
Hamilton	Norwood	2,450	Urban
Hamilton	Oak Hills	8,108	Suburban
Hamilton	Princeton	5,645	Suburban

Hamilton	Reading	1,472	Urban
Hamilton	Southwest	3,797	Suburban
Hamilton	Saint Bernard	1,035	Urban
Hamilton	Sycamore	5,599	Suburban
Hamilton	Three Rivers	2,025	Suburban
Hamilton	Winton Woods	3,931	Suburban
Hamilton	Wyoming	1,978	Suburban
Montgomery	Brookville	1,606	Suburban
Montgomery	Centerville	8,276	Suburban
Montgomery	Dayton	16,855	Urban
Montgomery	Huber Heights	6,651	Suburban
Montgomery	Jefferson Township	672	Rural
Montgomery	Kettering	7,568	Suburban
Montgomery	Mad River	3,709	Urban
Montgomery	Miamisburg	5,611	Suburban
Montgomery	New Lebanon	1,223	Rural
Montgomery	Northmont	6,010	Suburban
Montgomery	Northridge	1,790	Urban
Montgomery	Oakwood	2,180	Suburban
Montgomery	Trotwood-Madison	3,021	Urban
Montgomery	Valley View	2,048	Rural
Montgomery	Vandalia-Butler	3,466	Suburban
Montgomery	West Carrollton	3,801	Suburban

Preble	Eaton	2,343	Rural
Preble	National Trail	1,134	Rural
Preble	Preble Shawnee	1,478	Rural
Preble	Tri-County North	1,141	Rural
Preble	Twin Valley	1,073	Rural
Warren	Carlisle	1,797	Suburban
Warren	Franklin	2,927	Urban
Warren	Kings	3,812	Suburban
Warren	Lebanon	5,383	Suburban
Warren	Little Miami	3,800	Rural
Warren	Mason	10,379	Suburban
Warren	Springboro	5,056	Suburban
Warren	Wayne	1,459	Rural

APPENDIX B

Matt Bishop

e-mail: cahs_mb@swoca.net
(937) 746-8048

110 Colonel Drive
Carlisle, Ohio 45005

Dear Superintendent,

My name is Matt Bishop and I am principal at Carlisle High School. I am in the process of doing research to complete my Ph.D. in Educational Leadership at the University of Dayton. I am currently writing a doctoral dissertation entitled "A Study of Perceived General, Intrinsic, and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Public School Superintendents in Southwestern Ohio."

I am writing to ask that you participate in this study which will consist of answering the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form and completing a demographic survey. The survey consists of 20 questions that will measure extrinsic job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction, and general job satisfaction. The entire process should take no more than ten minutes of your time. All 81 superintendents in Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Greene, Hamilton, Montgomery, Preble, and Warren Counties are being asked to participate in this study

This study guarantees complete anonymity and confidentiality. Under no circumstances will data be published which identifies the participant. All replies will be coded and kept in a lock box with no names attached to any research. Results will be discussed with my dissertation chair, but will not be seen by any unauthorized individual. *There are no risks and no direct benefit for the participation.* If you would like to participate but have additional questions, you can contact me directly at (937) 746-8048 or my dissertation chair, Dr. Charles J. Russo, at the University of Dayton, at 937-229-3722. In addition, questions may be directed to the University of Dayton's Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair, Jon Nieberding, at 937-229-2171.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and demographic sheet and return it in the addressed stamped envelope provided by October 21, 2007. The data provided by you is greatly needed to assist in the research on superintendent job satisfaction. I certainly understand your time is valuable as a district leader. My hope is that the data gathered will contribute to the current knowledge base of superintendent job satisfaction. Thank you very much in advance for your help with this research.

