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The purpose of this study was to assess job satisfaction of high school principals in Mississippi as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The primary question addressed by the study was: What is the overall job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire? In addition to the primary question, six other questions were addressed by the study. They were: a) What is the general satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi according to the following demographic variables: public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, level of education, salary level, years of experience as a teacher and administrator, school size and school socio-economic level? b) Is there a relationship between general job satisfaction and the Mississippi Department of Education rating level (1-5) among principals in public schools? c) What is the satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi for each of the 20 dimensions of the job as measured by the MSQ? d) Which of the demographic variables of public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, experience, school size and Mississippi school rating can be predictors of general job satisfaction for high school principals in Mississippi? and e) What effects has the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) had upon job satisfaction of Mississippi high school principals?

All 355 of the high school principals in the state of Mississippi were invited to participate in the research. One hundred fifty three of them responded. This represented 43% of the state’s high school principals. Each principal completed the demographic data sheet, the MSQ and responded to questions concerning the No Child Left Behind Act. The Long-Form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to measure job satisfaction. This instrument utilized a 20-
dimension Likert-type scale with five response alternatives ranging from "Very Dissatisfied" (weighted 1) to "Very Satisfied" (weighted 5). On this scale, the general satisfaction score for the respondents resulted in a mean of 3.93 (SD= .55) indicating that these principals are "Satisfied" (3.00-3.99) with their jobs. According to the demographic variables, all general satisfaction scores were within or above the "Satisfied" range. The mean scores for the 20 dimensions ranged from "Satisfied" (3.00-3.99) to "Very Satisfied" (4.00-4.99). Compensation ranked the lowest in the (M=3.30, SD=1.02), and Moral Values ranked the highest (M=4.29, SD=.55). In relation to the No Child Left Behind Act 58% of those surveyed reported that they have less job satisfaction since initiation of NCLB. This could be due to higher stress and increased workloads as 79% report having increased stress levels and 86% report an increased workload. At the same time 70% report being able to spend less time with their families or significant other.

Recommendations for further research included longitudinal and interval studies to determine if changes occur over time, studies to include elementary and middle school principals, a study to investigate how a principals job satisfaction level affects job performance of the schools teachers and success of students, a qualitative study including interviews to determine more specifics and insight into principals job satisfaction and possibly bring to light new issues related to job satisfaction. Also, further investigations into the relationship of the No Child Left Behind Act are warranted in relation to budget constraints, high stakes testing, special education, accountability and other areas mentioned in comments principals made during this study.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many will agree that the most important factor in any school is its teaching staff. It is easy to understand that teachers' qualifications are tied to student achievement. According to Wong (2004), “Teachers hired today are the teachers for the next generation. Their success will determine the success of an entire generation” (p. 41). Wong went on to say that, effective, experienced teachers are linked to greater student achievement.

The principal is the key agent at the school level, the cornerstone of an effective school and the person responsible for raising the level of expectations for students and teachers and without which a school cannot succeed (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). If a school is to have good teachers, it must also have good leadership in the form of a competent, well-educated, respected and effective principal. Effective principals are essential for effective schools.

A school’s leader is the key element in establishing a productive and satisfying work climate (Koll, Robertson, Lampe, & Hegedus 1996). As the instructional leader of the school, the principal must promote effective teaching (Blase & Blase, 1999).

Sometimes there are differing opinions as to how establishing a productive and satisfying work climate might be accomplished, which facets of leadership should come into play, or which aspects are more closely associated with school effectiveness (Koll et al., 1996). However, no matter which opinion prevails the fact remains that the principal’s position and leadership is what drives the school. According to Norton (2003), “Research studies strongly support the fact that the leadership of the school principal impacts directly on the climate of the school and, in turn, on student achievement.”

To be an effective school leader the principal has to create a cooperative and non-threatening partnership with teachers, that provides and encourages peer connections and
collaboration, professional development and a sense of empowerment and self-efficacy while respecting their knowledge and abilities (Blase & Blase, 1999). Principals may further promote school effectiveness by fostering teacher reflection and integrating the use of “action research, peer coaching, the study of teaching and learning models, and conscientious development” (Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 18) of their teaching staff.

So where have all of the principals gone? An ever-expanding shortage of principals is occurring nationwide. Many administrators are nearing retirement age, many are leaving the profession and beginning new careers, and some are returning to the classroom for various reasons. There are enough certified administrators in the country to fill the open positions, but there is a lack of applicants for the job. Because having available, effective administrators is crucial to our educational systems, this researcher will endeavor to discover the level of job satisfaction of high school principals and the causes of the shortage of qualified individuals who apply for the unfilled principalships. What can school systems do to make the job more appealing and what must be done to recruit and retain highly qualified individuals into the profession?

**Principals’ Job Description**

The job of a high school principal is difficult and complex, the many roles, responsibilities, and obligation to satisfy the various stakeholders decrease the level of job satisfaction. As society evolves and the call for accountability of our schools continues to increase, the job will become more complex in nature (Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004a). This may increase stress and make the job so undesirable that many leave the profession.

In their research, Rayfield and Diamantes (2004a) identified 25 specific job items tied to the principalship, which were:

1. Selection of teachers
2. Evaluation of instructional staff
3. Assignment of faculty to courses
4. Leading professional development
5. Developing a master schedule
6. Working to develop a cooperative relationship
7. Enforcement of contract provisions
8. Making the school safe
9. Dealing with disruptive students
10. Dealing with attendance concerns
11. Working with parents relative to student behavior
12. Curriculum development or alignment
13. Accepting accountability for instructional program.
14. Compliance with state mandates
15. Special Education supervision
16. Publication of newsletters
17. Attendance at community events
18. Awards recognition programs
19. Budget development
20. Budget management
21. Fundraising
22. Selection of coaches
23. Evaluation of supplemental personnel
24. Supervision/Attendance at extra-curricular activities
25. Facilities maintenance personnel supervision. (p. 711)

These 25 specific job items may vary from school district to school district, some tasks might be delegated, but in the end, the entire responsibility of school management rests with the principal. The scope of the list reveals that the principal’s job is two-fold because principals act as school managers as well instructional leaders of the school. The former concerns day-to-day operational considerations while the latter entails helping
teachers become effective educators and assuring student learning while setting the educational tone and direction of the school.

The Principal’s Job Is Becoming More Complex

Due to accountability issues brought about by The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), high-stakes testing, and a higher demand to meet the needs of stakeholders, the principal’s position is a complex job that is becoming harder to manage (Whitaker, 2003). At the same time, the role of the principal is drawing increasing attention in the media and by educational stakeholders.

This increased focus by the public sometimes places the principal in a precarious situation. Being mindful of the expectations of stakeholders to produce positive results sometimes leads to a disregard for bureaucratic factors, processes, and using the correct approach (Sergiovanni, 2001). The social system outside of the school adds additional pressure on the principal as he/she tries to meet the demands and needs of the local community (Cooley & Shen, 2003).

It is suggested that principals should spend at least one-third of their time in the classroom striving to provide educational leadership and developing effective teachers and teacher-leaders (Eisner, 2002). Most principals find it hard to accomplish this because of other demands of the job. The ever changing multiple roles of principals and the duties required of them are expanding. New responsibilities are being added while few are deleted (Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004a). This puts many school leaders in the position of having to choose between instructional and managerial tasks. Rayfield and Diamantes went on to say that, a current trend is to reduce emphasis on managerial duties and to increase time spent on educational leadership, but acknowledged that this may not always be possible. According to Stricherz (2001), a majority of principals reported feeling overworked due to an overwhelming number of mandates, stymied by bureaucracy with too much paperwork, and stressed due to too little time to accomplish...
what is required. A large part of the problem was blamed on special education issues, which "exacts too much time and costs too much money" (Stricherz, 2001, p. 5).

Another challenge facing principals is the trend of delegating authority and the process of shared decision-making. Local management also known as site-based management is striving to move decision-making to the individual school empowering parents, the school faculty and staff, and in some instances even the students to share in decision making processes impacting the school (Whitaker, 2003). Whitaker also noted that this might actually cause the principal additional work and a feeling of losing control, while increasing overall stress. While the overall process is positive, in many ways, it can create uncertainty for principals as their job shifts from leader to facilitator as they spend more time dealing with group dynamics, politics, and in formal and informal meetings (Whitaker, 2003). All of these processes are a part of leadership, but they deduct from administrators’ time as educational leaders and force them to devote more time acting as managers.

With NCLB came an increased level of accountability and the added stress of high-stakes testing. According to Kubiszyn and Borich (2003), all 50 states have some sort of annual high-stakes test program in place due to this federal legislation and each state requires annual academic assessments for all students in grades 3-9. Increasingly, the results of high-stakes testing are being used to guide decisions on promotions and other academic issues.

With inclusion of special needs students into the regular classroom following the enactment of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1997, an ever-increasing emphasis has been placed on high-stakes testing and the requirement for students to make Annual Yearly Progress (Kubiszyn & Borich, 2003). Clearly, this requirement brought about by NCLB added more anxiety to the already stressful position of the principalship.
Accountability issues add further concern to an already stressful role for a principal as the outcomes of high stakes testing affect them in many ways. As a consequence of test scores, a school may (a) receive an acceptable or unacceptable performance rating, (b) be granted or denied funding, (c) gain or lose staff, or (d) be closed or taken over by a state education agency or private organization (Kubiszyn & Borich, 2003). In addition, a principal may be terminated if scores fall too low or remain low for a lengthy period. Although most principals agree that, their districts use these tests well, “fifty-five percent of principals think the tests are flawed gauges of achievement or are implemented poorly” (Stricherz, 2001, p. 5). Because of the mandates resulting from state and federal legislation dealing with accountability many principals have had to become more involved in the areas of curriculum and instruction, which adds additional time to their already overcrowded agenda (Cooley & Shen, 2003).

So how does all of this affect today’s principal in public education? There is a shortage of effective well-trained school leaders and a reduction in the number of teachers willing to enter the field of educational leadership and administration. (Cushing, 2003; Norton, 2002; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004a; Rodriguez, 1999; Whitaker, 2003). A survey conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) noted “increased responsibilities, long work days, and difficulties satisfying parents and school boards, along with low salaries have made the once coveted job of school principal less desirable” (Rodriguez, 1999, p. 6). Rodriguez further reported that over half of the surveyed districts had difficulty filling school principal positions in 1998 and 1999, and the problem is expected to worsen as 40% of the current 93,200 principals in the United States are nearing retirement age. There is concern that the pool of candidates entering education leadership programs in the United States will not be enough to meet the demand. In another U.S. study, 40% of superintendents and 28% of principals reported somewhat serious severe shortages of principals (Stricherz, 2001).
According to Norton (2003), NAESP and NASSP studies found that during the 1990–2000 decade nearly half of all high school principals “turned over” or left the profession. Studies predicted that such losses would most likely increase into the twenty-first century. Reasons given for so many principals leaving included (a) short supply of future school administrators, (b) great number of administrators approaching retirement age, and (c) increasing necessity to rely upon substitute administrators. Such research findings indicate that recruiting and retention of quality school principals should become a national priority.

“As a result of the increased demands upon the life of a principal, not only does the turnover rate continue at a high level but fewer individuals are being attracted to the principalship position” (Norton, 2003, p. 51). Norton added that one study showed over 90% of the superintendents stated that the principal shortage is moving to the extreme.

Many principals are leaving the field altogether, while others are returning to the classroom where it is less stressful and affords them an opportunity to have more interaction with students. The difference in pay between principal and teacher salaries has not outweighed the lowered stress level and reduced workload for those returning to the classroom (Pounder & Merril, 2001).

The reason for less interest in assuming the role of principal is in part due to the difficulty of performing the duties and accepting the responsibilities of the role. One of the major problems associated with high principal turnover is “the changing demands of the position” (Norton, 2003, p. 51). As previously discussed, many of these changes and increased workload may be due to NCLB.

The Importance of Job Satisfaction

Theoretical Framework

“General job satisfaction, the overall attitude of liking or disliking a job, is a universal and essential aspect of adult career development” (Jepsen & Sheu, 2003,
Researchers accept the assumption that nearly everyone seeks satisfaction in his or her work (Jepsen & Sheu, 2003). Job satisfaction can be a determining factor in why one applies for a job, stays in a job, or even leaves a job for another job.

Job satisfaction is of high importance in the workplace. According to DeMato and Curcio (2004, p. 237),

Job satisfaction contributes to job performance, influences emotional and physical well-being and is necessary to ensure high quality performance, while job dissatisfaction is associated with stress and burnout, and can be associated with a number of potentially damaging personal and professional symptoms.

Job satisfaction can play a role in reducing job-related stress (Latham, 1998).

Since job satisfaction is also seen as an important factor in the retention of employees, it is also important to understand why principals are leaving and others are not entering the profession (Ernst, Franco, Messmer & Gonzales, 2004). Terpstra and Honoree (2004) found that job satisfaction was related to employee motivation, performance, absenteeism and turnover and may positively influence organizational citizenship behavior. Dissatisfaction with pay may also lead to decreased job satisfaction (Terpstra & Honoree, 2004). In turn, the morale of the administrator can have implications on those working under them and the health of the individual themselves (Mertler, 2002).

There is a definite link between job satisfaction and the propensity to leave a job (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). Stress and job dissatisfaction are factors that cause individuals to abandon their jobs and careers (2002). Lack of job satisfaction may lead to burnout and cause workers to (a) leave a profession prior to retirement, (b) change jobs, or (c) enter a completely new career path.

Latham (1998) suggested that, "One of the best ways to strengthen the teaching profession would be to make teaching a more satisfying career. Not only would this encourage bright young prospects to become teachers, it would also encourage
experienced teachers to stay in the profession” (p. 82). This should not only be true for teachers, but also for administrators and those in other professions as well.

Recent literature review shows that most of the age-job satisfaction studies have concluded there is some relationship between employee age and job satisfaction (Oshagbemi, 1998). An article in Reading Today reported that younger and less experienced teachers had reported higher levels of satisfaction than older more experienced teachers in public schools, while in private schools the very youngest and least experienced along with the very oldest and most experienced teachers had the highest level of satisfaction (Reports list, 1998). Those in-between were less satisfied. Overall, private school teachers tended to be more satisfied than public school teachers. Further research needs to be done to see if this also holds true for educational leaders of private schools.

Rayfield and Diamantes (2004a) assert that, “Research is needed to focus on the satisfaction level principals’ report with specific duties they are expected to perform (p. 4).” Rayfield and Diamantes went on to question if school size or length of service affects job satisfaction among principals.

In a related article concerning the assistant principalship Sutter (1996) stated, “If factors that may predict assistant principals’ levels of job and career satisfaction could be determined, perhaps steps could be taken to improve their job and career satisfaction” (p. 109). The same should hold true for the position of principal. Further studies could result in improvements in principal recruitment and retention and alleviate principal shortage.

Extensive research has been done on levels of job satisfaction that have distinctive applications to academic faculty. This is especially true when viewed in relation to intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of academic employment and the separation between satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Iiacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 1995). Although their results refer to higher education, it may also relate to the job satisfaction in high school administration and may require a deeper look. Intrinsic rewards only go so
far, and principals still need adequate pay, benefits, and free time to make the position desirable.

In some research, gender differences have been examined as a factor of job satisfaction. In a study of teachers, female teachers experienced more job satisfaction than males (Mwamwenda, 1997). It would be interesting to note if the same is true for administrators. There has been a trend for more women than men to enter the profession. If women show more satisfaction than men do in similar conditions then this could explain this pattern of their willingness to enter the field while men are staying away.

When looking at ethnicity and race, there has been a decline in the representation of African-Americans in higher education faculty, but those employed seem to indicate an overall satisfaction with their employment (Fields, 2000). Determining the levels of satisfaction of African-American administrators is important to the profession.

It is probable that in the first decade of the twenty-first century that more than 80% of the new professionals will be minorities (Daufin, 2001). Daufin went on to explain that minorities tend to develop more stress and be less satisfied with positions in education that results in them leaving the career earlier than their white counterparts do. Recruiting minority teachers and administrators to provide leadership for the incoming minority students in the field of education may prove to be a challenge. It is critical that to determine the reasons for this dissatisfaction in order to create reforms that will insure retention of minority high school administrators.

When looking at private and public schools there are many differences that may be noted. “Students populations in public schools tend to be more racially and ethnically diverse than in private schools” (Public and private school differences, 2000, p. 53). In the same article, it was noted that teachers and staff members tend to follow the same trend. Furthermore, teachers in public schools seem to be better qualified and more have higher degrees than their counterparts in private schools. Public school teachers tend to get more in-services hours and staff development, Public schools are usually larger, and
spend more time on core subjects and are more likely to offer programs that support students with special needs (Public and private school differences, 2000). However, when it came to NCLB very few differences were noted (Viadero, 2003). In some states, private schools are not required to take the high stakes tests so it may be easier for private schools to meet standards. Regarding job satisfaction, differences between workers at public and private schools, there seems to have been little research conducted. It would appear that those at private schools might have higher job satisfaction ratings, due to smaller schools, lowered class size and other issues. Research may be needed to explain if principals at one or the other is more satisfied with their positions, and the same is true of charter schools.

In a study completed by Pearson (1998), “Job satisfaction and leisure satisfaction were found to be significant positive predictors of psychological health” (p. 416). Pearson went on to say that, this becomes a serious implication for school leaders. If they do not have enough time, or take enough time to involve themselves in satisfying leisure activities to even out the stress they get from work, burnout may occur or psychological health issues arise that may affect job satisfaction and performance. This, in turn, may lead them away from the profession.

Clearly, there are many questions concerning the job satisfaction of high school principals, and there are many aspects to consider. Each aspect and condition could have implications on the ability of school systems to recruit and retain high-qualified school leaders in the future.

Problem Statement

There is a shortage of highly qualified applicants to fill the openings that exist in the principalships in schools across the United States. This shortage may be linked to job satisfaction and conditions. Therefore, this research investigated the level of job satisfaction of high school principals in Mississippi and compared the levels of job satisfaction between public and private school principals to see if differences exist. Since
private schools are not required to meet the standards, set by the NCLB Act there may be lower stress levels and in turn higher job satisfaction. There may also be other factors that influence the situation. Usually private schools are smaller, have fewer discipline problems, and a lower stress levels are associated with them. Part of this may be due to the fact that private schools are able to select which students they admit as opposed to a public school that must accept all comers.

The study focused on three areas as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). These areas include (a) the general job satisfaction level of the high school principals in Mississippi, (b) a determination of which of the 20 dimensions of the job assessed on the MSQ the principals identified as contributing to job satisfaction and (c) the influence of variables gender, age, ethnicity, education, experience, school size, salary, public or private school, and school rating on the principals’ general satisfaction level, and their satisfaction with the twenty dimensions of the job.

As a part of the study principals that have been in the position prior to and post NCLB were asked to rate their job satisfaction both before and after the initiation of the act. This could provide information as to how the mandates of NCLB have affected the principal’s role and job satisfaction.

Purpose of The Study

The primary purpose of this study is to assess the job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi as measured by the MSQ included (a) to identify the satisfaction levels of the principals according to the demographic variables of public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, experience, school size, and the Mississippi school rating, (b) job satisfaction levels for each of the twenty dimensions of the job, (c) to assess the satisfaction for the twenty dimensions according to demographic variables, and (d) what effect NCLB had on the job satisfaction of principals

Despite several studies of school principals’ job satisfaction, little has been conducted on effects that NCLB on the recruitment and retention of principals. The same
is true of comparing job satisfaction between public and private schools. Therefore, the study of high school principals' job satisfaction in Mississippi is incomplete. Principals across the state are from varied background, experiences and situations. Job satisfaction of Mississippi's principals is an important determinant in career decisions among these educational leaders. The purpose of this study was to investigate job satisfaction and related factors of Mississippi high school principals.

Research Questions

1. What is the overall general job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?

2. What is the general job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi according to the following demographic variables: public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, level of education, salary level, years of experience as a teacher and administrator, school size, and school socio-economic level?

3. Is there a relationship between general job satisfaction and the accreditation level (1-5) among principals in public schools?

4. What is the job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi for each of the 20 dimensions of the job as measured by the MSQ?

5. Which of the demographic variables of public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, experience, school size, and Mississippi school rating can be predictors of general job satisfaction for high school principals in Mississippi?

6. What effects has the NCLB Act had upon general job satisfaction of Mississippi high school principals?

Definitions

Definitions specific to this study are presented in this section.

Age- Refers to the length of life of the respondent.

Education Level- refers to the highest education degree obtained.
Experience as an Assistant Principal- Refers to total years employed as an assistant principal before becoming a principal.

Experience as a Principal- Refers to total years employed as a principal.

Gender- Refers to the sex of the respondent.

Headmaster - In a private school, synonymous with principal or director.

High School- A school that houses the grades 9 – 12 or 10 – 12 as stipulated by the local school district.

Mississippi School Ratings (5 - 1) (Mississippi Department. of Education, 2007)
Level 5 School – Superior-Performing
Level 4 School – Exemplary
Level 3 School – Successful
Level 2 School – Under-Performing
Level 1 School - Low-Performing, may be designated as a Priority School.

Principal- The school level administrator responsible for the direction of the day-to-day activities including both educational and business management of the school.

Private School- For the purpose of this study schools that are not established by the Mississippi Department of Education; a school run by private funds or donations and does not receive federal, state or local tax support.

Public School- For the purpose of this study, public schools include those established by the Mississippi Department of Education; a school that receives public funding and is supported by federal, state and local taxes.

Salary- Refers to monetary compensation received for their employment.

Satisfaction- The pleasure or contentment derived from the fulfillment or gratification of a desire or need.

School Size- For the purposes of this study school size will be determined as follows:
Small School = Less than 500 students;  
Medium Sized School = 500 – 999 students;  
Large School = More than 1000 students.

*School Socio-economic Status*- Refers to the percent of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch program.

*Years of Experience*- refer to the number of years a person has served in that position.

### Assumptions

The following statements represent the assumptions of the study:

1. All high school principals in the state of Mississippi received the data collection instrument and materials and had an equal opportunity to reply.
2. All respondents provided honest and accurate responses, which yielded valid information.
3. The results of this study are relevant in Mississippi from the information gathered and within the period of study.
4. The Mississippi Department of Education list of public and private schools was complete and accurate.

### Delimitations

The following delimitations may apply to this study:

1. The subjects were limited to high school principals currently employed in the state of Mississippi during the 2006 – 2007 school year.
2. The study was delimited to the high schools listed on the Mississippi Department of Education website.
3. The data collection instrument is a self-reporting instruments. This could result in:
   a. Low response rates
b. Inadequate answers that cannot be investigated for more specific or relevant responses
c. Respondents' inability to clearly understand an item

4. The study only deals with the facts and aspects of the demographic questionnaire and the MSQ are designed to measure.
5. The survey was conducted in Mississippi so no inferences may be drawn to any other states.

Justification

As suggested by Rayfield and Diamantes (2004a), “Research is needed to focus on the satisfaction levels principals reports with specific duties they are expected to perform.” (p. 4). Other research has shown that there is a crisis forming with respect to the number of individuals leaving the profession and the lack of candidates applying to fill the resulting open positions (Norton, 2003; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004b; Rodriguez, 1999).

Job satisfaction is associated with absenteeism, inefficiency, counterproductive behavior, and the lack of leadership. There are aspects of the principal’s job, which lead to satisfaction while others lead to dissatisfaction. It is necessary to identify both types of aspects. In hopes of making the job of principal more appealing, it is important to school districts to be aware of the aspects that make the job more or less satisfying. It is important that jobs be more attractive in order to recruit and retain faculty and principals.

It is anticipated that the results of this study would provide many educational benefits.

1. Contribute to a body of literature on levels of administrators’ satisfaction.
2. Validate or refute previous research.
3. Demonstrate which variables contribute to overall job satisfaction for high school principals in Mississippi.
4. Assist current and future administrators in making decisions regarding their work conditions in an attempt to improve job satisfaction.

5. Assist those considering the field by providing variables to evaluate

6. Aid districts with a better understanding of the position of principal so they may use this data to make the position more attractive and enable them to recruit and retain qualified and effective school leaders.

7. Provide insight into the changes that have arisen since the initiation of NCLB to see if these aspects of high stakes testing and accountability make the position less desirable and thus could be cause of lower job satisfaction.

8. Assist graduate schools of education, state and local policy makers, state and local boards of education and superintendents in identifying strategies for decision-making, which affects high school principals and education leaders in general but specifically here in the state of Mississippi.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature regarding job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has been a prominent topic that has been the focus of thousands of research studies involving many aspects of work and its relationship to human behavior as a whole and its effects on society and the worker. This chapter investigates the earlier writings of experts in work theory and job satisfaction and concludes with a review of the most recent studies. Earlier works studied the concept of job satisfaction and the workforce in general, while recent works have explored individual occupations and professions. Both general and occupation-specific studies are relevant to any study of job satisfaction. Due to the vast amount of research in this area, this literature review will include only the major work. In addition, many studies duplicated previous studies and reached similar conclusions. Therefore, this chapter includes only the most relevant studies.

Job Satisfaction – An Overview

In the old testament, work is declared as punishment for men, as the experience of pain in childbirth is for women. For many, this is reason enough to preclude fun and pleasure from work or the ‘useless’ display of emotion. Work for many people, thus, is seen as an involuntary burden, and their place of work is simply where they ‘have to be’ for the sake of earning a living (Altorfer, 1977, p. 1). Altorfer continued by observing that this axiom may not hold true in modern society. Dissatisfied workers can strive to remedy the situation or they can become grumbling malcontents. According to the Conference Board (2005), “Americans are growing increasingly unhappy with their jobs. The decline in job satisfaction is widespread among
workers of all ages and all income brackets” (p. 1). Over the past decade job satisfaction has declined by 10 percent and the study shows that “approximately one-quarter of the American workforce is simply showing up to collect a paycheck” (p. 1). The largest decline took place in the 35-44 age group followed by those the 45-54 age group. The smallest decline was seen in workers over age 65. “40% of workers feel disconnected from their employers” (p. 2).

Herzberg (1959, p. 3) stated,

Work is one of the most absorbing things men can think and talk about. It fills the greater part of the waking day for most of us. For the fortunate it is the source of great satisfactions; for many others it is the cause of grief.

By 1969, it was estimated that over 4000 studies of job satisfaction had been conducted (Gruneberg, 1976). Since that time, a plethora of additional studies adds to the literature on job satisfaction.

“Job satisfaction refers to the individual’s emotional reactions to a particular job” (Gruneberg, 1979, p. 3). “Theorists and practitioners seem to accept the assumption that nearly everybody seeks satisfaction in his or her work” (Jepsen & Sheu, 2003, p. 162).

Managers and workers alike pursue job satisfaction in the often naïve belief that it leads directly and surely to that other workplace ideal – high performance. The fact is, however, that sometimes satisfied employees perform better and sometimes they do not (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p.1).

Chambers (1999) contended that job satisfaction is considered an important and desirable goal for organizations because satisfied workers perform at higher levels than those who are not satisfied.

But what is job satisfaction? Although it is hard to define, it is generally considered an affective response to work. “Affective response” means that job satisfaction is a gut-level reaction, an emotional response, a feeling of “liking”. In
other words, job satisfaction is a positive or negative emotional state associated with one’s work (Bullock, 1984, p. 1).

Along the same vein, Locke (1969) defined overall job satisfaction as “a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceives it as offering” (p. 309). Additionally, Mortimer (1979) said, “Job satisfaction is defined as a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 2). While Jepsen and Sheu (2003) suggests, “General job satisfaction, the overall attitude of liking or disliking a job, is a universal and essential aspect of adult career development” (p. 162).

Overall job satisfaction refers to one’s general opinion of the job while “facet-specific” refers to specific aspects of the job. These may include wages, hours, conditions, and other variables (Mortimer, 1979). Mortimer further explained that job satisfaction can further be broken onto categories that are external or internal to the worker. Intrinsic aspects of work create job satisfaction. However, the presence of extrinsic rewards rarely lead to satisfaction, but their absence can lead to job dissatisfaction.

One common element among job satisfaction approaches is that they usually view job satisfaction as a summation of several facets of work in one overall response. Bullock (1984) explained that many factors go together to create job satisfaction, and job satisfaction is closely related to one’s disposition toward life. General satisfaction with life usually is related to general satisfaction with one’s job.

In early research on worker motivation, productivity, and satisfaction, five elements are important to the productivity and satisfaction of individual members and the overall effectiveness of the group. According to Zaleznik (1958, p. 35), these elements include:

(1) Technical organization of the group.

(2) Social structure of the group.
(3) Individual task motivation, i.e., the willingness to work hard that each member brings to and maintains toward his job.

(4) Rewards he receives from doing his job, and

(5) Satisfaction obtained from being an accepted member of the group.

"The traditional model of job satisfaction is that it consists of the total body of feelings that an individual has about his job" (Gruneberg 1976, p.x) "However, what makes a job satisfying or dissatisfying does not depend only on the nature of the job, but on the expectations that individuals have of what their job should provide" (p.x).

One argument is that the essence of job satisfaction lies in the "fit" or congruence of the worker and the job. As a result, workers will respond differently to their job experiences, depending on their orientation, the rewards deemed by them to be most important, and their most pressing individual needs. These psychological attributes will vary with the workers education, age, stage in the family life cycle, sex, race, and other social characteristics" (Moritmer, 1979 p. 2).

"It is not job complexity itself that influences intrinsic satisfaction but the difference between desired complexity—the complexity one would like—and the actual complexity of one’s job" (Ganzach 2003, p. 100). "Job satisfaction has been found to be positively related to a host of work dimensions that may be considered indicative of a “good job”. Autonomy and freedom from close supervision, good pay, and other economic benefits, job security, promotional opportunities, use of valued skills and abilities, variety and interesting work" (Mortimer 1979, p. 3). Mortimer also found that higher satisfaction among those in supervisory positions. Job satisfaction depends upon the total effect of (a) relationships with co-workers, (b) pay, (c) work environment, and (d) other factors unique to the job situation (Bullock, 1984, p. 1).

According to Sinetar (1987), humans have a specific disposition and a given set of aptitudes and skills that require an equally specific type of work. Sinetar continued,
I know now that work needs to fit my personality just as shoes need to fit my feet, otherwise I’m destined for discomfort. It is human nature to do what you enjoy and have an aptitude for. When you study people who are successful it is abundantly clear that their achievements are directly related to the enjoyment they derive from their work. They enjoy it in large part because they are good at it (p. 8-9).

Humans are flexible and able to adapt to many circumstances and conditions. However, work should not be constant stress and battle. Instead, a job should provide opportunities to work in ways that compliment and utilize natural talents and allow for ways for individual expression (Sinetar, 1987). The individual’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction is determined by his or her total situation at work and at home, in every aspect of his or her life. Disaffection in one aspect of life may spill over and become disaffection in another (Zaleznik, 1958).

An individual’s ability to obtain job satisfaction is proportional to the degree to which they are able to implement self-concepts that they envision for themselves from that job (Jepsen & Sheu, 2003). Jepsen and Sheu continued,

If a person becomes engaged in work that matches his or her occupational self-concept, then he or she is likely to experience general job satisfaction. Specifically, the match between expressed occupational choices and the kind of work that a person enters contributes to the person’s general job satisfaction (p. 162).

According to Heisler and Houck (1977), in order for a worker to be satisfied, the work must be “humanized”. Similarly, Robert Kahn (as cited in Heisler and Houck, 1977, p. 85) posited that work should stimulate and satisfy the worker, make use of natural interests and talents, allows the worker to perform other life roles, and avoid harm and degradation of the worker.
Heisler and Houck (1977) went on to proclaim that humans are social creatures and as such it is natural for them to form organizations and groups in society “such as the tribe” (p. 13). In doing so individuals address a “full range of physical and spiritual needs” (p. 3). In this “tribe”, it is necessary for humans to adopt specialization and “to have each person do what he can to answer some need excellently by exercising his special skill responsibly” (p. 3). “A truly humane society would be one in which the primal needs and rights of every man, as a full human being, would be respected as sacred” (Heisler & Houck, 1977, p. 14).

If an individual does not accomplish this place in the “tribe” and achieve a sense of satisfaction and happiness then a lack of self worth may become evident resulting in lower job satisfaction. Low job satisfaction relates to the following factors (Heisler & Houck, 1977):

1. Conditions at work: presence of health and safety hazards, and unpleasant work conditions, such as fast-paced and physically demanding work; long, hours; afternoon and nightshifts; unclear tasks; lack of control over work over hours and pace.
2. Work itself (job content): inability to use skills and abilities; highly fractionated, repetitive tasks involving few diverse operations.
3. The work group: lack of interaction with co-workers; work groups that are too large and lack cohesiveness; non-acceptance by co-workers.
4. Supervision: no participation in decision-making; inability to provide feedback to supervisor; lack of recognition for good performance; unsympathetic supervisors.
5. The organization: large organization with a “flat” organizational structure (relatively few levels in the organization); having a staff position (vs. a line position); discrimination in hiring.
6. Wages and promotion: low financial reward levels or perceived negatives in wages; lack of promotional opportunities. (p. 94).

Not surprisingly, there is some evidence that continued dissatisfaction with one’s job may lead to mental distress and other disorders. Heisler and Houck (1977) explained the literature among job satisfaction and other diverse indices of mental health suggest the following:

1. Correlations between job satisfaction and indices of personal happiness and life satisfaction average in the low 40s for males and are lower for females.

2. Correlations between indices of vocational adjustment (such as absenteeism) and personal adjustment run somewhat lower, and correlations between job satisfaction and symptom-based indices of mental health are still lower (ranging in the mid 20s). Among older respondents these correlations are especially low.

3. Personal happiness is more closely related to satisfaction with family relationships than with job satisfaction.

4. Alienation at work does not seem to generalize to other areas of life, such as intergroup relations or political events.

5. There is no evidence that lack of satisfaction in one area of life is compensated for by particularly strong enjoyment or satisfaction in another – at least in the sense that none of the studies have shown negative associations between pairs of satisfaction or mental health indices. For example, a person who is satisfied with his superior will unlikely be dissatisfied with some other aspect of his job satisfaction (i.e., pay, the work itself, etc.) (p. 97).

Work defines a human on every level of every kind - social, professional, domestic, economic and personal. The more successful a person feels on each of these levels, the more satisfied the person feels as a worker and an individual (Heisler & Houck, 1977).
Satisfaction and performance benefit both the organization and the worker. When the scales tip in either direction, or the life of the worker in terms and conditions of employment are not in balanced proportions, something suffers. Either the worker experiences demoralizing, demotivating and debilitating pain, or the organization suffers a downturn in productivity (p. 6).

In education, this could lead to an ineffective school, lower student achievement, and lessened school moral. Naturally, this leads to turnover in the faculty and administration.

Heisler and Houck (1977, p. 15) posited that three conditions are necessary for workers’ happiness. (1) The worker must feel he has satisfied the clients’ needs. (2) The worker must feel that he has upheld high standards. (3) The worker must feel his personal and moral needs have not been compromised.

Heisler and Houck (1977) further explained,

If these considerations constitute the obligations of the worker, the meeting of them constitutes perhaps the main source of his satisfaction. Meeting them, he can be happy to feel himself becoming a part of the past, the present, and the future in the building of society; being a member of a dedicated group; helping to overcome the challenges of his art; acquiring skill and exercising it effectively; seeing that his work is technically pleasing; realizing that his art is better than he found it; contemplating the sheer splendor of “work well done”, his own included; sharing in that delightful fellowship, the fellowship of masters; educating and being educated generously (p. 16).

“When the relationship between job satisfaction for different aspects of the job and overall job satisfaction is analyzed, considerable differences in the extent of the correlations are found” (Gruneberg, 1979, p. 3).
Professional employees relate to the workplace and their responsibilities in
different ways than do the rank and file of labor. While one cannot assume that
professionals take total responsibility for their acceptance, the career problem for
professionals usually centers around his ability to increase his skills and to make
that increase visible to his colleagues (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 9).

According to Bruce & Blackburn (1992), a job should afford opportunities for
workers to achieve, receive recognition, assume responsibility and experience personal
and professional growth. They went on to explain, “Enriched jobs contain five core work
dimensions: task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy and feedback” (p.
12).

Additionally, Bruce and Blackburn (1992) found that job satisfaction could be
increased if a high quality of work life was provided. In this type environment, employee
production increases because the environment is satisfying. They also determined eight
quality work life factors:

1. Fair and adequate compensation;
2. Safe and healthy work environment;
3. Opportunities to develop human capacities by performing meaningful work
   and being given the chance to suggest new ways of doing job tasks;
4. Growth and security with opportunities to improve knowledge;
   skills, and abilities while enjoying a sense of job security;
5. Social integration and the ability to interact favorably with both
coworkers and manager;
6. Constitutionalism, fair administration of personnel policies, a work
   environment free of harassment and equal opportunities for all
   employees to advance;
7. Total life space or the ability to balance the demands of home and work; and

8. Social relevance (e.g. pride in both the job and the employer).

Of course, there is no absolute way to measure something as subjective as happiness or satisfaction. These abstract ions are subjective and related to many influences such as (a) personal and cultural circumstances, values, and expectations; (b) age and experience; and (c) cultural conditions (Gruneberg, 1979).

Whether a person is or is not satisfied with a job may depend upon the individual's maturity level, age, marital status, educational level, or his overall state of well being (Zaleznik, 1958). Workers adapt to work circumstances and conditions by adjusting their own values, expectations, and hopes for the future so that they are more closely aligned to the realities of work. (Moritmer, 1979).

Surprisingly, Katzell and Yankelovich (1975) found that limited programs such as job enrichment, participation in decision-making, or incentive pay plans did little to increase job satisfaction or productivity. However, they discovered that several factors might lead to improved job satisfaction and increased production. These include (a) aligning financial compensation to performance; (b) matching workers to work that meets their needs and expectations, providing the resources to be successful, (c) providing the opportunity for workers to fully use their abilities, and (d) allowing workers to make meaningful contributions to the company as well as being involved in participatory decision-making in areas that affect their jobs and working lives.

Gruneberg (1976, p xii) said, "It is as true of job satisfaction as of any other sphere of life that one man’s meat is another man’s poison." Studies of job satisfaction
show that what individuals desire in a job may vary according to the worker’s age, gender, occupational level, social group, and individual expectations. Analyzing job satisfaction involves an understanding of the individuals’ expectations and values and a realization that expectations and values can vary from group to group and may even vary among individual group members.

Regarding Heisler and Houck’s discussion of the “tribe” and human nature, job satisfaction may be related to cultural factors, maturity level, and gender issues of the individual as well as to the group into which the individual fits. This brings in various cultural issues as to what is acceptable to the group or “tribe” of which one is a member.

“Job satisfaction is a combination of many factors such as salary, benefits, condition, the chance for promotion, peer relationships, and the intrinsic satisfaction” (Bender, Donohue & Heywood, 2005, p. 479). What an individual expects from a job and whether that person is more highly intrinsically or extrinsically motivated may determine their level of job satisfaction.

During his early research, Herzberg (1959) found several job attitude factors that workers used to express feelings about their work. He divided these into two levels. Level one factors included:

1. Recognition – this may be either positive or negative and come from anyone.

2. Achievement – successful completion of a job, solutions to problems, vindication and seeing the results of one’s work. The opposite of achievement is failure.

3. Possibility of Growth – again this may be positive or negative. A negative would be a lack of education preventing growth possibility.
4. Advancement – must be an actual change in status or position – not a lateral move.

5. Salary – includes all sequences of events in which compensation plays a role. Positive would be an increase while negative would be an unfulfilled expectation of salary increase.

6. Interpersonal Relations – there are three levels of these relationships, superior, subordinate and peers, all of which have a series of subcategories within each. Some may be purely social while others are work related. These may also be positive or negative.

7. Supervision – technical – these factors deal with the characteristics of interpersonal relationships with one’s supervisor from his behavior carrying out his job. These may also be positive or negative.

8. Responsibility – workers derive satisfaction from being given responsibility for his own work or for the work of others or being given new responsibility. There may also be a loss of satisfaction from a lack of responsibility.

9. Company Policy and Administration – this category describes those components of a sequence of events in which some over-all aspect of the company was a factor. This may involve adequacy or inadequacy of company organization and management, or the harmfulness or beneficial effects of the company’s policies.

10. Working Conditions – this entails the physical conditions of work, the amount of work, or facilities available for doing work.

11. Work Itself – Good or bad feelings related to the actual doing of the job or the tasks of the job.
12. Factors in Personal Life – Situations in which some aspect of the job affected personal life in such a way that the effect was a factor in the workers feelings about his job.

13. Status – if status is a factor in feelings about the job.

14. Job Security – if it reflects in some objective way on job security, such as tenure considerations or the company’s stability or instability (p. 45-49).

Herzberg (1959) added that level two factors are related to the first level factors.

“As an example a feeling of recognition could come from words of praise, a promotion or raise or from a new job assignment” (p. 49). The list of second level factors include:

1. Feelings of recognition
2. Feelings of achievement
3. Feelings of positive growth, blocks to growth, first level factors perceived as evidence of actual growth.
4. Feelings of responsibility, lack of responsibility, or diminished responsibility.
5. Group Feelings: feelings of belonging or isolation, sociotechnical or purely social.
6. Feelings of interest or lack of interest in the performance of the job
7. Feelings of increased or decreased status
8. Feelings of increased or decreased security.
9. Feelings of fairness or unfairness
10. Feelings of pride or of inadequacy or guilt.
11. Feelings about salary (p. 49)

Any combination of these factors may influence job satisfaction. Other factors may include (a) how feelings affect the way the worker does his job, (b) for what length of time this effect lasts, (c) the way feelings affect the worker personally, (d) possible changes in the way worker feels about the company, (e) reactions to consequences that
might affect the worker’s career, and (f) the overall feelings caused about the profession. (Herzberg, 1959).

According to Herzberg (1959), workers may act on their feelings about work in any number of ways. This may result in either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and thus may result in causing one or more effects on the work itself.

Herzberg (1959) went on to describe these effects as performance effects, turnover, mental health effects, effects on personal relationships, and attitudinal effects. There are three kinds of performance effects. Depending on whether the feelings were positive or negative, work or work rate could (1) become better or poorer than usual, (2) change while the quality remains the same, or (3) change quality-wise. Of course, there could also be a combination of these effects.

Turnover may vary from (a) the consideration of departure, (b) investigating the possibility of departure, (c) to actually leaving the position that caused the dissatisfaction. “Any of these effects may cause a lower moral at work and affect other workers and job performance” (Herzberg, 1959, p. 51).

Mental health effects may be positive, but for the most part, they are negative. There are three classifications for negative effects. The first is psychosomatic, which is caused by mental or emotional stress, and manifested, in physical symptoms. The second, cause physiological changes due to high stress levels. In these cases, individuals actually become sick due to lowered resistance to disease because of the effect the stress causes on the bodies immune system, and third more diffuse symptoms, which include manifestations of anxiety states. This may lead to what we sometimes call a mental breakdown.

Effects on interpersonal relationships may cause either an improvement or degeneration of interpersonal relationships. This may manifest itself at work but carry over to relationships outside of work and interfere with friendships or family
relationships. Naturally, any breakdown in relationships with peers or supervisors at work may affect job performance.

Attitudinal effects are situations in which a person’s feelings about his job lead to changed attitudes about himself, his colleagues, his profession, or the company he works for. These effects may again be positive or negative with negative effects resulting in lowered self-esteem, or negative feelings toward his colleagues, or supervisors. These may also develop into effects on interpersonal relationships.

Clearly, these factors may further influence a worker’s job satisfaction or dissatisfaction level if they persist over a period of time with resulting effects related to long-term positive or negative effects on the individual or their work. The negative effects, lowered quantity or quality of work, poor relationships with co-workers or management, absenteeism or turnover, or other factors, would be more harmful to both the individual and the organization.

In a later work, *Work and the Nature of Man*, Herzberg (1966) examined the history of research of job satisfaction and motivation and the predominant theories that arose from this research. In the 19th century, he describes paternalism as the first approach toward including a humanistic concept in industrial relations. “The precept that the worker has to work out of duty is no longer valid, and it becomes apparent to management that the worker must be willing – if not eager – to work” (p. 35). This concept resulted in a trend that overly endorsed a paternalistic concern for the worker and ended up in what Herzberg calls “welfare capitalism”. In this welfare capitalism an attempt is made to equate the balance of “hygiene needs by treating the worker better, paying him more and paying him for doing the job the way management wishes it done” (p. 35).