Sincerely,

Matt Bishop
Principal
Carlisle High School
cc: Dr. Charles J. Russo, University of Dayton

APPENDIX C

"A STUDY OF PERCEIVED GENERAL, INTRINSIC, AND EXTRINSIC JOB
SATISFACTION AMONG PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN
SOUTHWESTERN OHIO"

SUPERINTENDENT DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

(Please return with the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire)

Please check if you would like to receive a copy of the results of the study. ____

1. Number of students in the district:

Less than 2000 ____ 2001-3000 ____ 3001-5000 ____
5001-8000 ____ more than 8000 ____

2. Identification of the school district by the State of Ohio:

Rural (Group 1, 2, 3 Schools) ____

Urban (Group 4, 5 Schools) ____

Suburban (Group 6, 7 Schools) ____

3. Rating of the district on the 2005 Ohio School Report Card:

Excellent ____ Effective ____ Continuous Improvement ____
Academic Watch ____ Academic Emergency ____

4. Gender:

Male ____ Female ____

5. Age:

Less than 35 ____ 35-45 ____ 46-55 ____ 56-65 ____ over 65 ____

6. Years of experience as a superintendent:

Less than 3 ____ 3-8 ____ 9-13 ____ 14-18 ____ more than 18 ____

7. Most recent position held prior to becoming superintendent:

Principal ____ Assistant Superintendent ____ District Supervisor ____

*Other (specify job title and responsibility):

8. Highest degree held:

Masters ____ Educational Specialist ____ Doctorate (Ph.D. or Ed.D.) ____

APPENDIX D

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

(short-form)



Vocational Psychology Research UNIVERSITY
OF MINNESOTA

Copyright 1977

Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people like and dislike about their jobs.

On the next page you will find statements about your present job.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

—if you feel that your job gives you more than you expected/ check the box under "Very Sat." (Very Satisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under "Sat." (Satisfied);

—if you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under "N" (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check the box under "Dissat." (Dissatisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check the box under "Very Dissat." (Very Dissatisfied).

- Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.
- Do this for all statements. Please answer every item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.

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

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

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

	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1. Being able to keep busy all the time.....	—	—	—	—	—
2. The chance to work alone on the job.....	—	—	—	—	—
3. The chance to do different things from time to time.....	—	—	—	—	—
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.....	—	—	—	—	—
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.....	—	—	—	—	—
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.....	—	—	—	—	—
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	—	—	—	—	—
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.....	—	—	—	—	—
9. The chance to do things for other people	—	—	—	—	—
10. The chance to tell people what to do.....	—	—	—	—	—
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities..	—	—	—	—	—
12. The way company policies are put into practice.....	—	—	—	—	—
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.....	—	—	—	—	—
14. The chances for advancement on this job.....	—	—	—	—	—
15. The freedom to use my own judgment.....	—	—	—	—	—
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.....	—	—	—	—	—
17. The working conditions.....	—	—	—	—	—
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.....	—	—	—	—	—
19. The praise I get for doing a good job.....	—	—	—	—	—
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.....	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX E



2 July 2007

Mr. Matt Bishop
110 Colonel Drive
Carlisle, OH 45005

SUBJECT: "A Study of Perceived General Intrinsic and Extrinsic
Job Satisfaction of Public School Superintendents in
South Western Ohio"

Dear Mr. Bishop:

The Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research has reviewed the subject proposal and has approved it for a period of one year. If the study is not completed by 2 July 2008, you are required to seek re-approval from the committee at that time. The committee must approve any changes in the protocol prior to the implementation of the change unless such a delay would place your participants at an increased risk of harm. In such situations, the committee is to be informed of the changes as soon as possible. The committee is to be informed immediately of any ethical issues that arise in your study.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jon Nieberding", is written over a light gray, textured background.

Jon Nieberding
Chair

jn:lky

UNIVERSITY
OF DAYTON
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

Contracts and Grants
Administration
300 College Park
Dayton, OH 45469-0104
(937) 229-2919
FAX (937) 229-2291

APPENDIX F

*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*

July 6, 2007

Matt Bishop
110 Colonel Dr.
Carlisle, OH 45005

Dear Matt Bishop:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 short form version in your research project.

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.

Sincerely,



Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research

R702034992