Another theory of the 19th century states, “people work effectively when they are well treated physically. It becomes the manager’s responsibility to see that the worker, in addition to being paid, is comfortable; and when this happens
management believes it should follow that all of the workers motivational drives will be elicited (Herzberg, 1966, p. 35).

This fits in with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs; humans must be safe, healthy, and physically and socially comfortable in order to perform well.

According to Herzberg (1966), Frederick Taylor’s theory espoused that the manager should decide the best way to do the job and then provide the tools and “select the right man, train him in the right way of doing the job, give him incentives if he does perform the job correctly, and by doing all of those things, he should motivate the worker to work” (p. 35). This was known as the scientific management theory. This system does not always result in a satisfied worker. As Herzberg pointed out, when this theory is put into action, it may result in an “almost inhuman society” (p. 35). The effect was that the system limited the use of individuals to single boring tasks to try to reduce errors in production, but “in doing so it also maximized the waste of human talent” (p. 36). Scientific management eliminated the variability in the workforce or “individual differences” (p. 36). Herzberg (1966) stated,

This system of utilizing only the lowest common denominator in the catalogue of ability was a consequence of Taylor’s theory of scientific management. Using only the minimum in a man’s repertory of behavior was in a sense amputating the rest of his capabilities” (p. 36).

This resulted in the “mechanistic man” (p. 37). The “mechanistic man” had a desire to be “utilized efficiently and with a minimum of effort (p. 37). “People were assumed to be pleased about not being forced to make decisions. Management believed that content workers were ones who did not have to the worries and obligations related to management responsibilities. This concept was erroneous. Workers were found to be not as happy as thought, and it was discovered that workers desired input into decisions that affected them and their work (Herzberg, 1966).
The next major study of job satisfaction and worker production was undertaken in the Hawthorne Studies from 1927 – 1932. This research was conducted to determine the effects of change in the physical environment on work production. According to Herzberg (1966), "The researchers found no consistent correlation and no rationality between the many changes in the external environment of the place of work and the productivity of the worker" (p. 37). From these studies, it was shown that the harsh conditions of the Industrial Revolution left the workers feeling left out of the life experiences that they most cherished. Workers also felt a need to be accepted as part of a group and this demonstrated that the jobsite must also fulfill certain social needs of the workers. The results of these studies became known as the Hawthorne Effect and suggested there was a human social element at work in the workplace that resulted in the human relations approach to work theory.

Later Freud explained that adult behavior might be due to manifestations of unresolved childhood needs. "If the worker is a victim of his emotions and if these emotions stem from childhood, it must follow that the worker is childish" (Herzberg 1966, p. 39). Argyris' work followed this theme and "suggests that the child is passive, dependent, and subordinate and that he is characterized further by having a short span of interest and a restricted time perspective for the meaning of his actions and by being limited in his awareness of himself as an individual" (p. 39). This description fits the thought of this time period that the workers were "incapable of adult behavior" (p. 39). Therefore "the tasks assigned the worker were limited and sterile" (p. 39). In a self-fulfilling prophecy, workers who are forced to assume the role of a child eventually conform to this role. Then, the worker is perceived and labeled as a child.

The next level of development in worker satisfaction theory and motivation was the "instrumental man" (Herzberg, 1966). According to Herzberg (1966), "Man's higher intellectual talents must now be organized in the same way that his motor skills were organized for assembly line operations" (p. 42). Every man must have a specialty, even
the decision-makers and administrators or managers. "The new man does his job well without the intrusions of any nonspecific task-oriented factors, and it is especially important that he encapsulate what he does well from all the rest of his abilities" (p. 42). "Every manager and professional is to be a skilled artisan. But the joy of achievement and creativity is an unsought pleasure. The instrumental man finds his greatest happiness in being an unattached expert" (p. 42), he strives for recognition in that one area in which he may excel.

One aspect of job satisfaction seems to be found in psychological growth. "Every job experience consists, in part, of the familiar plus some of the unfamiliar; this means that some tasks can be done without a person’s knowing anything more than was known before, while other tasks require some learning of new facts and principles" (p. 59). Psychological growth requires the acquisition of isolated bits of information and then placing that information into context by relating it to other information. "An individual may use information gained to make relationships and then take it further to create new information or processes" (p. 61). Psychological growth continues as a worker becomes mature and desires satisfaction from becoming an adult. One of the most difficult challenges of growth and maturation according to Herzberg (1966, p. 62) is "to live with insecurity, to accept change and alteration, and to deal with complexity."

The next stage of development in worker job satisfaction is that of individualization. "The primal fact is that each human being is separate, distinct, and a unique individual, with a nervous system as particular as are fingerprints" (Herzberg 1966, p. 66). One of the highest levels of psychological growth and development is becoming an individual. "This means a man’s having, in addition to what the socialization process makes of him, his own feelings, beliefs, values, judgments, ideas and behaviors as a mark that he himself exists and not merely as a protest to society. Cooperation with others becomes a means not only of enhancing some fictitious entity, the group, but also of personal enhancement" (p. 67). One of the hardest things to
accomplish according to Herzberg is to “cleave fantasy from the real to stamp it as fiction to be used only for recreation” (p. 68). “Man can strip themselves of the mysteries that attach to their conceptions of the physical universe, of their own bodies, even of their own religious beliefs, but what they cannot give up are the illusions of who they are” (p. 69).

From the review, studying of what others had done, and then applying the results of his own research Herzberg (1966) identified five factors that stand apart as strong determiners of job satisfaction and achievement. These were “recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement – the last three being of greater importance for lasting change of attitudes” (p. 72). Herzberg lists dissatisfiers as, “company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions” (p. 74). He stated that the job satisfiers “all seem to describe man’s relationship to what he does” (p. 74) while the dissatisfiers, “describe his relationship to the context or environment in which he does his job” (p. 74).

Herzberg (1966) labeled these two distinct groups. The job dissatisfiers were called “hygiene factors” and the satisfiers were named “motivators”. This was based on a study by Dr. Robert Ford who discovered that the satisfiers were found to be “effective in motivating the individual to superior performance and effort” (p. 74). During his research, Herzberg (1966) found that “the factors involved in producing job satisfaction were separate and distinct from the factors that led to job dissatisfaction” (p. 75). He concluded that, “the opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction” (p. 75). Further, hygiene factors fail to provide for positive job satisfaction because they do not provide for an individual’s sense of growth. However, “some individuals may report job satisfaction from hygiene factors. These “hygiene seekers” are fixated at a lower maturity level and have not reached a stage of personality
development at which self-actualizing needs are active” (p. 80). He therefore seeks satisfaction by avoiding things that cause dissatisfaction.

Herzberg (1966) categorized these two types of individuals. A Hygiene Seeker is usually, motivated by nature of the environment; has chronic and heightened dissatisfaction with various aspects of his job context, (e.g., salary, supervision, and working conditions, status, job security, company policy and administration, fellow employees); may overreact with satisfaction to improvement in hygiene factors; have a short duration of satisfaction when the hygiene factors are improved; overreaction with dissatisfaction when hygiene factors are not improved; realize little satisfactions from accomplishments; show little interest in the kind and quality of the work he does; show cynicism regarding positive virtues of work and life in general; does not profit professionally from experience; is prone to cultural noises a. is ultraliberal, ultraconservative, b. parrots management philosophy, and c. acts more like top management than top management does and may be successful on the job because of talent.

On the other hand, a Motivation Seeker is generally Motivated by the nature of the task; shows higher tolerance for poor hygiene factors; has less reaction to improvement in hygiene factors; milder discontent when hygiene factors need improvement; realizes great satisfaction from accomplishments; shows more capacity to enjoy the kind of work he does; has positive feelings toward work and life in general; profits professionally from experience; has belief systems sincere and considered and may be an overachiever.

Altorfer (1977) states that workers have certain needs and wants that allow them to become satisfied or dissatisfied with their work. These were classified as either Intrinsic or Extrinsic. Altorfer lists these work needs and wants as follows:
1. Intrinsic job satisfaction – the right type of work for you: “I like what I’m doing”.

2. Sense of Accomplishment – Achievement – Added responsibility – Autonomy

3. Participation – Total Involvement – Opportunity to make decisions or to participate in decision-making affecting you and your work. – Fair competition and challenge.


5. Self Development – Inner growth

6. Opportunity to use imagination and to be creative – Mental stimulation – Opportunity to think (p. 147)

Extrinsic Work Needs and Wants

1. Compensation – Monetary rewards – Benefits

2. Status – Promotions – Advancement

3. Fair Organization – Fair treatment from company as judged by you

4. Effective Planning – Good administration

5. Good Working Conditions

6. Job Security – Not too much worry your job will be gone tomorrow (p. 147)

Altofer went on to describe collective indicators of what workers expect from their job:

1. People know what they need and want on the job;

2. Employee groups and leader groups have similar needs.

3. Intrinsic and non material work needs are as often stated by workers as their leaders” (1977, p. 52).

Altorfer (1977) also pointed out, “It is significant that social and psychological needs and wants are mentioned at a rate of about two to three times as high as are material needs, with recognition and self-development taking priority” (p. 53).
“Maslow contends that man has five basic categories of needs, which are ranked and satisfied in order of importance. The physiological needs, which are regarded as the most basic of all human needs, affiliation or love, esteem needs and self-actualization needs respectively” (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698).

Alderfer attempted to address the shortcomings in Maslow’s theory by aligning the needs hierarchy with empirical research. According to Alderfer, man is motivated by three groups of core needs - existence, relatedness, and growth. This is referred to as ERG theory. The existence needs, include the human basic needs necessary for existence, which are physiological and safety needs. The relatedness needs refer to man’s desire to maintain important interpersonal relationships. These are man’s social, acceptance, belongingness, and status desires. The last group of needs is the growth needs, which represent man’s desire for personal development, self fulfillment, and self-actualization” (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698).

Alderfer’s theory is more related to work and job satisfaction as satisfaction of growth needs may result in increased performance and higher job satisfaction according to Arnolds and Boshoff (2002). “The satisfaction of growth needs impacted significantly on the job performance of top managers” (p. 699) which would be compared to the principals in a school, so if their growth needs are met it may result in a higher level of performance and job satisfaction as well.

Other theories have been developed as well, but most relate in some way to those already discussed. “The need fulfillment approach to job satisfaction is concerned with how much individual needs are being satisfied” (Bullock, 1984, p. 1). This theory is related to those previously discussed. “The discrepancy-theory approach views job satisfaction as the difference between desired outcomes and actual outcomes” (Bullock, 1984, p. 1).
“The equity theory says satisfaction is based on equity compared to other people. This approach suggests that satisfaction results when there is equity between an individual’s input-outcome when compared to relevant others” (Bullock 1984, p. 1).

“The two factor theory, views satisfaction and dissatisfaction as separate continuums, rather than opposite sides of the same dimension. Some job facets (achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement opportunities) are the basis for job satisfaction, while other job facets (pay, working conditions, supervision, company policy, and interpersonal relations) are the basis for job dissatisfaction. Researchers using this approach look at the sources of job dissatisfaction and attempt to assess how many of the dissatisfaction-producing factors are present” (Bullock, 1984, p. 1). This is the theory suggested in part by Herzberg that has been discussed in detail.

Dinham and Scott (2000) in their research in Australia and New Zealand identified what they call a third aspect of satisfaction in education. In their research, they recognize the work by Herzberg and others as having two main groups - satisfiers or dissatisfiers. The satisfiers being those that are intrinsic and including areas such as “student achievement, helping students to modify attitudes and behaviors, positive relationships with students and others, mastery of professional skills, and feeling part of a collegial, supportive environment” (p. 389) and those of an extrinsic nature such as pay, benefits, and working conditions as discussed previously.

Conversely, the major sources of teacher and executive dissatisfaction were matters extrinsic to the task of teaching children and working with the other staff. These dissatisfiers are largely out of control of teachers and schools, and found within the wider domain of society, governments, and the employing body. The nature and pace of educational change, increased expectations and responsibilities being placed on schools with resultant increases to teacher and executive workloads were also found to have contributed to the most strongly felt
dissatisfiers, which included the community’s apparent poor opinion of teachers and their “easy” work conditions, the negative image of teachers portrayed in the media, problems associated with change and change management, coping with added responsibilities, the perceived low level of support provided to implement change, lack of support services for teachers and promotion opportunities and procedures which many found problematic (p. 390).

This study pointed out that educators have rules and regulations that differ from those of society and the work arena. Educators are governed by federal, state, and local laws, mandates, and regulations. These constraints may play a large role on job satisfaction and retention. One may be very satisfied by their position in the classroom or administration, but if many feel overburdened by the rules and regulations put upon them, they may leave the profession for a less regulated, more lucrative work situation.

“The composition of the American work force is changing rapidly. More than half of the U.S. work force now consists of minorities, immigrants, and women. In 1991, only 22 percent of new entrants into the job market were white males. Typical workers in the twenty-first century will be more mature, more highly educated, and more technologically sophisticated than their counterparts in the twentieth century. Increasing numbers of new work force entrants will be nonwhite and from cultures other than European-American” (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 34). These factors may affect job satisfaction in the future and will be addressed in the following sections.

Job Satisfaction and Gender

“According to the United Nations statistics, women make up one-half or the world’s population and do 75% of the world’s work” (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 58). In 1990, 57% of the work force were female, with more than 46 percent of them in professional or managerial positions. Women have been the dominant factor in labor-force growth in the last few decades. Furthermore, more than half of all college and university students are women (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 34).
Education has always been a predominantly female profession. One variation in this pattern has been in the area of administration that has been mostly male until recently. According to Eckman (2004), this is due to the historical perspective in secondary schools where women teach and men lead.

One of the differences in measuring job satisfaction between men and women is the way they look at their jobs. Women place less value on salary then do men. This is based on historical gender roles in which the male was the "bread winner" for the family. Women are more likely to identify social relations on the job of high importance and this correlates to high job satisfaction. Women are also more likely to value good co-workers, a good supervisor, and the task significance to be of higher importance than men are. (Bender, Donohue, & Heywood, 2005, p. 482).

"Women place greater importance than men on interpersonal relationships at work and on the 'comfort factors' such as hours, and travel time from home, which make work more compatible with family responsibilities" (Mortimer, 1979, p. 5).

Many early studies were inconsistent in their results as to gender and job satisfaction. The general feeling was that, "women should be less satisfied than men, since they are usually placed on lower job levels, which have a lower pay rate, and which usually offer few promotional opportunities" (Gruneberg, 1976, p. 176). "In addition to the factors of wages and job level, there is the issue of societal norms concerning appropriate roles for men and women" (p. 176). When looking at gender differences, "the entire constellation of variables which constantly covary with sex; for example pay, job level, promotional opportunities, societal norms" should be examined, because it may be the total situation that is causing the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction rather than just gender itself (Gruneberg, p. 181).

"Even when one controls for a number of factors, job satisfaction remains significantly higher for women than for men" (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2003, p. 691) In citing research the Souza-Poza's state that this could be accounted for in the fact that
throughout history women’s jobs have been so much worse than men’s that they now just have lower expectations. It does not necessarily mean that their jobs are unobservedly better than men’s are. They go on to point out that “the gender differential disappears for younger workers, higher-educated workers, workers in professional or managerial positions, workers whose mothers had a professional job, and those working in male-dominated workplaces” (p. 691). They further explained that this may change as women’s position improves in the workforce in relation to their expectations. When they conducted a ten-year study in Great Britain (1991 – 2000) the Souza-Poza’s found that during that time period men’s job satisfaction ratings remained fairly constant while women’s job satisfaction showed a substantial decline. This is most likely because women are now expecting more in a society where gender roles have been evolving over the past several decades.

Men and women should experience similar career life stages and developmental tasks, even though the gender role demands affecting their work are extremely different. Considering the gender, differences in job satisfaction two perspectives have emerged. (Jepsen & Sheu 2003) “The structural perspective explains observed gender differences as due to conditions, such as pay and promotion, covarying with gender rather than due to gender itself. The socialization perspective holds that the differential socialization of men and women results in psychological differences in the motivation to work, which, in turn, influence job satisfaction. Compared to men, women’s job satisfaction may have different correlates, such as workplace social support, and gender concentration within an occupation. Therefore, matches for women may differ from those for men” (p. 162)

When looking at the rewards of employment and job descriptions according to Newton et al. (2003) “men rated the job descriptions depicting extrinsic job attributes more favorably than women and women rated job descriptions depicting intrinsic job attributes more favorably than men” (p. 512). Men traditionally being the “bread winners” seem to be more highly motivated by salary, while women historically enter the
workplace with other motivation, although these trends may be changing. Many women now enter the workplace with career goals and advancing up the ladder in mind. Some research indicates that “the number of hours devoted to a job may upset the career paths of women” (p. 512); “Women are twice as likely as men to identify ‘overwhelming workload’ as a major challenge facing principals” (p. 512). At the same time according to Newton, many women spoke of the difficulties of balancing their personal and professional lives and the personal loss due to the high demands of their careers; “For many women, leadership positions come at too high a cost” (p. 512).

“In both the United Kingdom and the United States, a contrasting portrait of relative earnings and satisfaction has been painted. The estimated gender earnings gap indicates women are paid less, but women in both countries appear more satisfied with jobs than men” (Bender, Donohue, & Heywood, 2005, p. 480). There appear to be two reasons for this phenomenon. “First, satisfaction is a function of expectations, and if women have lower expectations about labour market outcomes, their expectations are more easily fulfilled. Second, the bundle of characteristics associated with women’s jobs may appeal to them sufficiently to overcome the satisfaction lost from their lower earnings” (p. 480).

Another factor is the profession the women are engaged in. Studies show that “women in male dominated jobs are less satisfied than women not in male dominated jobs” (Bender, Donohue & Heywood, 2005, p. 480). One would assume that because education is a predominately-female profession, women would have a higher job satisfaction level than men in the profession. However, according to Mwamwenda (1997), male teachers experienced more job satisfaction than female teachers in the study carried out in Transkei. This was also true in Japan and Germany. Interestingly, an Israeli study found the opposite; more female teachers reported a high job satisfaction than male teachers did. Similar results were found in Malta where female teachers reported greater job satisfaction than male teachers reported.
According to Gruenberg (1976), "Individuals whose measured needs are relatively stronger that the potential of the occupation for satisfying those needs will tend to be frustrated and hence to be less well satisfied with their occupation" (p. 3). Since a career role tends to be primary for males and secondary for females, a hypothesis was that these relationships would hold to a greater degree among men than women would (Gruenberg, 1976). According to Gruenberg, this was confirmed by the research of Brayfield, Wells and Strate in 1957 (1976). One would assume that as women became more active in the workplace and their roles change that these findings would not continue to hold true.

Newton et al. (2003) found that "significantly more women made their job choice decisions based on the amount of time available for instructional leadership, than did men" (p. 524). "Perhaps the gendered nature of the work of education (women teach, men manage) explains the reaction of the female participants" (p. 524).

Male and female administrators differ in their views of their responsibilities. Newton, Giesen, Freeman, Bishop and Zeitoun (2003) stated, "In the educational workplace, male and female administrators tend to spend their time in different ways. Whereas female administrators tend to be more concerned about student achievement, curriculum, teacher productivity, and the social development of students, male administrators tend to be more concerned about political activities and networking" (p. 511). Due to this, "Secondary teachers perceive female principals as more effective at coordinating curriculum than male principals and male principals as more effective at protecting instructional time" (p. 511).

According to Stockard and Lehman (2004), many studies have been done related to gender and the teaching profession. "Some results suggest that women tend to be somewhat more satisfied with their teaching career, whereas men tend to be more likely than women to stay in teaching" (p. 743). In their study, Iiacqua and Schumacher (1995)
found that gender had no significant impact on the job satisfaction of academic faculty in higher education.

In Klecker’s and Loadman’s (1999) study of job satisfaction by years of teaching experience they “found no statistically significant interaction effects by gender and years of teaching experience on any items of the study or total scale score” (p. 504).

“There have been only a few studies examining job satisfaction where gender in the high school principalship was considered” (Eckman, 2004, p. 368). In their study, Koll, Robertson, Lampe, and Hegedus, (1996) found no relationship between gender and work satisfaction for principals. They did note, “research on gender in school administration is limited due to the lack of women in administrative positions. We did find that teachers and principals in female-female dyads expressed more satisfaction with their jobs, and teachers who were part of male-male dyads expressed the least satisfaction” (Koll et al., 1996, p. 104).

According to Eckman (2004), previous studies showed that female principals were satisfied in the position and would make the same career choice again and that another study in 1984 found that female principals experienced higher levels of job satisfaction the older they were, the larger the schools enrollment, and the more positive feedback they received from their students. It was noted that both of these studies were limited due to the small number of female high school principals at the time each was conducted. In other research, “female principals mentioned twice as often as did male principals the enormity of the workload and the difficulty of balancing everything” (Eckman, 2004, p. 368).

“Significant differences continue to appear between female and male high school principals in terms of their age at their first principalship, their years of teaching experience, their marital status, and the presence of children at home” (Eckman 2004, p.381). Women tend to be older and with more years of teaching experience than men when they enter the profession. This inequity is accounted for by Eckman (2004) as the
historical environment in secondary schools where women teach and men lead. Only 24% of the female principals in Eckman’s study have children at home while 59% of the male principals did. The fact that women become principals at an older age may be attributed to them waiting until their “children are grown and out of the house” (p. 382). Other reasons may be the lack of confidence in young female leaders, or the societal expectations of wife and mother staying at home may be preventing them from applying for these positions (2004).

According to Eckman (2004), “Job satisfaction as a high school principal was similar for women and men; the two groups as a whole experienced only moderate job satisfaction” (p. 383). Eckman went on to note that since longevity in the position tends to increase job satisfaction, men, because they begin their careers earlier on average, have a greater opportunity to experience job satisfaction.

A study of Ohio secondary assistant principals conducted by Sutter (1996) determined that female assistant principals had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than did their male assistant principals. “The sex of assistant principals appears to play a role in determining career satisfaction. The higher levels of career satisfaction reported by female assistant principals may be because they have more positive feelings about their present and future career progress than their male counterparts” (p. 113).

Job Satisfaction and Race and Ethnicity

In 1970, 10.9% of the American workforce was nonwhite and by 1985, this had increased to 13.6%. In 2000, it was expected to increase to 15.7% and continue to rise. The rate of Hispanics in the workforce has increased by over 23%, blacks by over 8 percent and Asian and other nonwhites by over 36% (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 34). Over the next twenty years, the U.S. population is expected to grow by over 42 million with Whites accounting for only 13% while Hispanics will account for 47%, Blacks for 22% and Asians and other nonwhites will account for about 18% according to Bruce and
Blackburn (1992). “Some demographers estimate that, over the next decade, as many as 80% of the new entrants into the labor force will be racial minorities and White women” (Daufin, 2001, p. 18) Due to this fact the need for quality minority and women administrators is apparent. We need good role models for these students during their education.

Minority faculty have demonstrated their superior ability to provide direct, beneficial support for minority students; to represent an important symbol to minority students about their own futures, as well as the institution's commitment to them and to create a more comfortable environment for minority students and faculty (Daufin, 2001, p. 18).

This emphasized that minority faculty members and administrators must be satisfied with their positions if schools are going to be able to recruit and retain minorities.

According to Gruneberg (1976), “Satisfaction occurs when the job fulfills what one values. And just as with expectations, values will vary, from group to group and between individuals with any one group” (p. xi). With this in mind, one might assume that those individuals coming from different backgrounds will have different values and thus different expectations from their employment and therefore may have different levels of job satisfaction due to these differences. However, according to Bruce and Blackburn (1992), studies have failed to find a significant difference in job satisfaction based on race or national origin within the same jobs. They went on to state, “what is said about maximizing job satisfaction and performance is related to organizational and job characteristics rather than to race or culture. One can generalize about jobs and working conditions. One cannot generalize about people” (p. 50).

Other research demonstrates,

Homogeneity of members in a group is argued, and found, to produce positive sentiments on the part of the group members sharing the homogeneous characteristic. In addition, these positive sentiments were expected to increase the
satisfaction of these members and increase their commitment to the group. A
group member who does not exhibit the homogeneous characteristic (there is a
mismatch), however, is found to have less positive sentiments and thus reduced
satisfaction and commitment to the group. Although the characteristics defining
homogeneity have varied considerably across studies, probably those receiving
the most attention are gender and race, both of which are known to be crucial
segmenting characteristics in the formation of groups” (Mueller, Finley, Iverson,
& Price, 1999, p. 188).

Throughout history, this process has been at play in this country’s schools. Our schools
are some of the most diverse on this planet. Whether it is due to gender, race or ethnicity,
dissatisfaction may arise. But, how does this impact job satisfaction?

Mueller, Finley, Iverson, and Price (1999) hypothesized that “teachers working in
school where there own race is dominant will be more satisfied with their jobs and
committed to that school than teachers in schools where another race is dominant” (p.
193). They went on to predict, that

White teachers in schools where teachers of their own race are dominant will
(relative to all other settings) experience and perceive more support from other
teachers (coworker support), less conflict in job expectations (role conflict), more
adequate resources for doing one’s job, and fewer constraints on how to do one’s
job (greater autonomy) (p. 194).

Furthermore, regardless of their race, teachers in schools with students of ethnic or racial
minorities will perceive this negatively and may result in lower job satisfaction and
retention rates.

Mueller, Finley, Iverson and Price (1999) also found that, “racial composition
affects job satisfaction and school commitment, but not commitment to the teaching
profession” (p. 211). This
suggests that different racial compositions of schools will have more short-term than long-term effects on teachers. Because job satisfaction and commitment to one’s employer have effects on quitting that employer, teachers can be expected to move from school to school because of racial compositions, but they will not likely leave the teaching profession because of this. (p. 211)

Unfortunately, they also discovered that Black teachers in non-Black schools were less committed to a teaching career than White teachers in White dominant schools, and this suggested that racially integrating predominantly White schools by bringing in Black teachers may add diversity to the teaching staff but will tend to discourage retention among the Black teachers. These findings demonstrate that in education the ability of a teacher or administrator to be mobile and move from school to school, district to district or even state to state allows them to more or less control their own destiny and locate a workplace where they may acquire higher job satisfaction. (p. 211)

According to Stockard and Lehman (2004), “The majority of studies report no differences in retention rates between race/ethnic groups” (p. 743) as far as the teaching profession is concerned. A study of faculty members in higher education found that African-Americans compared to their white counterparts, they are less likely to be tenured, are concentrated in the lower academic ranks, are often concerned about low salaries, felt isolated and unsupported at work, and often encounter prejudice, discrimination, and a continuing climate of racism (Tack & Patitu, 1992, p. 2). This, then, resulted in a lower job satisfaction rating.

Shipp’s (1999) study of career choices of African American college students found that “… non-education majors placed significantly more importance on salary, job security, and advancement in their career choices than did education majors. Regarding a career in teaching, both groups perceive salary and prestige as the least attractive aspects” (p. 343). “It is no secret that the number of minority students entering the field of
education is decreasing while there is a rapid increase in the number of minority students entering public education” (p. 343). There are several theories as to why there is this decline in minority’s entrance into the field of education. One is that there are now more opportunities in careers that are more lucrative and prestigious. Another is that too many African-American college students, “a career in teaching is perceived as a career of a bygone era that reflected a lack of options” (p. 243). Still another suggested that “the decline is due to more stringent testing and admission standards in schools of education and more demanding certification and licensing measures” (p. 243). In the states that have stringent testing “African-Americans had average scores lower than Whites” (p. 243). Another factor may be that African-American enrollment in university programs has dropped over the past two decades by as much as 7.5% for African-American females and 17% for African-American males (Shipp, 1999).

One of the important findings in the study completed by Shipp was that African-Americans place a large value on career security and opportunities for advancement. Administrators in education are usually recruited from the ranks of the teachers. Haines, McNeese, and Roberson (2006) of the University of Southern Mississippi investigated why teachers enter the field of administration. Results indicated that while Whites said that they were encouraged to go into the profession and had confidence that they would do a good job; African-Americans did not feel encouraged and confident.

“There is evidence that Blacks are more extrinsically oriented than Whites even when socioeconomic differences are taken into account. There may also be rural-urban differences in occupational values according to other research” (Mortimer, 1979, p. 5). This may account for some differences in job satisfaction where “Opportunity for advancement is one major contributing factor to job satisfaction and performance for members of all racial and ethnic groups” (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 50).

Job Satisfaction and Age
When related to age studies vary somewhat in their results. However, one thing is clear as evidenced by Bruce and Blackburn (1992) findings. “The culture of the United States is not one that values age and maturity” (p. 51). In many cases the older more experienced workers are “put out to pasture” in order to make room for a less expensive, although more inexperienced workers. In education though, research shows that the more experienced educators and administrators produce higher learning curves and schools that are more effective.

Bruce and Blackburn (1992) also reported,

A number of scholars have concluded that older workers (51+ years) are more satisfied than younger colleagues and that the length of time an employee has been on the job directly affects job satisfaction. Mature workers generally tend to be more satisfied than youthful workers are. Those who have been in a career long enough to have become established in it are more satisfied with their jobs than are workers in earlier career stages” (p. 57).

They went on to explain, “This is not to say that mature workers will be satisfied with anything, just because they are getting older. They do often expect fewer quantitative rewards from the workplace, but want a higher quality of work life” (p. 57).

As people develop and adapt, their purposes more closely match the work that occupies their time and effort; in other words, the match becomes increasingly harmonious. Therefore, job satisfaction is expected to increase as people progress through career life stages (Jepsen & Sheu, 2003, p. 162).

Research has generally shown that a worker’s job satisfaction is likely to increase as the worker ages. This has been explained by the changing of one’s needs, a mellowing process, and changing cognitive structures associated with age. (Oshagbemi, 1998).

Other researchers have attributed this to the fact that older workers are more satisfied than younger workers only because they have better jobs (Wright & Hamilton, 1978). Younger workers’ dissatisfaction “may be attributed to the fact that the young, in
the early stages of their work careers, have objectively poorer jobs than their more experienced elders, however; high aspirations and expectations for future mobility may also contribute to their dissatisfaction" (Moritimer, 1979, p. 5).

Herzberg found that when considering age that a u-shaped curve was involved. Morale started off high at the beginning of employment, declined toward the end of the first decade of work, and then began a rise for the remainder of a workers life. Saleh and Otis showed that for those in management positions, job satisfaction increased to age sixty years and then declined as the worker approached retirement. (Gruneberg, 1976) Turner's study “showed that workers began to feel hopeless as they contemplate growing older in a job which holds little interest for them and which may in addition, begin to demand a pace too fast for their advancing years” (Gruneberg, 1976, p. 167). Their morale deteriorates as they look for ways to leave and go into other professions, but they cannot afford to do so. This may be a reason that teachers leave the classroom for administration.

Teachers early in their careers, as well as those nearing the end of their careers, indicate higher levels of job satisfaction than did teachers who were in the middle of their careers. A greater number of teachers in their early to late 20s, as well as those in their early 50s, indicated a desire to enter the profession again if given the opportunity (Mertler, 2002, p. 49).

In their study, Iiacqua and Schumacher (1995) found that age had no significant impact on the job satisfaction of academic faculty in higher education.

Zaleznik (1958) seems to sum up the issue as each person is their own individual and as such, each will rate satisfaction differently on his status in the life cycle and other environmental life factors. Therefore, what is good for one may not be good for another.

Job Satisfaction and Salary
According to Tang, Kim, and Tang (2000), money is seen as the measure of value. "In America and around the world, money is how we keep score" (p. 216). "The importance attached to money is one's motive to outperform others" (p. 216).

Research shows that the most important reason for voluntary turnover is higher wages and career opportunity. "Employees are more satisfied with the turnover outcome when they are leaving for higher wages or career opportunities" (p. 217). Those who leave a position tend to have lower pay satisfaction than those who remain and receive about 20 percent more income on their new job (Tang, Kim, & Tang, 2000).

Working for the same company for a long period time one falls into a situation known as wage compression. "On average, an extra five years of service with a company means earning 6 percent less. In order to avoid wage compression and to increase their pay, many employees may be motivated to change jobs" (Tang, Kim, & Tang, 2000, p. 217). Therefore, one of the leading reasons for changing jobs is the pursuit of higher wages.

In referring to Herzberg and earlier discussions, "money can be perceived as either a motivator or a hygiene factor" (Tang, Kim, and Tang, 2000, p. 217), it is all in the attitude of how the worker views it. If they view it as their frame of reference for measuring their everyday life, it "may have a significant impact on their motivation and work related behaviors" (p. 217). This in turn, could have a major impact on job satisfaction. Herzberg maintains that pay can only lead to feelings of dissatisfaction while others assert that "pay satisfaction should be regarded as a continuous variable ranging from positive (satisfied) to negative (dissatisfied) feelings" (Gruneberg, 1976, p. 116). Pay satisfaction results when existing pay corresponds to desired pay; dissatisfaction increases as the two diverge" (p. 116).

In examining the relationship of salary to job satisfaction according to Ganzach (2003), "it is not pay itself that influences pay satisfaction but the difference between what one expects to be paid and what one is actually paid" (p. 100). When investigating
the relationship of intelligence and education on job satisfaction, especially when
investigating the facets of the job, Ganzach (2003) states one “should consider not only
their effects on actual complexity and actual pay, but also their effects on expected pay
and desired complexity” (p. 100). “Expected pay is influenced primarily by education,
whereas desired complexity is influenced primarily by intelligence” (Ganzach 2003, p.
100). This occurs for two main reasons. “First, education is more important than
intelligence in formal pay systems” (p. 100). “Second, education is more important than
intelligence in forming one’s reference group, because information about the education of
other workers, but not about their intelligence, is publicly available. Because one’s
reference group is a major determinant in forming one’s expectations, education should
play a more important role than intelligence in forming pay expectations” (p. 100).

Whereas the information that underlies the formation of expectations about pay is
public, the information that underlies the formation of aspirations regarding
complexity is private. It is based on people’s experience in performing tasks with
various levels of complexity, evaluating their intrinsic satisfaction with
performing these tasks, and finding out what is their desired, or ideal,
complexity—the complexity that will maximize their intrinsic satisfaction (p.
100).

“These processes lead to positive relationships between the complexity one
desires and intelligence: less intelligent people will not desire complex work
because they will fear failing in them, and intelligent people would not desire
simple work because success in this work will not lead to intrinsic satisfaction (it
will be attributed to the ease of the task)” (p. 101).

“To summarize, the model for the relationship between education, intelligence,
and facet satisfaction is based on the premise that expectations are negatively related to
satisfaction and that education has a strong influence on expected pay but a weak
influence on desired complexity, whereas intelligence has a strong influence on desired
complexity but a weak influence on expected pay. Education has a direct negative effect on pay satisfaction and a negligible effect on intrinsic satisfaction, and intelligence has a direct negative effect on intrinsic satisfaction and a negligible effect on pay satisfaction” (p. 101).

Those that enter the field of education tend to be more intrinsically motivated. Educators often proclaim, “I didn’t become a teacher for the money.” Research tends to bear this out. According to Bolger (2001), “Teachers who reported that they chose this occupation because of inherent professional values expressed higher levels of satisfaction and greater commitment than did their counterparts who went into teaching for economic reasons” (p. 666). “Teachers are more motivated by the intrinsically rewarding aspects of their roles. The failure of incentive plans designed to motivate teachers by altering the extrinsically rewarding of teacher’s work support the notion that educators tend to be motivated by intrinsic factors” (Newton, Giesen, Freeman, Bishop, & Zeitoun, 2003, p. 511). But, salary still plays an important role in job satisfaction and some research shows that a shift may be occurring in teachers' values and this might cause “many teachers to begin to place more importance on the extrinsically rewarding aspects of teaching such as salary” (p. 5).

According to Hinton and Kastner, (2000) “there is a narrowing gap between the salaries of veteran teachers and principals.” (p. 1) This may not seem to be a problem until the quality-of-life factors are compared. (p. 2) In studying various research done on salaries Stockard and Lehman (2004) found that, “teachers with lower salaries...are more likely to express dissatisfaction or leave teaching” (p. 744). The same would prove true for administrators.

Job Satisfaction and Education Level

Overall studies examining job satisfaction and the relationship with education have seen mixed results. “It appears that when job characteristics are adequately
controlled, education does have a negative effect on job satisfaction” (Ganzach 2003, p. 97).

Education may have both a positive and negative effect on job satisfaction. It may have a positive indirect effect on job satisfaction because more highly educated people are able to find more rewarding jobs and therefore derive more satisfaction from with their work, And it may have a negative direct effect on job satisfaction, because expectations about job rewards—which are negatively related to satisfaction—tend to increase with education (Ganzach, 2003, p. 97).

“There is evidence that education raises worker expectations such that the more highly educated workers approach their jobs from a different point of reference than their less educated counterparts” (Mortimer, 1979, p. 5). “Research has shown that rewards of greater magnitude (pay, variety, task complexity) were required to satisfy the more highly educated employee” (p. 5). In other research, Ganzach (2003) noted that the negative effect of education on job satisfaction was the result of a positive correlation between intelligence and education and reflected a negative effect of intelligence, and not education on the job satisfaction. Ganzach (2003) then summarized that, “an increase in education can only lead to an increase in job satisfaction, through its positive effect on job characteristics, and cannot lead to a decrease in job satisfaction” (p. 98).

Most studies that examine the effects of education on job satisfaction have focused on the global satisfaction rather than investigating the facets of the job satisfaction. Due to this fact “the effects of intelligence and education on intrinsic work satisfaction may be quite different from their effects on satisfaction with the extrinsic aspects of the work and in particular, on satisfaction with pay” (Ganzach, 2003, p. 99).

In reviewing research done on retention rates in the teaching profession, no differences were found based upon different levels of education (Stockard & Lehman, 2004). Similarly, Iiacqua and Schumacher (1995) found that level or degree of education had no significant impact on the job satisfaction of academic faculty in higher education.
Job Satisfaction and Longevity in the Position

As previously discussed, there are theoretical differences in developing a strong conceptual definition of worker satisfaction. "Yet theoretical models of worker turnover, as well as empirical data suggests that workers' satisfaction, however it might be defined, influences their intentions to stay in or leave their jobs, which in turn influences their actual behavior" (Stockard & Lehman, 2004, p. 742).

Although the exact grouping of variables differs slightly from one analyst to another, researchers who have examined influences on teacher satisfaction and retention suggest that important factors to consider include (a) demographic and background variables, (b) variables related to the teaching assignment, (c) the teachers' effectiveness and self-efficacy, (d) the support they receive from colleagues and parents, and (e) administrative practices and policies within their schools (Stockard & Lehman, 2004, p. 743).

According to Brunetti (2001) Perie and Baker in their research found that, only 26.3% of public high-school teachers were highly satisfied with their jobs and that this dropped consistently with their years of experience. While 36.1% of these teachers with three years or less experience rated themselves as highly satisfied with their jobs only 23% of the teachers surveyed with 20 or more years of experience rated themselves as highly satisfied.

In 1998, a report from the National Center for Educational Statistics showed that in public schools younger and less experienced teachers had higher levels of job satisfaction (Report lists factors, 1998). You’s (2001) examined the effects of years of teaching experience on teacher job satisfaction and found that those “teachers with five or fewer years in teaching rated higher in job satisfaction on (a) opportunities for advancement; (b) personal/professional challenge; (c) professional autonomy/decision making; and (d) total scale score. There were no differences in teacher job satisfaction
across the “six years of experience” categories after the first five years of teaching” (p. 118).

An individual’s ability to obtain job satisfaction is proportional to the degree to which they are able to implement self-concepts that they envision for themselves from that job (Jepsen & Sheu, 2003).

If a person becomes engaged in work that matches his or her occupational self-concept, then he or she is likely to experience general job satisfaction. Specifically, the match between expressed occupational choices and the kind of work that a person enters contributes to the person’s general job satisfaction (p. 162).

As one goes through life things change in their work environment, for one thing they get older. The demands of the job changes, technology changes as well as many other factors. Due to these factors adult career development and as a result job satisfaction is “a continuing process of improving the match between self and situations” (Jepsen & Sheu, 2003, p. 162).

The match between self-concepts and work situations is a never-completed project extending across the adult working career. People change their self-concepts to accommodate changing social conditions. Likewise, work conditions change in terms of labor market opportunities, organizational structures, and task content. At any particular age or stage, a person’s satisfaction reflects the contemporary match between his or her general purposes and generalized job realities (p. 162).

According to Cooley and Shen (2000), “…principals moved between school districts for salary increases, to work in larger schools, and promotions to line and staff positions” (p. 445).

To a degree, job satisfaction or dissatisfaction may play a role in how long a worker stays in a particular job or position. Other factors are also involved such as the
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availability of positions available, location, pay and benefits and mobility issues. The next section discusses these and other factors related to burnout and turnover.

Job Satisfaction, Burnout and Turnover

"How effectively a business functions depends critically on how well its people function. The ultimate success of the organization is the result of committed and participating human beings. The employee's performance in turn reflects three conditions that mold every job, whatever its nature.

(1). The degree of the employees internal motivation.

(2). The correspondence between the goals of the employee and those of the organization.

(3). External forces spurring the employee to action through stimulators such as punishment and reward systems and the frequency, duration and intensity of these stimulating forces (Peskin, 1973, p. 2).

When one or more of these conditions is negative, it introduces dissatisfaction into the job. Peskin (1973) applies the term “Doomsday Job” to a position in which the worker finds little or no satisfaction and one in which they will eventually flounder or leave. “With the employee who tolerates the doomsday job it spells professional ineffectuality, With one who does not it spells turnover” (Peskin, 1973, p. 2). “It is the job content that is satisfying and that ultimately has the highest motivating influence” (Peskin, 1973, p. 8). In order to gain a sense of achievement, a worker needs to see how they fit into the big picture and how they contribute to the whole of the organization. (Peskin, 1973). Some employees do not want to achieve internal motivation. “Their satisfactions are in the work environment or off the job” (p. 10).

Job satisfaction contributes to how effectively individuals perform their jobs (Bacharach, Bamberger & Mitchell, 1990; Schuler, Aldage, & Brief, 1977; Spector, 1997). “Reasonable agreement exists that job satisfaction is negatively correlated both
with absenteeism and with turnover, but bears no uniform relationship to performance and productivity" (Heisler & Houck, 1977, p. 96).

Many studies indicate that job satisfaction influences the emotional and physical well being of an individual (Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Olson and Dilley, 1988; Pugliesi, 1999). Decreased job satisfaction has also been associated with a number of potentially damaging personal and professional symptoms (Coll & Freeman, 1997; Hansen, 1967, Schuler, 1977, Van Sell, Brief, & Schuler 1981). “Job dissatisfaction and concomitant stress have been linked to mental and physical health problems, including depression, low self-esteem, social isolation, fatigue, psychosomatic illness, work related injuries, and coronary vascular disease” (Mortimer, 1979, p. 1) Heisler and Houck (1977) report that poor mental health has been shown to be related to the following factors:

1. Conditions at work: exposure to health and safety hazards, and unpleasant work conditions; necessity to work fast and to expend a lot of physical effort; excessive and inconvenient hours.

2. Work itself: lack of skills and abilities, perception of job as uninteresting; repetitious work, especially on a constantly moving assembly line; role overload, both qualitative and quantitative, involving generally a discrepancy between resources (time, worker’s training and skill, machinery, organizational structure, etc.) and job demands.

3. Shift work: fixed afternoon and rotating shifts, which affect time oriented body functions and lead to difficulty in role behavior (e.g., role of spouse or parent), if these role activities are normally performed during the time of day when the worker is on the shift.

4. Supervision: job demands, which are unclear or conflicting (role ambiguity or role conflict); close supervision and lack of autonomy; lack or feedback from supervisor; reports of problems with supervisor.

5. The organization: working on the boundary of the organization (e.g., salesman,
customer service representative, etc.)

6. Wages and promotion: inadequate income; perception of promotional opportunities as unfair or too slow (p.94).

“Job satisfaction and leisure satisfaction were found to be significant positive predictors of psychological health. Stepwise regression indicated that job satisfaction was the better predictor of psychological health, but leisure satisfaction added significantly to the prediction” (Pearson, 1998, p. 416). “Evidence even suggests that job satisfaction may be causally related to improvements in psychological status” (p. 417). This would lead us to believe that someone who is happy on the job would have less stress, therefore be more mentally healthy, and thus have a reduced chance for burnout. “Satisfaction is only part of the answer to the problem of turnover. Other factors such as the condition of the labor market, the age of workers, chances of obtaining another job and financial responsibilities all contribute to a workers decision to leave his job” (Gruneberg, 1976, p. 219).

“Satisfied employees are more likely to experience high internal work motivation, to give high-quality work performance, and to have low absenteeism and turnover” (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 6) While studies show that unsatisfied employees and those with job dissatisfaction are associated with stress and burnout, (Kesler, 1990; Leiter & Meechan, 1986; Lobban, Husted & Farewell, 1998, Martin & Schinke, 1998; Wolpin, Burk, & Greenglass, 1991). When related to education Brunetti (2001) calls burnout a phenomenon “which leaves teachers feeling trapped in jobs they no longer like, if they ever did, or results in teachers quitting the classroom before retirement age” (p. 50) This definition could also be applied to other professions as well, especially educational administration.

Worker burnout is evidenced by increased levels of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, reduced work goals, taking less personal responsibility for work outcomes, greater emotional detachment, work alienation and heightened self-interest.
(Hughes, 2001). Escape from the situation is a resultant outcome with the "thinking of quitting" as one component of the "climax of burnout" (Hughes, 2001). "Only by aggressively intervening in the burnout process is it possible to prevent the potential negative impact of burnout on both the teacher and the educational process" (Hughes, 2001, p. 297).

Many of those suffering from burnout may wish to change jobs or leave the profession but for a variety of reasons, (family, personal, waiting for retirement, mobility issues) may not and stay in the job setting suffering further. This only brings more problems for the educational organization as a whole (Hughes, 2001). Others may leave causing more job openings in a profession that is already struggling to fill the positions.

According to Huttunen and Heikkinen (2004), "Often burnout at work originates in the lack of recognition" (p. 164). They went on to note that recognition is a basic human need. Positive recognition in the workplace creates a feeling of solidarity and increases job satisfaction where the lack thereof can erode the working community and lower job satisfaction.

The stress load of principals often interferes with their personal lives and interests.

Because of the dawn-to-dusk hours that principals must spend addressing school-related concerns, they tend to let personal interests take a back seat to school work, when in fact, personal interests can provide opportunities for formal and informal connections to students and faculty members and can help reduce stress (Foster, 2002, p. 3). A principal may schedule activities into their day that will provide for both business and pleasure, and in the process see their students and teachers in another light. One suggestion would be to lead an aerobics class or run in practice with the track or cross-country team. Any process that reduces stress and at the same time addresses issues at hand may help prevent burnout.
One of the results of burnout is turnover, or leaving a position for one that appears to be better suited to the individual. "The major cause of turnover and job dissatisfaction are dehumanizing elements in the organization’s culture that ignore or contravene the worker’s values and needs" (Peskin, 1973, p. 2). "There is a clear relationship between worker attitudes (particularly job dissatisfaction and low organizational commitment) and employee turnover" (Mortimer, 1979, p. 1). When the stresses and pressures of the job become too great, coupled with the personality of the administrator contributing to the job fit concept, "the discrepancy evolved into administrator stress and burnout and in some instances resulted in the administrator leaving the profession" (Cooley & Shen 2000, p. 445). "A poor fit between a person and the work environment has consistently been associated with lower job satisfaction and higher rates of turnover" (Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995, p. 272). "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are the most immediate determinants of turnover intentions" (Tang, Kim, & Tang, p. 219).

"Managers increasingly identify more with their occupations than with their employers, which is a major reason they have become one of the most mobile occupation groups in the nation. When frustrated they move on because they are able to find work elsewhere, and they prefer to shift jobs rather than attempt to improve their current situation" (Peskin, 1973, p. 12).

For the past several decades, turnover research has been an important topic in human resource management and organizational behavior. Turnover is one of the most popular outcomes examined in organizational research because it is related to an organization’s bottom line in a competitive market (Tang, Kim, & Tang, 2000, p. 214).

In education, the bottom line is educating students and meeting requirements set by state and federal laws such as NCLB.

People with a negative disposition and a high level of job dissatisfaction may have a lower expectation to translate job dissatisfaction into thoughts of quitting,
evaluations of alternatives, and ultimately, lower turnover than those with a positive disposition. On the other hand, people with a positive disposition are generally happy individuals. When employees with a positive disposition report a certain level of job dissatisfaction, they are more dissatisfied with the jobs and are more likely to take action (i.e. quit their jobs) than those without (Tang, Kim, & Tang, 2000, p. 214).

According to Tang, Kim, and Tang (2000) these results have been documented throughout the research. "Individuals dissatisfied with their jobs but positively disposed to life in general were the individuals most likely to quit" (p. 214). This is because they are more willing to proactively make positive changes. "A dissatisfying job is more salient and alarming for employees who have a positive disposition than for those that have a negative disposition" (p. 214). "Those negatively disposed toward life are less likely to translate job dissatisfaction into withdrawal behaviors than are other individuals because individuals with negative dispositions are not accustomed to acting on the basis of their levels of job dissatisfaction. These individuals may withdraw psychologically from their work and develop 'indifferent' orientation (rather than ambivalent and upward mobile)" (p. 215). A person who remains in a dissatisfying position may experience burnout and fall into a mode of survival. Certainly, this lowers the quality of the individual's work performance.

By reducing turnover and burnout, quality administrators can be kept in the position of running an effective school. This must be the goal of the future if our nation is to recruit and retain quality administrators.

Job Satisfaction and the Principalship

Seeking school principals. Qualifications: Must be faster than a speeding bullet, more powerful than a locomotive, able to leap tall buildings in a single bound; must communicate in multiple languages. Ability to be in more than one place simultaneously, to perform miracles and to walk on water highly desirable. Blue
uniform with tights and cape furnished by employer (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003, p. 28).

Why does one become a high school principal? What makes the job attractive?

"High school principals are typically the highest paid field officers in the public school system. A typical high school principal’s salary exceeds that of his or her middle school and elementary school associates when experience and professional degree are held constant" (Pounder & Merrill, 2001, p. 30) "In addition to enhanced financial incentives, public school administrators receive substantial opportunities to attend professional development conferences at the expense of the school district" (p. 31). "Furthermore, some school districts enhance this base salary through stipends for extracurricular responsibilities and/or provide retirement annuities in addition to the retirement benefits offered all other educators" (p. 30). However, the salary and benefits provided may be insufficient to maintain loyalty and commitment to the principalship in this age of high stress, long hours and increasing accountability. (Pounder & Merrill, 2001). Brown, Hohenshil, and Brown (1988) noted that job satisfaction is necessary to ensure continuous and high quality services to children and the adults who work with them.

Job satisfaction greatly influences teachers and administrators’ career paths (Cooley & Shen, 2000, p. 445). According to Pounder and Merrill (2001), individuals were drawn to the position of high school principal due to a desire to achieve, influence, and improve education. Other influencing factors included the position’s salary and benefits. On the other hand, negative factors included time demands as well as ethical dilemmas, student discipline problems, termination of unfit employees, and union negotiations. Less than one-third of those surveyed saw the principalship as within their career plans. Pounder and Merrill (2001) summarized that only those who find the position highly desirable are likely to actively pursue attainment of the position. Those candidates who may only marginally be
interested in the position may need stronger incentives or encouragement to seek
the high school principalship, or, said conversely, may need less potent
disincentives to pursue the position” (p. 46).

Haines, McNeese and Roberson (2006) found that principals gave five reasons
for becoming a school administrator.

1. Belief that they would have a greater impact on student’s lives if they moved from
the classroom to administration.
2. Desire to advance their career.
3. Belief that they could provide additional instructional supervision to teachers.
4. Perception that they thought the job would be more challenging and rewarding.
5. Increased pay.

While all of these are reasonable expectations, they may still not be enough to attract the
number of administrators needed at this time.

In this era of accountability and significant school reform, efforts to improve
schools increasingly look to the principal to spearhead change efforts at the school
level. It is widely accepted that good principals are the cornerstones of good
schools and without a principal’s leadership efforts to raise student achievement,
schools cannot succeed. The principal is seen as the key agent at the school level,
initiating change by raising the level of expectations for both teachers and

“School administrators are not strangers to accountability; whenever a problem occurs in
a school, heads turn automatically toward the office. However, the recent emphasis on
high-stakes, standards driven accountability systems poses some issues for school
leaders” (Normore, 2004, p. 66). There are issues of fairness in accountability of schools
serving different types of students, issues dealing with skills and knowledge, and issues
of authority and support. A principal must be aware and knowledgeable of these issues
before they can be held accountable. “Principals are in a position to help direct the course
of their own accountability rather than have systems imposed on them” (Normore, 2004, p. 68).

According to Tom Luce, former chief of staff for the Texas Select Committee on Public education (as cited by Cross & Rice, 2000):

Most of the factors that we have long believed determine academic results are not as important as we may have thought. However, all those successful schools, whatever the economic status or location, shared one vitally important characteristic. The common denominator of successful schools, we found, was a principal who was an academic leader. (p. 62)

This statement alone shows the importance of attracting and retaining effective, high quality principals in our schools.

“The school principal is seen by many as the key element in establishing a productive and satisfying work climate, but there are differences of opinion over which facets of leadership—personality attributes, behaviors or context—are most closely related to school effectiveness and work satisfaction” (Koll et al., 1996, p. 102).

School change and reform are the order of the day; new pattern of management, curricular innovations, increased student testing, accountability measures, and market forces each contribute to a role that is complex, imbued with conflict, and far reaching. As new responsibilities are added, principals report their time and attention stretched in multiple directions; neither does it appear any slowing in principal role change is on the horizon (Portin, 2000, p. 494). Leaders in contemporary educational organizations are confronted by external and internal challenges and expectations that make demands on their time, expertise, energies, and emotional wellbeing. They are, being increasingly, held accountable for their performance and are expected to comply with ethical and moral standards in their relationships and practices. While these leaders my experience
confusion, even frustration, in their attempts to respond productively to these pressures, the current emphasis in many educational organizations on corporate management values, strategies and practices has contributed to a feeling among many leaders of “excessive managerialism” and of having to do more with less (d’Arbon, Duignan & Duncan, 2002, p. 469).

Many studies of effective leadership indicate that without commitment from the front-line leader (the principal, in the case of a school) it is impossible to achieve lasting change. It is the principal’s passionate commitment to the students’ academic achievement that will make the difference between a highly successful school and one that is content with the status quo (Cross & Rice, 2000, p. 61).

“Many school administrators truly love what they do and have a great deal of job satisfaction. Frequently, they have enjoyed teaching and yet desire to use their organizational skills to enable the education system to run more effectively and efficiently” (Picton, 2001, p. 7) The continued expansion of the duties of the principal “has created a situation in which principals have to make choices relative to the duties that will consume their time.” (Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004, p. 253). “Principals find themselves in the “eye of the storm” as a society conditioned by instant gratification and change expects immediate results from the latest reform effort” (Cooley & Shen, 2003, p 10). “As reflective practitioners, school leaders know that the decisions that are made and the values that underlie those decisions are filled with moral implications for the entire school community” (Denig & Quinn, 2001, p. 43).

A recent study of middle and high school principals conducted by NASSP showed that these professionals spend an average of 62 hours a week involved in various school and community activities. In addition to this, they are expected to attend athletic and extra curricular events in music and drama as well as events that connect them and their school with the community. Stress is increased further as internal and external groups pressure these administrators to be more visible and accountable (Foster, 2002).
Principals incur an awesome responsibility that includes student achievement and compliance with all local, state, and federal guidelines. Add to that financial concerns, NCLB requirements, and grueling hours! (Cushing, Kerrins & Johnstone, 2003, p. 28).

"Many of the issues administrators are facing today were not regarded as problems when they started their careers even ten years ago" (Picton, 2001, p. 6). This was true when Picton made the statement in 1991 and may be even more relevant today. With the new requirements and additional stress created by NCLB, it may even be more so than when it was originally stated.

Meeting the responsibilities of the principalship requires an endless changing of gears, creates fragmentation of effort, and propels principals into long hours of work at paces that strain both physical and mental stamina. Successfully juggling managerial and instructional leadership tasks becomes an increasingly elusive goal and produces high levels of stress that can affect energy levels and dispositions toward work (Foster 2002, p. 1).

The time demands of school leadership are enormous; the rewards, these principals and others tell us, are all intrinsic: they come from doing the job well and seeing kids learn (examples of Herzberg’s notions of job satisfaction and McGregor’s “Theory Y” at their best) (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003, p. 28).

Although the study of job satisfaction has been widely researched (e.g., Locke, 1976; Martin and Schinke, 1998; Spector, 1985, 1997), few studies have focused specifically on the job satisfaction of high school principals in light of the impact of the NCLB:

To rejuvenate their professional and personal energy, principals must regain the feeling that school leadership is fun. This can occur only when principals create purposeful moments of authentic engagement that inform and model effective practices and that revive their own physical and mental energy (Foster 2002, p. 1).
Rayfield and Diamantes (2004b) designed and carried out research to determine school administrator’s attitudes toward routine tasks “in an attempt to offer insight into why the job may or may not be considered a wise career choice or even a desirable job” (p. 254). Their finding demonstrated “that the work of a secondary school principal is complex and requires a great deal of commitment and talent” (p. 254). “The requirements to become “expert” across many disciplines tends to make the principal’s job look overwhelming and might also explain reluctance toward the job” (p. 254).

“Role commitment is defined as how individuals prioritize between their work and significant relationships” (Eckman 2004, p. 369). “The personal and professional attributes of the high school principal contribute to and affect the role dimensions of role conflict and role commitment, which in turn contribute to or affect job satisfaction” (p. 369) “As administrators experienced increases in role conflict, they reported decreases in overall job satisfaction” (p. 370). According to Eckman (2004), the results of her study showed that, “Job satisfaction was significantly and inversely related to role conflict for the entire group of high school principals. The higher the levels of role conflict, the lower the level of job satisfaction.” (p. 380). In addition the study revealed that the younger the principal the more role conflict they experienced and as they progressed in the career, the longer they worked as a principal the lower the role conflict and the higher the level of job satisfaction (2004).

According to Eckman (2004),

The difficulty women and men have in balancing their personal lives and their professional lives as high school principals and the increased role conflict that come with that struggle affect the future recruitment and retention of both women and men for the profession. (p. 383)

Certainly, in times of economic hardship when the supply of workers far exceeds the demands for their talents, people are frequently so glad to be employed that the issue of being satisfied with a job is immaterial to them. Their performance
may relate more to a determination to insure financial security than to any personal satisfaction they may derive from a job (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992, p. 8).

In today’s education market, this is not the case.

With the shortage of administrators today, those highly qualified may shop around for the positions that give them the highest level of job satisfaction whether in the field of education or another area outside the field.

Job Satisfaction, School Size and Location

“The fact that this nation and the world are facing a crisis in finding school administrators is well documented. Regrettably, a leadership shortage has peaked at the same time that school officials face serious educational problems” (Cooley & Shen, 2000, p. 443).

Although these problems are found in all schools, urban school districts face the most pressing and serious challenges. Many urban schools are more than 50 years old, with buildings in need of repair or replacement. Teacher and administrator salaries dwarf their rural and suburban counterparts and contribute to higher turnover among urban educators (Cooley & Shen, 2000, p. 443).

For these reasons, there is a greater need for good leaders at urban schools that fact a myriad of problems not encountered at rural schools. These urban schools also are seeing less qualified applicants and face a greater shortage than schools in other locations.

Urban principals expressed concern with compensation and extrinsic factors, whereas suburban principals were more likely to value a positive work environment” (Cooley & Shen 2000, p. 445). In the study completed by Cooley and Shen (2000) concerning administrators in urban schools, “Teachers cited the relationship between the board, administration, and teachers as the most critical factor in applying for an administrative position” (p. 450). “The most significant factor rated by principals was salary commensurate with responsibilities” (p. 451). “School improvement is unlikely to
occur unless the best and most capable leaders are recruited” (Cooley & Shen, 2000, p. 453).

“A worker assesses his present status by referring to the alternative positions which are available to him” (Gruneberg, 1976, p. 130). Socioeconomic conditions may affect this situation, if attractive alternatives are not present to those currently working in “slum conditions”, the workers present job will seem more satisfactory. This may also be related to other factors. Rural workers and small town workers were more satisfied when their jobs demanded greater personal involvement. On the other hand, urban workers showed higher satisfaction when their jobs required less personal involvement (Gruneberg, 1976).

School culture or climate involves the environment and the general feeling of the school. A myriad of factors and influences create a school’s culture. “The pervasiveness of an organization’s culture requires that management recognize the underlying dimensions of their corporate culture and its impact on employee-related variables such as satisfaction, commitment, cohesion, strategy implementation, performance, among others” (Lund, 2003, p. 219). Although very, few studies have been done on organizational culture and job satisfaction and none could be found related to school culture and job satisfaction. However, Lund conducted a study that may be relevant to a schools culture and job satisfaction. The study found that clan like cultures promote a higher level of employee job satisfaction. “Therefore, managers in organizations desiring to create greater levels of job satisfaction should begin a concerted effort to build consensus and cohesion, emphasize teamwork and loyalty, while encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship” (Lund, 2003, p. 230). Smaller schools that have a more family type atmosphere and culture, where all of the students and teachers know each other, work well together, and have built up a strong tradition (like a family or clan) may very well rate for a higher job satisfaction than those larger schools that have gotten so big that they become impersonal.
Job Satisfaction and Private Schools

What are the differences between public and private schools and how do these differences affect the job satisfaction? One would assume that since a private school is usually smaller, has more control over their student population and other aspects that those employed at a private school may report a higher level of job satisfaction than in a public school.

A report in 1998 from the National Center for Educational Statistics tends to agree with this assumption as it showed that private school teachers tend to be more satisfied than public school teachers and went on to say that the public school teachers who were younger and less experienced were more satisfied in their position than those who were older and more experienced. In private schools, the youngest and least experienced as well as the older and more experienced teachers said they were more satisfied than those in between. The most satisfied teachers were those who receive the highest amount of parental support and were less likely to have been threatened by students. The teachers reporting the highest amount of parental support were those from private schools (Reports list, 1998).

At the same time there seems to be a crisis in private schools as well in the ability to recruit qualified school leaders. According to d’Arbon, Duignan and Duncan (2002). “There is also a concern that there are fewer “appointable” applicants for advertised positions in systemic Catholic schools and there is anecdotal evidence that this situation is being replicated in the religious order-owned or private Catholic schools. This of course, is not a problem unique to Catholic schools as similar problems are being experienced in a number of education systems in a variety of countries” (p. 468). They go on to confirm that, “reports from nation after nation refer to the shrinking pool of applicants for the principalship” (p. 468).

According to recent statistics released by the United States Department of Education, differences between public and private schools go much deeper than just...
funding. Student populations in public schools tend to be more racially and ethnically diverse as do their faculty’s. Being exposed to people of different races and cultures helps students embrace diversity and learn tolerance towards others (Public and private school differences, 2000).

Public school teachers, for the most part, seem to be better qualified than those in private schools and have a higher percentage of teachers with advanced degrees. Forty-two percent of those in public schools had masters degrees compared to thirty percent in private schools. Public school teachers were also more likely to have a degree in the subject they taught and more years of experience. Public school teachers attend more professional development activities and were more highly trained in technology according to the report. Public schools teachers on average earn higher salaries and receive better benefits (Public and private school differences, 2000).

Private school teachers feel that they have a greater influence on school policies, such as discipline policies, establishing curriculum, and in-service training topics. Public school teachers believe they have greater influence on budget issues (Public and private school differences, 2000).

Private schools have higher turnover, but seem to be more satisfied with working conditions. 36% of private school teachers reported being highly satisfied with their job compared to 11% of public school teachers (Public and private school differences, 2000). So one would wonder why the turnover level would be higher in the private sector.

Public schools are larger with the average public school being twice the size of private schools. However, with this size comes the advantage of being able to offer more services to students with special needs, having more technology available, being able to offer remedial programs, and meeting the varied health needs of public school students. Public schools were also more likely to have libraries and more media services available to their students (Public and private school differences, 2000).
Both types of schools have their advantages and disadvantages. The levels of job satisfaction reported may depend more upon the individual school and its culture and individual differences rather than being just public or private. As discussed earlier one of the most important aspects of job, satisfaction is worker fit in the position. Some educators and administrators may fit better in a private school position rather than a public one. It may simply be one of individual choice.

Job Satisfaction and Mississippi School Rating

No outstanding research has been found regarding job satisfaction in relation to the school rating received by the Mississippi Department of Education. One might assume that an administrator of a Level 5 school would be more satisfied with his job than an administrator of a Level 1 school. However, this may not be true if the pressure and stress of keeping the Level 5 rating is more taxing than turning a school with a Level 1 rating around and raising it to a Level 3 or higher.

Job Satisfaction and the Principal Shortage

One only needs to pick up a current educational journal to learn of current shortages of teachers and administrators in this country. There is a definite need of qualified individuals in both positions. But what has caused this shortage? Why do we not have enough principals and what should we do about it? These issues are addressed in the following sections.

The shortage of principals is approaching crisis status (Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004b). This is especially true in rural schools because of their limited budgets and inability to compete with urban schools (Hinton & Kastner, 2000). On the other hand, urban schools find themselves being held responsible for economic and social stresses; this is just another obstacle in filling administrator positions (Portin, 2000). Other challenges now being faced by school leaders relate to the fact that our nation has become an increasingly more litigious and critical society (d'Arbon, Duignan, & Duncan, 2002).
The difficult role and heavy responsibility that administrators face may explain why teachers are reluctant to become administrators (Rayfield & Diamantes 2004b).

The position of principal has evolved over the past decades; this had put more stress on individuals and made the job less appealing for the relatively low amount the position pays. At the same time, the position is becoming more demanding. A great amount of new responsibility has been placed on principals. The average workday and work year have also been extended (Hinton & Kastner, 2000, p. 1).

"The idea that administrators must become “a jack-of-all-trades and a master of all trades” certainly places pressure on the principals” (Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004b, p. 254). Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, (2003) cited that part of the current principal shortage is due to too few rewards. Other reasons included are low pay, high stress, and long hours. In all, human resource directors in California cited poor working conditions as the overall reason for the low interest in administrative positions in education. (2003).

Many administrative students want to get their credentials so they may work in central office positions, few want to be a school principal because the position is “too demanding with few rewards” (Cushing et al., 2003. p. 29).

The British Columbia Principal’s and Vice- Principals Association recently released a survey reporting a decline in the ratio of applicants per vacancy over the past three fiscal years. If this issue is not resolved, the quality of administration will decline drastically and inexperienced and unqualified personnel will occupy these strategic school administrative roles. This could result in the administrative position becoming more of a management position rather than one of leadership (Picton, 2001, p. 7).

A recent study conducted by the Educational Research Service and the National Association of Secondary School Principals reiterated the shortage of principals. Teachers were not seeking administrative positions for a variety of reasons,
including inadequate compensation, stress, politics, and excessive work hours (Cooley & Shen, 2000, p. 444).

Cooley and Shen went on to explain that discontent among principals is responsible for the lack of administrators. Similarly Cushing, Kerrins, and Johnstone (2003, p. 28) reported, “Directors of human resources express concern that fewer people are applying for administrative positions than in years past. They worry about having to reopen positions, re-advertise and re-interview if no qualified applicant is found.”

Concerns exist that the position may turn into a managerial position rather than one of educational leadership. Picton (2001) explained,

... schools where principals are inclined to act as managers only, little or no innovation is likely to occur, personnel become interested in doing as little work as possible in order to collect their paychecks resulting in a serious decline in the quality of instruction and a less than optimum student learning (p. 9).

Certainly, these circumstances jeopardize administrators and teachers’ job satisfaction as well as student achievement.

“One of the best ways to strengthen the teaching profession would be to make teaching a more satisfying career. Not only would this encourage bright young prospects to become teachers, it would also encourage experienced teachers to stay in the profession” (Latham, 1998, p. 82). It may also encourage them to become effective school leaders.

“Trends indicate that filling open principalships will become more difficult in the next decade as retirement rates of experienced principals increase, high percentages of current principals move to non-administrative positions, and numbers of qualified applicants choosing to become school leaders decrease” (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003, p. 469).

The next section discusses the problems faced in recruiting and retaining qualified individuals in the profession and possible solutions.
Job Satisfaction and the Recruiting and Retention of Principals

In the previous section of this dissertation, we have discussed the problem of the principal shortage that is occurring worldwide. Hinton and Kastner (2002) stated that many studies show that less than 10% of administrative candidates fail to pass the muster. “These findings indicate that other factors are the cause of the shortage, including the rise in the number of principal positions and the retirement of baby boomers” (Hinton & Kastner 2002, p. 2). They went on to say that increases in student enrollment may also be a contributing factor to the shortages of principals and teachers, and they expect an increase in student population from 47 million in 1999 to 48 million in 2008.

While some point to the lack of qualified candidates to fill administrative positions, “findings show that there are more than adequate numbers of qualified candidates, they are not applying for the openings” (Hinton & Kastner, 2000, p. 2). According to Cooley and Shen (2000), a study in Pennsylvania found an increase in teachers that were completing administrative certification programs, but fewer were applying for the positions. In a Louisiana study, less than half of the teachers gaining administrative certification planned to enter administration positions in the next five years (Cooley & Shen, 2000). Haines, McNeese and Roberson (2006) found similar results when almost 12% of the University of Mississippi students enrolled in administration programs never plan on going into administrative positions, but are enrolled in the programs just to get a pay raise or for professional development. This shows that some are still concerned about entering the profession in this era of high stress due to higher accountability and other reasons.
We know that the position of a high school principal has changed dramatically since the passing of NCLB and the increased accountability it, other state, and local rulings have brought about. Donaldson (2001) stated that “the principalship and the assistant principalship are undergoing changes that have created questions and concerns regarding the recruitment and retention of effective school leaders” (p. 136) Browne-Ferrigno (2003) notes that the replacement of exiting educational leaders will require a concentrated effort if we are to attract, train, and retain quality applicants in this field.

Changes must be made in the profession if it is to become attractive again to those who are qualified. To be motivating and satisfying a job must provide a worker with the ability to feel personally responsible for a meaningful portion of what he does, and provide outcomes that are intrinsically meaningful or worthwhile to the individual. It must also provide feedback for that which the individual has accomplished (Gruneberg, 1976). Numerous studies have provided evidence that job satisfaction will be improved for many workers by making fundamental changes in the job itself (Gruneberg, 1976) "Where there is a discrepancy between an individuals needs and what the job offers, there will be dissatisfaction" (Gruneberg, 1976, p. 1). The attitude of an administrator should be one of doing everything in their power to help both students and teachers be successful and continually helping them to learn and grow. According to Cushing et al. (2003), “We must find ways to encourage individuals with this attitude and perspective into leadership roles at the school site. Then we must do everything in our power to help them be successful. If we can do this, we won’t need to be concerned about a principal shortage” (p. 37).
In order to solve the principal shortage many school districts are turning to programs designed to identify and groom potential leaders. More emphasis is being placed on mentoring and support programs for new principals. Recognition of outstanding principals, encouraging talented people to prepare for and apply for the principalship, and attempting to decrease the disparity between the amount of authority granted and responsibility expected of principals, are needed steps in solving the principal shortage (Hinton & Kastner, 2000, p. 5).

Koll et al. (1996) declared that one of the ways to improve future leaders is to improve the programs that are preparing them for the position. "The growing role of school leaders as change agents demands a change in conventional preparation programs by teacher training institutions. To prepare educational leaders for participatory governance and transformational leadership there are a number of steps administrator preparation programs could take" (p. 110.). Some of the things they suggested include

1. Providing course work that conceives of leadership as a broadly shared responsibility.
2. Develop and include processes to increase self-knowledge.
3. Provide a central focus on participatory leadership designed to promote continuous quality improvement.
4. Increase the theory/practice connection through the use of simulation, role-play, reflection devices and case analysis.
5. Integrate developmental experiences to stimulate and support complex thinking skills.
6. Conduct research that studies leaders and managers in many kinds of organizational settings (p. 111).

Rayfield and Diamantes (2004b) suggested,
... the work of the secondary principal continues to grow with regards to complexity, universities and programs are forced to offer experiences that provide students with sufficient opportunities to learn the skills necessary for success. Most importantly, administrator preparation programs will have to address the perceived reluctance for the position and somehow address this in their coursework. Identifying and elaborating on the positive aspects of the job as well as establishing support/mentoring programs is needed. Perhaps this could be implemented during required field experiences and practical, if not in coursework across the board” (p. 256).

If future administrators are prepared for the tasks ahead and well aware of what will be expected of them, as well as being capable of meeting the demands of the position with proven strategies that work it only makes sense that they will stay in the profession longer at a higher level of job satisfaction.

Alterning the way we prepare individuals for the field may be part of the answer but others look to changing the profession as it exists to provide needed relief to those already in the profession if were are to retain them and make the profession more attractive to others. After reviewing research and the issues involved with the principal shortage Cushing, Kerrins, and Johnstone (2003) suggested:

1. High school teachers assume some of the leadership responsibilities.

2. Co-principalships are created so two administrators share the job.

3. Principals delegate routine duties to clerical worker or assistants.

Cushing et al. (2003) also found that other things may be done as well, providing inservices in time management, reducing paperwork or providing additional time for
completing it, support from mentors and supervisors, participation in job related
discussions with peers, greater technological support, time for self reflection and building
a support network in the community.

Greater monetary compensation for principals should also be considered in
attempts to solve the shortage. The high level of time demands compared with the
financial compensation is the most apparent cause of the shortage and should not
be entirely overlooked in the efforts to create a larger pool of qualified candidates
(Hinton & Kastner, 2000, p. 5).

If reform does not soon take place, the problem will only worsen. The number of
people leaving administration will be more than the number of those entering
administration. Who will lead our schools through the twenty-first century?
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the aspects of job satisfaction of high school principals comparing public and private schools in Mississippi. The results of this study provide information on the relationships between school and personal demographics of these principals to their job satisfaction. Chapter III includes a discussion of the study design, a description of the population, the research instrument and methods that were used to collect data, and how that data was analyzed.

Design of the Study

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to describe the sample and examine variability within the data and look for relationships that are present. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and describe the characteristics of the data gathered (Graziano & Raulin, 2000), while inferential statistics were used to determine if there were any patterns or relationships found within the data (McMillian & Schumacher, 2006). By conducting the study, the researcher attempted to determine: the general job satisfaction level for high school principals in Mississippi as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). A copy of the sample questions from the questionnaire may be found in Appendix. Since the questionnaire is copyrighted, the author is unable to produce the document in its entirety. The job satisfaction level for each of the twenty dimensions of the job was measured by the MSQ. Job satisfaction was related to each of the demographic variables - public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, experience, education, school size, and Mississippi School Rating level. With the present principal shortage and the ever-stressful job demands, it was crucial to determine Mississippi principal’s levels of job satisfaction.

Participants

The participants of the study were the high school principals of public and private schools in the state of Mississippi. The list of public and private schools and their
addresses was obtained from the Mississippi Department of Education website and formulated into address labels that were compatible for mailing the questionnaires. All 363 public and private high school principals in the state of Mississippi were invited and encouraged to participate.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Prior to data collection, approval was obtained from both the doctoral committee and the University of Southern Mississippi’s Human Subjects Review Board. The appropriate forms are located in Appendix. Data collection included the following steps:

1. Each of the high school principals in the state of Mississippi was mailed a packed containing:
   a. A letter (Appendix E) explaining what the study is about, who is to be involved, and the ultimate goal of the study. The letter will assure the potential participants of the complete anonymity of their responses.
   b. The survey instrument
2. A self-addressed stamped envelope addressed to the researcher for return of the instrument.
3. The packets were mailed on May 5, 2007
4. Responses were collected for a period of three weeks.
5. The response rate was lower than anticipated so an additional mailing was done at the end of May to those schools that had not responded and an additional two weeks was allowed to collect data.

**Instrumentation**

The instrumentation used was a two-part self-administered paper survey. Part 1 consisted of an individual data page (Appendix F) and part two was the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) long form. Putting the data page first provided the respondent with easy questions to begin the survey and reduce the likelihood of the
respondent forgoing the demographic data if it is located at the end of the survey. It should be noted that the MSQ authors required that certain data be asked so that the MSQ designers may use the survey findings for future research. The MSQ was chosen because it was determined to be the best suited to gather the data required for this study.

Individual Data Sheets

The individual data sheet gathered data about selected demographic characteristics of the respondents. The characteristics were identified through a review of literature as being related to job satisfaction. Comparing the data collected from these demographic characteristics could indicate relationships between them and job satisfaction, which may be used to improve recruitment and retention of principals in the future. It could also provide information concerning changes in job satisfaction since NCLB. These characteristics were to help provide a description of the subjects by age, gender and race. The variables studied included: Salary, Years as a Principal, Years, if any, as an Assistant Principal, Years in Teaching before becoming a Principal, School socio-economic status, School Size, Mississippi School Rating, Education Level, and differences noted after the initiation of NCLB if the individual was a principal both before and after the initiation of NCLB. The demographic data survey may be found in Appendix F.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

As previously mentioned research data was collected through the use of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. This instrument has been in use since 1967, but was revised in 1977. This study used the long form of the revised (1977) edition. This instrument is a classic research tool that has been used in numerous research studies. The author has noted at least fifteen dissertations in education that have used the instrument over the past three years. It was deemed as the best survey instrument available to measure the aspects of this study.
The MSQ is designed to measure a level of twenty different subscales and is self-administered in 15 to 20 minutes. The items appear in blocks of 20 so that items for each subscale appear at 20 item intervals. The MSQ scales are described below (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967):

1. Ability Utilization- The chance to do something that makes use of abilities
2. Achievement- The feeling of accomplishment one gets from the job
3. Activity- Being able to keep busy at all time
4. Advancement- The chances for advancement on the job
5. Authority- The chance to tell other people what to do
6. Company Policies and Procedures- The way company policies are implemented
7. Compensation- Feelings about pay in contrast to the amount of work completed
8. Coworkers- How one gets along with coworkers
9. Creativity- The opportunity to try one’s own methods
10. Independence- The opportunity to work autonomously
11. Moral Values- The opportunity to do things that do not run counter to one’s beliefs
12. Recognition- Being recognized for a job well done
13. Responsibility- The freedom to implement one’s judgment
14. Security- The way a job provides for steady employment
15. Social Service- Being able to do things in a service to others
16. Social Status- Having respect for the community
17. Supervision- The relationship between supervisors and employees
18. Supervision-Technical- The technical quality of supervision
19. Variety- The opportunity to do different things
20. Working conditions- Physical aspects of one’s place of employment
The MSQ is used to measure relative satisfaction to select job characteristics. The respondents were given a choice, "On my present job, this is how I feel about..." And they responded: not satisfied, only slightly satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied. A five-point Likert format was used to record responses and a total satisfaction score was computed.

Reliability

The MSQ has undergone extensive analysis and has been found to be a reliable measure of general job satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967). Two measures of reliability were used: Internal consistency and stability. Internal consistency was measured by using Hoyt’s method of analysis of variance, which showed a reliability coefficient for 83% of the groups at .80 or larger and only 2.5% lower than .70. This data shows that the MSQ scales have internal consistency reliability (Weiss et al., 1967).

A pilot study was conducted for this research to complete both a qualitative and quantitative item analysis of the questionnaire. Participants for study were high school principals in the state of Georgia from the Atlanta and Savannah areas. Eighteen principals completed the pilot study. Revisions were made based on the qualitative analysis and participants’ comments and suggestions.

The quantitative analysis consisted of running a Cronbach’s Alpha to look at the reliability of the questionnaire. Each section of the questionnaire was analyzed. The seven questions related to the NCLB resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha of .809, while the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) produced a result of .965. Both are well within acceptable limits.
Further analysis was done on the MSQ by testing the General Satisfaction Scale of the questionnaire, which resulted in a Cronbach's Alpha of .884, and each of the 20 individual subscales. These subscale results are provided in the table below.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability Utilization</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policies</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision – Human Relations</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision – Technical</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the pilot study were acceptable and the project was submitted to the Institutional Review Board.

**Validity**

Evidence for the validity of the MSQ was derived mainly from its performing according to expectations, or its construct validity. Evidence of concurrent validity of the MSQ was collected from 25 occupational groups (n = 2,955). The analysis revealed group differences were statistically significant at .001 levels for both means and variances on all 20 dimensions of the MSQ (Weiss et al., 1967).

**Method of Analysis**

After the data was collected, a data analysis was conducted for each research question. Through SPSS, a descriptive analysis was completed for each. This included the descriptive statistics of means, standard deviations and a range of scores. For some questions, a multiple regression was used to determine the role that independent variables may play in explaining the level of satisfaction of principals in the study.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this research was to investigate various aspects of the job satisfaction of high school principals in the state of Mississippi. The intent was to provide information on the relationships between school and personal demographics of these principals to their job satisfaction. This chapter presents the statistical analysis of the data obtained by analyzing the responses of the 153 respondents. Questionnaires consisting of the demographic information and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) were mailed to the 355 high schools in the state of Mississippi. The 153 respondents represent a response rate of 43%. The data were analyzed to test Hypothesis 1 through 6.

The information included in this chapter includes demographic information on the sample and the analysis of the statistical tests applied to each of the hypotheses. It is organized into three sections: (a) description of the sample, (b) analysis and findings organized by research questions, and (c) findings related to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

Description of Sample

Originally, 363 letters and questionnaires were mailed to high schools in Mississippi. It was later noted that eight of these schools were not high schools; this reduced the possible participants to 355. As previously mentioned, 153 of these returned the questionnaires for a response rate of 43%. Table 2 shows the frequency distribution for the demographic information.

Of the respondents, 126 (82.4%) were male, and 27 (17.6%) were female. The age range was from 28 to 68 years of age; five participants did not provide a response to the age question. The average age for the participants was 49.9 years (SD = 9.10); 59 years was the most reported age (n = 9, 6%). Of those individuals that participated in the research, 33 (21.9%) reported being Black non-Hispanic; 117 (77.5%) reported as White non-Hispanic, and one reported as White Hispanic.
Salaries reported were in a range from a low of less than $20,000 to a high of more than $100,000 per year, while 60 (39%) of the respondents reported earning an annual salary of between $70,000 and $80,000 per year. Regarding years of experience, three areas were considered by the questionnaire. The first was number of years teaching experience prior to becoming an administrator. The range was from one year to 41 years. The average years of experience before entering school administration were 13.36 years (SD = 7.77). The second area was years of experience as an assistant principal before becoming a principal. In this category, the range was from no experience at all reported by 51 (33%) individuals to 15 years of experience. The average years of experience as an assistant principal were 2.87 years (SD = 3.28), with 49.2% (75) of the respondents reported having between one and five years experience while 17.1% (26) reported six years or more experience. The third area examining experience was the number of years as principal. The range was from 1 to 37 years. 13.7% (21) of the participants reported being in their first year as principal. The average number of years of experience was 8.4 years (SD = 7.44). Of those participating 107 (71.3%) reported ten years or less experience while only 15 (10%) reported more than 20 years in the position. Of the principals responding 106 (69%) have a Masters degree, 24 (16%) and Specialist degree and 22 (14%) a doctorate degree (21 Ed. D. and 1 Ph.D.). Public school principals made up 136 (89.5%) of the respondents while 16 (10.5%) of the principals worked in private schools. The majority of principals surveyed were employed by small schools, 84 (54.9%) were working at schools of less than 500 students, 41 (26.8%) were at schools between 500 and 999 students and 29 (17%) at schools larger than 1000 students. Of the 134 public schools reporting 1 (.7%) had a 1 rating of Low Performing, 12 (7.8%) were rated a 2 or Under Performing, 55 (35.9%) were rated 3 Successful, 27 (17.6%) earned a 4 for Exemplary and 39 (25.5%) were rated a 5 or Superior by the Mississippi State Department of Education’s rating scale based on yearly testing and other data. Only 8.5% (13) of the principals reporting working at schools that had no low socio-economic
students that received free or reduced price lunch while 5.2% (8) schools reported have 100% of the students in this category. One-half of the schools (74) reported having 65% or more of their students receiving free or reduced price lunches. The average in this category was 59.4% so more than half of the students in public schools in Mississippi are from low socioeconomic conditions.

Table 2

*Frequency Distributions for Demographic Variables (N=153)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – 32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – 37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 – 43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 – 48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 – 53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 – 58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 – 63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 – 68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black non-Hispanic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Salary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below $20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 - $40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 - $50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $60,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $70,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 - $80,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 - $90,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above $100,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of Teaching Experience Previous to Becoming a Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of Experience as an Assistant Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Years of Experience as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist's Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Size of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 500 students</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999 students</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1000 students</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Low Performing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Under Performing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Successful</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Exemplary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Superior</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio Economic Status (% students receiving free or reduced price lunch) 59.6 29.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 90%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 100%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis and Findings Organized by Research Questions**

Questions on the MSQ portion of the questionnaire were answered using a Likert scale. Respondents answered on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1) Very Dissatisfied; 2) Dissatisfied; 3) Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied; 4) Satisfied; and 5) Very Satisfied.

Research Question 1: What is the overall job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?
The MSQ is designed to measure several areas of job satisfaction as well as the overall or general job satisfaction of the group being surveyed. The general satisfaction scale uses 20 items with one from each of the twenty subscales. The MSQ is copyrighted and cannot be reproduced in this document.

The general job satisfaction mean score for high school principals in Mississippi for this research was 3.93 (SD = .55) with a range from 2.10 to 4.95 on a scale from 1 to 5. This interprets to an above average general satisfaction level.

Research Question 2: What is the general job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi according to the following demographic variables: public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, level of education, salary level, years of experience as a teacher and administrator, school size, and school socio-economic level?

T-tests compared the means for gender, race and public/private schools. A One Way ANOVA was used to compare highest degree, salary level, and school size.

There were no statistically significant findings for question 2 relating to the demographics of public or private schools, gender, race, age, highest degree earned, school size or salary level. The non-significant findings are presented in Table 3 for the Independent Samples t-Tests and Table 4 for the One Way ANOVAs.

Private schools (M = 4.13, SD = .48) showed a slightly higher satisfaction level over Public Schools (M = 3.91, SD = .56), but this was not a significant difference \( t (150) = -1.50, p = .135 \). In comparing gender females (M = 3.94, SD = .60) were slightly higher than males (M = 3.93, SD = .55) but this could be due to the high number of males (\( n = 126 \)) that responded compared to the lower amount of females (\( n = 27 \)), however this was not significant \( t (151) = -.09, p = .930 \). When comparing education levels those that had earned a Doctorate Degree (M = 4.05, SD = .59) were more satisfied than those with a Specialist Degree (M = 3.85, SD = .63) and Masters Degree (M = 3.93, SD = .53), while principals with a Masters Degree were slightly more satisfied than were principals with a Specialist Degree. These results for Education Level was also not significant \( F = (2) = \)
.753, \( p = .473 \). Whites (\( M = 3.95, \ SD = .56 \)) were a little more satisfied than Blacks (\( M = 3.82, \ SD = .53 \)), but again findings for Ethnicity was not significant \( t(147) = -1.28, \ p = .204 \).

Table 3

*Independent Samples Test for General Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Analysis of Variance for General Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 500 students grades 9-12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 – 999 students Grades 9-12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than 1000 students
Grades 9-12

Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $60,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $70,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 - $80,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 - $90,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,001 - 100,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering salary level for the most part as the salary went up the
satisfaction level went up, but again the findings were not significant. There was an
exception as those in the largest reported salary range $70,001 - $80,000 reported the
lowest satisfaction. Table 5 demonstrates these results. It is important to note that due to
the low number of principals reporting salaries below $50,000, these categories were
combined with the $50,001 - $60,000 group.

Table 5

Comparison of Salary Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between general job satisfaction and the Mississippi Department of Education rating level (1-5) among principals in public schools?

Only one low performing school (Rating 1) participated in this study. This school’s data were added to the Underperforming (Rating 2) schools information for purposes of doing statistical analysis for this question.

The answer to this question is yes, as school rating goes up so does the job satisfaction of the principal. One might think that stress levels may rise at the top performing schools due to the increased pressure to stay on top. However, this does not appear to be the case. There is higher job satisfaction with higher ratings.

A One-Way ANOVA was run to compare the mean general job satisfaction scores between principals of schools at the various levels of Mississippi school rating and the results were statistically significant $F(3, 129) = 6.63, p = .001$. Table 6 presents the results of the ANOVA analysis for this question. When a Tukey HSD post hoc test was completed, specifically the principals at the Superior Performing schools were statistically significantly higher in general job satisfaction than the Under Performing Schools ($p = .028$) and the Superior Performing Schools were statistically significantly higher than the Successfully Performing schools ($p < .001$).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 - $60,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $70,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 - $80,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 - $90,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4: What is the job satisfaction level of high school principals in Mississippi for each of the 20 dimensions of the job as measured by the MSQ?

Using the Likert Scale the frequency of responses for each of the 20 dimensions is represented in Table 7. Each of the 20 dimensions has a mean score falling between the possible range from 1 to 5.

The top five ranking dimensions were Moral Values (M = 4.29, SD = .55), Achievement (M = 4.26, SD = .52), Activity (M = 4.21, SD = .52), Ability (M = 4.19, SD = .64) and Creativity (M = 4.11, SD = .73). High School principals surveyed in Mississippi were most satisfied with five aspects of their jobs. These included (a). the ability to do things that do not go against their moral values and beliefs, (b). the ability to see achievement and improvement in their schools, (c). opportunities to stay active and involved, (d). opportunities to use their abilities and training at a high level, and (e). the chance to be creative in what they do.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Workers</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision – Human Relations</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision – Technical</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensation ranked at the bottom of the list of the 20 dimensions (M = 3.30, SD = 1.02) indicating that those that participated in the research were least satisfied with the
amount of pay received for the number of hours that they put in and the work they do. Nevertheless, even this ranking with a mean of 3.30 was high enough overall to be considered above average in satisfaction.

Generally speaking, high school principals in Mississippi tend to be satisfied with those aspects of the job under their control such as moral values, achievement, activity, ability, and creativity. They are less satisfied with aspects beyond their control such as school district policies and procedures, recognition, responsibilities, advancement and compensation.

Research Question 5: Which of the demographic variables of public or private school, gender, age, ethnicity, experience, school size, and Mississippi school rating can be predictors of general job satisfaction for high school principals in Mississippi?

For the purposes of this research, none of the demographic variables was predictors of job satisfaction for high school principals in Mississippi. There were no statistically significant findings between job satisfaction and any of the demographic categories. This was determined statistically by running a regression using General Job Satisfaction as the dependent variable and the demographics of School Ratings, School Size, Gender, Age, Ethnicity, Teaching Experience, Experience as an Assistant Principal, and Experience as a Principal as independent variables. All requested variables were entered and model was not significant F (13,128) = 1.77, p = .055, R² = .15. The variables together do not significantly predict general job satisfaction, nor are any of the individual variables significant predictors of general job satisfaction for high school principals in Mississippi.
Research Question 6: What effects has the NCLB Act had upon job satisfaction of Mississippi high school principals?

A series of seven questions that related to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) were asked. Only principals who were in their administrative position both prior to and after the law was passed in 2001 answered these questions. This helped ensure that the administrators could reflect and provide insight as to its effect on their job satisfaction. There were 112 principals in the category that responded to this section of the questionnaire. The questions used a Likert Scale that allowed the respondents to answer by 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Neutral, 4 - Agree and 5 - Strongly Agree. Table 8 provides a summary of data related to these seven questions. Tables 9 - 15 reflect the number of responses to each individual question in this part of the research.

Table 8

*Frequency Distributions for Questions Related to No Child Left Behind (n=112)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCLB Question 1</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB Question 2</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB Question 3</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB Question 4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB Question 5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB Question 6</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB Question 7</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following discussions analyze the results of each question concerning No Child Left Behind.

NCLB Question 1: My level of job satisfaction has improved since the No Child Left Behind Act.
Table 9

*Frequency of Replies to Question 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the principals 58%, (65) disagrees or strongly disagree that their job satisfaction has improved since NCLB. Only 10% (11) agree or strongly agree with this statement. This indicates that the No Child Left Behind Act and the added stress that it brings with it has made the job of being principal less satisfying for a majority of principals in Mississippi.

NCLB Question 2: My stress level has increased since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Table 10

*Frequency of Replies to Question 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When answering this question 79% (88) of those surveyed agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that NCLB has resulted in higher stress levels. Only 7% (8) responded that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. The mean of 4.04 on this question confirms this response.

NCLB Question 3: My workload has increased since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to this question, the principals in Mississippi responded that their workload has increased due to NCLB; 86% (96) agreed or strongly agreed with this
statement while only 3% (3) disagreed or strongly disagreed. The mean of 4.21 confirms these results.

NCLB Question 4: My level of accountability has increased since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to accountability, a large majority 76% (85) of the principals surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that their accountability has increased since NCLB. Only 7% (8) disagreed or strongly disagreed. Again, the mean of 4.0 on this question confirms this.

NCLB Question 5: I devote more time to my job since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Just over half of the principals (52%, 59) agreed or strongly agreed that they devote more time to the job because of No Child Left Behind while 24% (27) responded that they disagreed or strongly disagreed and did not have to spend more time on the job. This question produced a mean response of 3.44.

**NCLB Question 6**: I spend more time as an instructional leader since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question had a mean of 3.40 and 52% (59) of the principals stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they spent more time as an instructional leader since NCLB. 29% (32) replied that they disagreed or strongly disagreed.

NCLB Question 7: I spend more time with my family/significant others since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if they spent more time with family or their significant other since NCLB a large majority of the principals said no. The mean was 2.25. Only 6 (5%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement of being able to spend more time with their family while 78 (70%) of them indicated they spent less time with their families by disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

When looking at correlations between the questions asked on No Child Left Behind and the 20 aspects measured by the MSQ we get several relationships. Table 17 summarizes these results.
Table 16

*Correlations Between MSQ Individual Scales and NCLB Questions (n=112)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policies</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1: My level of job satisfaction has improved since the NCLB Act.

Compensation: -.20* .036

Question 2: My stress level has increased since the NCLB Act.

Compensation: .20* .036

Question 4: My level of accountability has increased since the NCLB Act.

Human Relations: .20* .041

Question 5: I devote more time to my job since the NCLB Act.

Advancement: .19* .044

Question 6: I spend more time as an instructional leader since the NCLB Act.

Social Status: .21* .028

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

When looking at the relationships with NCLB Question 1: My level of job satisfaction has improved since the NCLB Act the correlations are all positive and even
though statistically significant, the relationships are weak. In relation to General Job Satisfaction the variables were weakly correlated, $r(110) = .20, p = .037$. When considering the chances for advancement on the job the variables were weakly correlated, $r(110) = .243, p = .01$. Compensation or receiving pay for the amount of work done was correlated weakly with NCLB Question 1, $r(110) = .200, p = .034$. The chance to “be somebody in the community” as related to social status and NCLB Question 1 were weakly correlated, $r(110) = .227, p = .016$. Having variety on the job and being able to do different things from time to time was weakly correlated to NCLB Question 1, $r(110) = .211, p = .026$. In relation to company policies and practices the correlation was, $r(110) = .208, p = .028$ and in the dimension of Independence and the chance to work alone the correlation was again weak, $r(110) = .228, p = .016$.

NCLB Question 2: My stress level has increased since the NCLB Act had a negative and weak correlation with compensation or pay received for work done, $r(110) = -.198, p = .036$.

NCLB Question 4: My level of accountability has increased since the NCLB Act was weakly and positively correlated to supervision and human relations to how the boss handles his employees, $r(110) = .194, p = .041$.

NCLB Question 5: I devote more time to my job since the NCLB Act was positively and weakly correlated to the chances for advancement on the job, $r(110) = .191, p = .044$.

NCLB Question 6: I spend more time as an instructional leader since the NCLB Act was weakly and positively correlated with social status and the chance to “be
somebody in the community”, $r(110) = .208, p = .028$. This could be the result of being visible on campus more and spending more time in the classrooms.

Qualitative Findings Related to the No Child Left Behind Act

The questionnaire contained a qualitative question that asked participants to explain how NCLB had influenced their job satisfaction and to describe what aspects of NCLB were most challenging to them in their roles as principal. Regarding challenges brought about by NCLB, the greatest concerns centered around the stress caused by (a) increased paperwork, (b) loss of time devoted to issues related to NCLB, (c) increased accountability of administrators, teachers, and students, (d) budgetary concerns related to NCLB and lack of funding, (e) frustration at being held accountable for what is perceived as unattainable goals, (f) compromise of teaching practices because teachers feel forced to “teach the test” so that standardized test scores indicate the schools’ annual yearly progress (AYP), and (g) decreased teacher and student motivation. In addition, great concern existed about special education students being held to the same standard as other students. One participant explained that special education students receive instruction on their individual levels of ability but are tested at grade level standards. Students, teachers, and administrators are held accountable for special education students’ performance at grade level and this was described as unrealistic, impossible, unattainable, a joke, and one-size-fits-all idealism. One administrator likened the goal of getting every special education student to perform well on standardized tests to a police department being accountable for wiping out 100% of the crime in a large city.

Although most of the remarks about NCLB were negative, there were a few positive comments. One administrator opined that NCLB only worries “…those people
who refuse to strive for excellence.” Others explained that NCLB forced them to recruit only highly qualified teachers and that it forced principals to “be strong.” Some administrators explained that forcing more accountability would lead to improvement in some schools and some situations.

However, most of the comments provided by the administrators revealed their dim view of the act. Because of the added stress and concerns associated with NCLB many participants explained that the worries and accountability that it brought about led to burnout of administrators, teachers, and students. A concern was that students receive instruction meant to enhance performance on standardized tests instead of receiving instruction that addresses the needs of the whole child. In this vein, one administrator warned, “…education is more than reading, writing, and arithmetic.”

Another predicted, “NCLB will test our kids right out of school.” Many administrators mentioned the fact that teacher and student motivation was negatively affected because all the fun had been taken away from the learning process. Another was the problem of the teacher shortage and trying to retain teachers after NCLB. One administrator cited “a difficulty in finding teachers”, and another said, “Trying to constantly motivate teachers to not over stress and continue to remain in education has been a big problem”.

Several comments were made about the regional and cultural needs and differences of schools being “overlooked by the NCLB.” In this same line of reasoning, several comments were made about federal legislation beginning to edge out states’ autonomy regarding education. One participant explained the feeling of “big brother is watching you.” Another administrator described NCLB as “the worse educational scam
in American history”. Regarding NCLB's effect on job satisfaction, one administrator explained that it was “like a slave wondering among barbarians.”

Summary

Chapter IV presented the data derived from the survey responses of 153 out of a possible 355 high school principals in Mississippi. This was a 43.1% response rate. The data was examined to develop a comprehensive look at the (a) demographics of the principals in Mississippi, (b) the overall general job satisfaction of these principals, (c) the overall level of job satisfaction in relationship to the twenty dimensions of job satisfaction on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, (d) the relationship of demographic variables to job satisfaction for high school principals and (e) the effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on the general job satisfaction of principals in Mississippi.

Data analysis indicated that the high school principals in Mississippi were generally satisfied. They were most satisfied with their being able to do things that do not go against their moral values and beliefs, being able to see achievement and improvement in their schools, being able to stay active and involved, being able to use their abilities and training at a high level and being creative in what they do. They were least satisfied with their compensation levels. They were more satisfied with aspects of the job that were under their control than not. A significant finding was that as school rating based on the Mississippi Department of Education Rating scale increased so did the level of general job satisfaction.

Most principals affected by NCLB reported that their general job satisfaction levels have decreased. Principals reported that stress levels, workload, and accountability have increased while they are able to spend less time with their family, spouse or
significant other. Certainly, these factors would lead to a lower job satisfaction in any job setting. Qualitative findings also resulted in many negative feelings related to NCLB and its effects on the schools and job satisfaction. Some of these negative aspects dealt with funding, increased accountability and stress, loss of time, lowered teacher and student motivation levels, and the tendency of educators to “teach to the test”. On the positive side, Mississippi principals said that it forced them to be strong and only bothered those who refuse to strive for excellence. A major concern was policies dealing with special needs students and the seemingly unfairness of providing a modified or accommodated curriculum to these students but testing them under standardized conditions.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate various aspects of the job satisfaction of high school principals in Mississippi as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and to determine if the No Child Left Behind Act has had an effect on their job satisfaction. All high school principals in the state of Mississippi were mailed a questionnaire during the spring semester of the 2006 – 2007 school year and invited to participate. The MSQ measures general job satisfaction and relative satisfaction to twenty individual dimensions. The MSQ measured 20 dimensions:

1. Ability Utilization- The chance to do something that makes use of abilities
2. Achievement- The feeling of accomplishment one gets from the job
3. Activity- Being able to keep busy at all time
4. Advancement- The chances for advancement on the job
5. Authority- The chance to tell other people what to do
6. Company Policies and Procedures- The way company policies are implemented
7. Compensation- Feelings about pay in contrast to the amount of work completed
8. Coworkers- The way in which one interacts with coworkers
9. Creativity- The opportunity to try one’s own methods
10. Independence- The opportunity to work autonomously
11. Moral Values- The opportunity to do things that do not run counter to one’s beliefs
12. Recognition- The acknowledgement for a job well done
13. Responsibility- The freedom to implement one’s judgment
14. Security- The way a job provides for steady employment
15. Social Service- The opportunity to serve others
16. Social Status- Respect within the community
17. Supervision- The relationship between supervisors and employees
18. Supervision-Technical- The technical quality of supervision
19. Variety- The opportunity for diverse activities and tasks
20. Working conditions- The physical aspects of one’s place of employment

In addition, specific questions were asked of those principals who have been in the position both before and after the No Child Left Behind Act to see what, if any, effect NCLB has had on their job satisfaction levels. All of this data was compared to demographic information to see if any relationships could be determined. Job satisfaction of Mississippi’s principals is an important determinant in career decisions among these educational leaders. It was hoped that this research could provide insight into aspects of the job that may be incorporated into the recruitment and retention of high school principals in the future.

Summary of the Procedures

High school principals in the state of Mississippi were mailed the research packets and asked to complete the demographic information, the questions concerning the No Child Left Behind Act and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire during the spring of 2007. The packets were returned to the researcher by mail. Confidentiality was maintained throughout the study by limiting access of the response materials to the researcher. Only the researcher’s statistician had access to the tabulated results of the data. The data were analyzed using SPSS and the appropriate tests as described in
Chapter IV as they related to each variable. The 0.05 level of significance was used in testing the research questions of this study as well as to identify any relationships between the principal's general job satisfaction and the selected variables.

Summary of Major Findings

Six research questions were developed in this study to investigate the general job satisfaction of high school principals in the state of Mississippi and the twenty dimensions measured by the MSQ. Each research question was tested to determine whether a significant relationship existed between general job satisfaction, the (a.) demographic variables (age, gender, and race), (b.) salary, (c.) number of years as a principal, (d) years as an assistant principal, (e.) years in teaching before becoming a principal, (f.) school socio-economic status, (g.) school size, (h.) Mississippi School Rating, (i.) participant's highest level of education, (j.) and differences noted after the initiation of NCLB if the individual was a principal both before and after the initiation of NCLB.

The study sought to identify factors that influence the general job satisfaction of high school principals. The results of the data analysis indicate that there was no statistically significant difference between general job satisfaction relating to the demographics of public or private schools, gender, race, age, highest degree earned, or salary level.

Of the six research questions tested, only one of the questions had statistically significant findings. Research Question 3: As the school rating increased so did the general job satisfaction of the principal. Results were statistically significant when comparing the school rating based upon state testing and other factors to the general job
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satisfaction of the principal. As the rating of the school by the Mississippi Department of Education increased up the scale from 1 to 5, so did the principals' general job satisfaction. Post hoc analysis specifically showed that principals at the Superior Performing schools were statistically significantly higher in general job satisfaction than the Under Performing Schools. Post hoc analysis also showed that the Superior Performing Schools were statistically significantly higher than the Successfully Performing schools.

Overall, the high school principals in Mississippi were generally satisfied. They were most satisfied with their being able to do things that do not go against their moral values and beliefs, being able to see achievement and improvement in their schools, being able to stay active and involved, being able to use their abilities and training at a high level, and being creative in what they do. They were least satisfied with their compensation levels. They were more satisfied with aspects of the job that were under their control than those over which they had no control.

Concerning the No Child Left Behind Act, there were some weak correlations between some questions and the various dimensions measured on the MSQ. Higher accountability associated with NCLB had a weak correlation with issues involving human relations and how a supervisor handles their employees, this could be the result of feeling more pressure from supervisors to be successful and improve school test scores. NCLB Question 5 showed a correlation between devoting more time to the job and the possibility for advancement. Being visible more and spending more time on the job could lead to advancement, which in turn could elevate job satisfaction. There was a correlation with social status that could also be the result of higher visibility on
campus and in the classrooms. With No Child Left Behind increased stress was reported. As one's stress level increases, principals may view their job situation more in relation to pay. If stress or workload goes up and pay stays the same or does not increase on the same level, then you would expect job satisfaction to decrease. There was also a weak relationship between general job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ and the answer to NCLB Question 1, in which a majority of respondents stated that their job satisfaction had gone down since NCLB. Concerns were voiced about the NCLB Act.

Conclusions

Based on the data presented in the previous chapter, the following conclusions were made about the high school principal's general job satisfaction in the state of Mississippi. It should be noted that the results of this study cannot be generalized to any state other than Mississippi or to principals in either middle or elementary schools because only high school principals in Mississippi participated in the study. Interpretations are based solely on the data gathered during this study and the limitations described herein.

Of the variables investigated in this study, a school's ranking on the Mississippi Department of Education's rating scale was the only factor found to be statistically significant when compared to the principal's general job satisfaction. This would be expected as those schools rated successful and above would be less stressful work environments and would be in a position to receive more positive recognition than low performing or underperforming schools. Job security might also be a factor that leads to job satisfaction in schools with higher success ratings. Those working at successfully rated or higher schools might have a greater sense of security than do principals of
underperforming schools. The research revealed that general job satisfaction was not related to any other variables in the research.

Even though not statistically significant there are some interesting trends that are borne out in the results. As school size increased so did the satisfaction level. Small school principals had a mean of 3.86 (SD = .52) while the largest school principals had a mean of 4.15 (SD = .59). It would seem logical that smaller schools would be easier to manage and less stressful. On the other hand, since salaries are usually correlated with school size this could explain why schools principals in larger schools are more satisfied; they receive greater compensation. Also smaller schools may have fewer personnel available and thus a larger workload might fall upon administrators. Furthermore, smaller schools may not have an assistant principals or staff to help in other areas. Small schools may offer less program options and therefore force the school principal of smaller schools to assume more responsibilities that could be delegated to someone else in a larger school. This should be investigated further to explore reasons for this increase of general job satisfaction in larger schools. Results of further studies could provide insight into improvement of job satisfaction that could be valuable in recruiting and retaining principals in the future.

Those principals with a Doctorate Degree, with a mean of 4.05 (SD = .59) were more satisfied than those with a Masters degree, mean of 3.93 (SD = .53) or those with an Education Specialist Degree with a mean of 3.85 (SD = .63). Logically one would assume that a higher degree would further prepare a principal at a higher level and in return make the job less stressful and possibly more rewarding. But those with an
Education Specialist degree have the lowest reported job satisfaction. Why? This, too, is a question that may warrant further study.

It would be easy to assume that a higher compensation level would coincide with a higher level of job satisfaction. This study found that as pay increased so did the job satisfaction. This was true except for those in the $70,001 to $80,000 salary range, this range revealed a slight drop in job satisfaction. This may be because this was by far the largest group and the size alone accounts for the slight decrease. Another question arose as to why principals rated compensation at the bottom of the dimensions for job satisfaction. This may be answered by how compensation is defined. One individual may consider compensation to be the total package including all benefits while others may only consider the direct salary. In the same light what one compares their salary to may also fit into the equation. Principals may have compared their salary to those of teachers. If the administrators felt they were being paid a substantial amount more than teachers were and that the pay was fair for the administrative role they performed, then may have felt satisfied with their compensation. On the other hand, if administrators felt that they did much more on the job than teachers and that administrative pay was only slightly above teacher pay in their district then they may be less satisfied. If a principal compared their compensation to those outside of the profession with comparable degrees, years of experience, and job responsibilities, then they may be highly dissatisfied since most workers in business make more than teachers or administrators with comparable experience and education. This is another area, which warrants further investigation.

Perhaps the use of qualitative methods could help to determine just how principals view
their compensation, what they are comparing it to, why they feel it is not high enough, and what do they see as fair compensation for the role they assume in education.

Moral Values, Activity, and Achievement were three aspects of the job that contributed to high satisfaction of the respondents in this study. It is encouraging for aspiring principals to know that principals find satisfaction in keeping busy with a variety of activities and tasks associated with their jobs, and that these activities, tasks and responsibilities do not conflict with their religious beliefs and moral values. The wide scope of responsibilities and roles that principals assume utilize many skills and talents as well as offer many challenges to administrators. The variety and opportunities for creativity within the role as administrator may be what many people find attractive about the job. Another positive aspect of the job was the fact that administrators did not feel conflicted by issues related to morals or values.

Achievement, Activity, Ability, Creativity, Variety, Working Conditions and Co-workers, and Other Dimensions have a mean of 4.03 and above. One can speculate that the reason for such high satisfaction levels in these areas was mainly because the school is considered a social system made up of students, teachers, support staff, paraprofessionals, specialists, volunteers, and administrators. The principal as leader of this system is constantly interacting with groups and individuals by advising, recommending, praising, and encouraging others toward the attainment of school goals. When schools are successful, achievement is recognized and celebrated. This includes recognition and celebration of administrators who act as leaders of successful schools. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 2, individuals who enter education are more intrinsically motivated and receive high levels of satisfaction from what they accomplish.
and help others accomplish. Being able to work in an environment that allows for achievement through their activity, ability and creativity would allow them to gain high levels of satisfaction from this environment. Principals deliver services to other people that create opportunities for others to derive satisfaction from the work that they perform. In return, principals derive satisfaction because they have created a sense of satisfaction for others.

Implications

The overall general job satisfaction of high school principals in Mississippi is above average. However, there are certain recommendations that can be made to help improve recruiting and retention of principals in the future. The following recommendations are based on the results of this study. It is hoped that state and local policy makers, superintendents, and school administrators will use these recommendations to initiate actions and create conditions that will enhance the satisfaction of high school principals in Mississippi. These recommendations may also be useful for those who provide (a.) in-service training for principals, (b.) staff development for school district leadership, (c.) college programs for prospective administrators, and (d) mentoring opportunities for administrators.

Based on the responses to the MSQ, it appeared that high school principals in Mississippi are satisfied with their positions. State policy makers, school boards, and superintendents should put forth effort to either maintain this level of satisfaction or increase it to a higher level in order to promote positive perceptions for this important position and potentially increase the recruiting and retention of high quality individuals in
these positions. This can be done by increasing satisfaction for Recognition, Advancement, Responsibility, and Compensation in the following manners:

1. Satisfaction level for Recognition can be improved by recognizing principals when they successfully attain a school goal or maintain or improve upon a Mississippi school rating of successful or higher. Recognition can include public statements and awards, as well as private statements of praise and congratulations.

2. The satisfaction level for Advancement can be improved by encouraging qualified principals to apply for principal positions in affluent and large schools or central office positions.

3. The satisfaction level for Responsibility could be increased by giving principals more autonomy in running their schools and by increasing site based management principles. Allowing administrators to employ innovative ideas and creative solutions might help schools overcome problems that are unique to their school’s situations.

4. Compensation ranked the lowest in the individual dimensions of satisfaction. School boards as well as the Mississippi State Board of Education need to ensure that principal salaries are competitive across the state and are at national averages or higher. As discussed in Chapter 2, current research shows that there is a shortage of qualified principal applicants in part due to dissatisfaction with compensation levels. If the state of Mississippi is to remain competitive with other states in attracting new applicants to replace those principals who are leaving or retiring, then salaries must be brought into line with other states and other those professions outside of education. Today’s job applicants are able to compare salaries and benefits packages at the click of mouse, and
the youth of today are savvy enough to look for jobs and locations that offer competitive pay.

Limitations

This research was limited by sample size, data collection instrument, and geographical considerations. The sample was limited to the high school principals in the State of Mississippi. The results may not apply to high school principals outside the State of Mississippi.

Recommendations for Further Research

In consideration of the data collected and reported within, utilizing information obtained in the review of literature related to the study of high school principal’s job satisfaction the following recommendations are made for further research:

1. It is recommended that future studies be conducted to examine further the role of school size in the job satisfaction of high school principals.

2. Although the level of job satisfaction is relatively high at this time, longitudinal and interval studies could be repeated to determine if changes do occur over time.

3. Similar studies should be conducted to determine and compare the general job satisfaction of middle and elementary school principals in the State of Mississippi.

4. A study should be conducted to investigate how the level of job satisfaction of school principals affects job performance and effectiveness of the teachers working under them and the success rate of students.

5. Further study should be done on the effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on the levels of job satisfaction of principals and the stresses associated with NCLB.
   The issues related to budget constraints, high stakes testing, special education, and
accountability should be examined to see how these factors affect retention, satisfaction, and performance of principals in all levels from kindergarten through high school.

6. A similar study of this type could be conducted using qualitative methods to interview principals and gain more in-depth insight regarding their job satisfaction. These studies may reveal concerns and issues not addressed in this study.

7. Issues dealing with compensation should be investigated since this was the area rated the lowest by the participants. This could also involve an investigation and comparison to national high school principals' salaries to see where Mississippi stands in relation to the rest of the nation.

Summary

In this study, the researcher used both responses to the MSQ and self-constructed questions to investigate the general job satisfaction and job satisfaction related to the 20 dimensions measured by the MSQ and the No Child Left Behind Act. This research was designed to provide practical data to those in the field that could be related to recognize and address job satisfaction issues used to increase the recruiting and retention of high school principals by improving their overall job satisfaction. It is evident that more research needs to be done in this area, especially as it relates to how the No Child Left Behind Act has influenced the job satisfaction felt by school administrators.

The findings revealed that there were no statistically significant differences based on general demographic issues, but school performance and school size issues could be determining factors.
The relationships among a principal’s job satisfaction and teacher and student performance were not investigated; further research in these areas is indicated. If a cause-and-effect relationship exists in either of these areas, job satisfaction could possibly have an effect on school performance. Furthermore, a closer look should be taken at relationships between the No Child Left Behind Act and principal’s job satisfaction. If NCLB is causing a decrease in satisfaction, this could lead to burnout and higher turnover in the profession.

From analyzing the age demographics of the high school principals who participated in this study, it can be predicted that about 20% of them will be retiring in the next five years. Job satisfaction is a critical issue in the recruitment and retention of principals. Stresses like those produced by NCLB and the normal day-to-day concerns that come with the position (e.g. teacher shortage, demands of parents, accountability, and plethora of paperwork) all detract from job satisfaction. There is no resolution in sight for these issues. Until support systems are determined and put into place or compensation and benefits that offset these stressors are offered, there may a future shortage of high school principals. Until then, all stakeholders in the school systems will suffer these effects of dissatisfied administrators.
Letter Requesting Use of Amended Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

6490 US Hwy 49 North
Apt. 246
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
geoffryhaines@comcast.net
601-544-9483

February 10, 2007

Dr. David Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
N65 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344

Dear Dr. Weiss:

I am a graduate student at the University of Southern Mississippi. After reviewing several professionally prepared questionnaires dealing with the topic of Job Satisfaction I have decided to use the long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for my dissertation research. My committee has approved the use of the instrument for the study. My dissertation project is entitled Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among High School Principals in Mississippi. I will be mailing the questionnaire to 363 public and private high schools in the state.

The research is also looking at aspects of demographics and the no child left behind act as they relate to job satisfaction. For this reason, I would like to modify the demographics page of your instrument and have added a series of questions pertaining to job satisfaction as related to the No Child Left Behind Act. I have enclosed a copy of the questionnaire, as I would like to use it in my research.

If this meets with your approval, I would take care of all printing of the document. I would need a letter from you giving me permission to use the document and the amount of the royalty fee I would be required to pay for its use. We will be scoring the instrument here at the university. My statistician is Dr. James Johnson.

If this would not meet with your approval, please indicate to me what I would have to do to be able to use your instrument. Your help and consideration in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Upon receipt of your reply, I will forward to you the Qualifications and Registration Form with a check for the royalty fees. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Geoffry Alan Haines
Doctoral Candidate
The University of Southern Mississippi
APPENDIX B

LETTER GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

6490 US Hwy 49 North
Apt. 246
Hattiesburg, MS 39401
geoffryhaines@comcast.net
601-544-9483

May 1, 2007

Dear High School Principal:

Thank you in advance for your help and consideration in participating in this research project. Your help and the time you are taking to complete the survey are greatly appreciated.

This investigation is research for a Doctorate Dissertation on Predictors of Job Satisfaction of High School Principals in Mississippi. Research shows that there is a decline in the number of individuals entering the profession of secondary school administrators on a national level. The purpose of this study is to investigate the job satisfaction of current principals and to investigate various aspects of the job in relation to the level of job satisfaction.

There are no known risks from participation in this survey. Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted) the researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. The participation in this survey will be kept in strictest confidence and no results of individual participants will be released in any form. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and subjects may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits.

It should take approximately 15-20 minutes for you to complete this short questionnaire. Please answer the questions honestly and completely. If you wish to make any comments please feel free to do so on an additional sheet of paper and enclose it with your survey form.

Again your help is greatly appreciated. If you would like a copy of the results of the survey you may contact me at the above address. Receipt of your questionnaire will serve as you informed consent to participate. Questions concerning the research should be directed to the researcher: Geoffry Alan Haines. This project and consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Sincerely,

Geoffry Alan Haines
Doctoral Candidate
The University of Southern Mississippi
APPENDIX D

IRB COMMITTEE APPROVAL
APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHICS AND NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND QUESTIONNAIRE

Confidential

Your answers to the questions and all other information you give will be held in the strictest confidence.

I. Demographic Information:

1. Gender: (check one)
   
   ____ Male
   ____ Female

2. Age: (write in) ___________

3. Ethnicity: (check one)
   
   ____ American Indian or Alaska Native
   ____ Asian
   ____ Black Non-Hispanic
   ____ Black Hispanic
   ____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   ____ White Non-Hispanic
   ____ White Hispanic
   ____ Multi-Racial

4. Individual Annual Salary: (check one)
   
   ____ Below $20,000
   ____ $20,001 - $30,000
   ____ $30,001 - $40,000
   ____ $40,001 - $50,000
   ____ $50,001 - $60,000
   ____ $60,001 - $70,000
   ____ $70,001 - $80,000
   ____ $80,001 - $90,000
   ____ $90,001 - $100,000
   ____ Above $100,000

5. Experience as a Teacher before becoming and administrator:
Never served as a teacher
Number of years (write in)

6. Experience as an Assistant Principal before becoming a Principal: (check one)

Never served as an Assistant Principal
Number of years (write in)

7. Experience as a Principal (including this year):

Number of years (write in)

8. Education Level: Highest Degree Earned (check one)

Bachelor’s
Master’s
Specialist’s
Doctorate

School Information

9. Is your school: (check one)

Public
Private

10. If you are in a Public School, what is your school’s Mississippi Board of Education School Rating as assigned by the Mississippi Department of Education? (check one)

5 – Superior
4 – Exemplary
3 – Successful
2 – Under Performing
1 – Low-Performing

11. School Size: (check one)

Fewer than 500 students grades 9 – 12
500 – 999 students grades 9 – 12
More than 1000 students 9 - 12

12. School Socio-economic level: (write in)

% of students eligible to receive free and reduced price lunch.
If you were working as a Principal before the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act please answer the following questions, if not please go to the next page and continue with the questionnaire.

Please answer the following questions using the following scale: (circle one)

1 = Strongly Disagree  2 = Disagree  3 = Neutral  4 = Agree  5 = Strongly Agree

13. My level of job satisfaction has improved since the No Child Left Behind Act.
   1  2  3  4  5

14. My stress level has increased since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.
   1  2  3  4  5

15. My workload has increased since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.
   1  2  3  4  5

16. My level of accountability has increased since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.
   1  2  3  4  5

17. I devote more time to my job since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.
   1  2  3  4  5

18. I spend more time as an instructional leader since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.
   1  2  3  4  5

19. I spend more time with my family/significant others since the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act.
   1  2  3  4  5

20. Please write a short statement on the back of this page as to the effects that the No Child Left Behind Act has had on your job satisfaction and what aspects of the Act are the most challenging to you as a principal. **When you have completed this statement, please go to the next page and complete the survey.**
APPENDIX G

MAILING LIST FOR MISSISSIPPI HIGH SCHOOLS
Downloaded from the Mississippi Department of Education Website April 15, 2006

Natchez-Adams School District
Natchez High School
319 Sergeant Prentiss drive
Natchez, MS 39120

Amite County School District
Amite County High School
P O Box 328
Liberty, MS 39645

Fallin Career and Technology Center
319 Sergeant Prentiss drive
Natchez, MS 39120

Amite County Voc Complex
P O Box 770
Liberty, MS 39645

Alcorn School District
Biggersville High School
571 Highway 45
Corinth, MS 38834

Ethel High School
P O Box 128
Ethel, MS 39067

Alcorn Central High School
8 CR 254
Glen, MS 38846

McAdams High School
P O Box 127
McAdams, MS 39107

Kossuth High School
15 Country Road 604
Kossuth, MS 38835

Kosciusko School District
Kosciusko Senior High School
206 S Huntington
Kosciusko, MS 39090

Rienzi Educational Center
21 School Street
Rienzi, MS 38865
Phone: (662) 462-5214

Kosciusko Attala Co Voc Complex
450 Hwy 12 East
Kosciusko, MS 39090

Alcorn Vocational Technical Center
Norman Road
Corinth, MS 38834

Benton County School District

Corinth School District
Corinth High School
1310 Harper Road
Corinth, MS 38834

Ashland High School
101 School Street
Ashland, MS 38603

Benton Vocational Center
Route 2, Box 42AA
Ashland, MS 38603
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hickory Flat Attendance Center</td>
<td>Cleveland Career Development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Center</td>
<td>601 Third Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland, MS 38732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bolivar School District</td>
<td>Walter C. Robinson Achievement Center</td>
<td>Third Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland, MS 38732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bolivar School District</td>
<td>Shaw School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bolivar High School</td>
<td>Shaw High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>498 Bradford Street</td>
<td>P O Box 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosedale, MS 38769</td>
<td>Shaw, MS 38773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Barnes Vocational/Technical Center</td>
<td>John F Kennedy Memorial High School</td>
<td>204 Edwards Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mound Bayou, MS 38762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit School District</td>
<td>Calhoun County School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce High School</td>
<td>P O Box 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce, MS 38915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland School District</td>
<td>Calhoun City High School</td>
<td>P O 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calhoun City, MS 38916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland High School</td>
<td>Vardaman High School</td>
<td>P O Box 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vardaman, MS 38878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side High School</td>
<td>Carroll County School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Z George High School</td>
<td>P O Box 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Carrollton, MS 38947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes Cooper Center</td>
<td>Chickasaw County School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearlman Accelerated School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston School District</td>
<td>Houston High School</td>
<td>P O Drawer 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Voc Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>P O Drawer 608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okolona Separate School District</td>
<td>Okolona High School</td>
<td>404 Winter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okolona Voc Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>605 North Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw County School District</td>
<td>Ackerman High School</td>
<td>280 E Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weir Attendance Center</td>
<td>Rt. 1 Box B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claiborne County School District</td>
<td>Port Gibson High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Technical Complex</td>
<td>P O Box 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise School District</td>
<td>Enterprise High School</td>
<td>501 River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quitman School District</td>
<td>Quitman High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarke Co Vocational Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Point School District</td>
<td>West Point High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Point Career And Technology Center</td>
<td>P O Box 1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coahoma County School District</td>
<td>Coahoma County High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coahoma Agricultural High School District</td>
<td>3240 Friars Point Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clarksdale High School
School Street
Clarksdale, MS 38614

Seminary High School
P O Box 34
Seminary, MS 39479

Heidelberg School
Maple at Anderson Boulevard
Clarksdale 38614

Covington County Vo-Tech Center
P O Drawer 1268
Collins, MS 39428

Kirkpatrick School
Smith Street
Clarksdale, MS 38614

DeSoto County School District

Carl Keen Voc-Tech
Walnut Street
Clarksdale, ms 38614

Hernando High School
805 Dilworth Lane
Hernando, MS 38632

Copiah County School District

Crystal Springs High School
201 Newton Street
Crystal Springs, MS 39059

Horn Lake High School
6125 Hurt Road
Horn Lake, MS 38637

Wesson Attendance School
1048 Grove Street
Wesson, MS 39191

Southaven High School
899 Rasco Road
Southaven, MS 38671

Hazlehurst City School District

Horn Lake High School
6125 Hurt Road
Horn Lake, MS 38637

Hazlehurst High School
101 S Haley Street
Hazlehurst, MS 39083

DeSoto County Career Technical Center
847 Rasco Road
Southaven, MS 38671

Covington County School District

Collins High School
P O Box 1479
Collins, MS 39428

Forrest County School District

Mount Olive High School
P O Box 309
Mount Olive, MS 39119

North Forrest High School
693 Eatonville Road
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

Forrest County Agricultural High School
P O Box 399
Brooklyn, MS 39425
Hattiesburg Public School District
Hattiesburg High School Blair Center
301 Hutchinson Avenue
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

Petal School District
Petal High School
1145 Hwy 42 E
Petal, MS 39465

Franklin County School District
Franklin High School
P O Box 666
Meadville, MS 39653

Franklin Voc Tech Complex
P O Box 155
Meadville, MS 39653

George County School District
George County High School
9284 Hwy 63S
Lucedale, MS 39452

Greene County School District
Greene County High School
Route 1 Box 12
100 Wildcat Alley
Leakesville, MS 39451

Greene County Vocational Technical
Route 2 Box 266
Hwy 57 South
Leakesville, MS 39451

Grenada School District
Grenda High School
1875 Fairground Road
Grenada, MS 38901

Tie Plant School
809 Tie Plant Road
Grenada, MS 38901

Grenada Career & Technical Center
2035 Jackson Avenue
Grenada, MS 38901

Hancock County School District
Hancock High School
7084 Stennis Airport Drive
Kiln, MS 39556

Hancock County Vocational Center
7180 Airport Road
Kiln, MS 39556

Bay St Louis Waveland School District
Bay St. Louis High School
750 Blue Meadow Road
Bay St Louis, MS 39520

Harrison County School District
D'Iberville Senior High School
3320 Warrior Drive
D'Iberville, MS 39532

Harrison Central High School
15600 School Road
Gulfport, MS 39503

Harrison County Vo-Tech
15600 School Road
Gulfport, MS 39503

Biloxi Public School District
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Biloxi High School
1424 Father Ryan Avenue
Biloxi, MS 39531

R D Brown Vocational Center
P O Box 168
Biloxi, MS 39533

Gulfport School District
Gulfport High School
100 Perry Street
Gulfport, MS 39507

Long Beach School District
Long Beach Senior High School
300 E Old Pass Road
Long Beach, MS 39560

Pass Christian Public School District
Pass Christian High School
270 W Second Street
Pass Christian, MS 39571

Hinds County School District
Terry High School
P O Box 129
Terry, MS 39170

Raymond High School
P O Box 759
Raymond, MS 39154

Career Center
14020 Highway 18
P.O. Box 789
Raymond, MS 39154

Hinds County Agricultural High School
P O Box 1089
Utica, MS 39175

Jackson Public School District
Bailey Magnet High
1900 North State Street
Jackson, MS 39202

Callaway High
601 Beasley Road
Jackson, MS 39206

Career Development Center
2703 First Avenue
Jackson, MS 39209

Forest Hill High
2607 Raymond Road
Jackson, MS 39212

Lanier High
833 West Maple Street
Jackson, MS 39203

Murrah High
1400 Murrah Drive
Jackson, MS 39202

Provine High
2400 Robinson Street
Jackson, MS 39209

Wingfield High
1985 Scanlon Drive
Jackson, MS 39204

Clinton Public School District
Clinton High School
401 Arrow Drive
Clinton, MS 39056

Clinton Career Complex
713 Lakeview Drive
Clinton, MS 39056
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holmes County School District</th>
<th>South Delta Vocational Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williams Sullivan High School</td>
<td>600 S Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14494 Hwy 51 South</td>
<td>Rolling Fork, MS 39159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durant, MS 39063</td>
<td>Itawamba County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J J McClain High School</td>
<td>Mantachie High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9479 Brozeville Rd.</td>
<td>P O Box 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, MS 39095</td>
<td>Mustang Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S V Marshall High School</td>
<td>Itawamba Agricultural High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12572 Hwy 12 East</td>
<td>11900 Hwy 25 South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchula, MS 39169</td>
<td>Fulton, MS 38843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes County Vocational Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P O Box 390</td>
<td>Itawamba County Voc-Tech Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, MS 39095</td>
<td>P O Box 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durant Public School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durant High School</td>
<td>Jackson County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P O Box 669</td>
<td>East Central High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 West Madison Street</td>
<td>P O Box 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durant, MS 39063</td>
<td>Hurley, MS 39555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys County School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys County High School</td>
<td>St Martin High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 Cohn Street</td>
<td>10800 Yellow Jacket Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belzoni, MS 39038</td>
<td>Ocean Springs, MS 39564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys County Vocational Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 Fourth Street</td>
<td>Vancleave High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P O Box 672</td>
<td>12424 Hwy 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belzoni, MS 39038</td>
<td>Vancleave, MS 39565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Delta School District</td>
<td>Jackson County Vocational Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Delta High School</td>
<td>12425 Hwy 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 S Parkway</td>
<td>Vancleave, MS 39565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Fork, MS 39159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Point Separate School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Point High School</td>
<td>Moss Point High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4913 Weems Street</td>
<td>4913 Weems Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Point, MS 39563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moss Point Vocational Center  
4924 Church Street  
Moss Point, MS 39563  

Ocean Springs School District

Ocean Springs High School  
2320 Government Street  
Ocean Springs, MS 39564

Elizabeth H Keys Technology Center  
2401 School St  
Ocean Springs, MS 39564

Pascagoula School District

Gautier High School  
4307 Gautier/Vancleave Road  
Gautier, MS 39553

Pascagoula High School  
1716 Tucker Avenue  
Pascagoula, MS 39567

Pascagoula Opportunity Center  
1520 Tucker Avenue E  
Pascagoula, MS 39567

East Jasper School District

Heidelberg High School  
P O Drawer M  
Heidelberg, MS 39439

West Jasper School District

Bay Springs High School  
P O Box 389  
Bay Springs, MS 39422

Stringer Attendance Center  
P O Box 68  
Stringer, MS 39481

Jefferson County School District

Jefferson County High School  
Route 1 Box 266  
Fayette, MS 39069

Fayette Vocational Center  
Route 2 Box 35E  
Fayette, MS 39069

Jefferson Davis County School District

Bassfield High School  
P O Box 370  
Bassfield, MS 39421

Prentiss Jr/Sr High School  
P O Box 1168  
Prentiss, MS 39474

Jeff Davis County Vocational Technical Center  
P O Drawer 70  
Carson, MS 39427

Jones County School District

Northeast Jones High School  
68 Northeast Drive  
Laurel, MS 39440

West Jones High School  
254 Springhill Road  
Laurel, MS 39440

A P Fatherree Voc-Tech School  
2409 Moose Drive  
Laurel, MS 39440

Pine Belt Educational Center  
P O Box 6441  
Laurel, MS 39441

Laurel School District
Laurel High School
1100 West 12th Street
Laurel, MS 39440

R H Watkins High School
1100 West 12th Street
Laurel, MS 39440

R H Watkins Voc- Complex
1100 West 11th Street
Laurel, MS 39440

Kemper County School District
Kemper County High School
P O Box 429
Dekalb, MS 39328

Oxford Public School District
Oxford High School
222 Bramlett Boulevard
Oxford, MS 38655

LaFayette County School District
LaFayette High School
160 CR 404
Oxford, MS 38655

Oxford-Lafayette School of Applied Technology
134 Hwy. 7 South
Oxford, MS 38655

Lamar County School District
Oak Grove Attendance Center
2543 Old Hwy 24
Hattiesburg, MS 39402

Purvis High School
220 School St.
Purvis, MS 39475

Sumrall Middle/High School
Center Street
Sumrall, MS 39482

Lamar County Voc-Tech Center
College Street
Purvis, MS 39475

Lumberton Public School District
Lumberton High School
P O Box 551
Lumberton, MS 39455

Lauderdale County School District
Clarkdale Attendance Center
7000 Hwy South
Meridian, MS 39301

Northeast High School
702 Briarwood Road
Meridian, MS 39305

Southeast High School
2361 Longcreek Vimiville Road
Meridian, MS 39301

West Lauderdale High School
9916 West Lauderdale Road
Collinsville, MS 39325

Bonita Educational Center
730 Oak Drive
Meridian, MS 39301

Meridian Public School District
Meridian High School
2320 32nd Street
Meridian, MS 39305
Ross Collins Vocational Center  
2640 24th Avenue  
Meridian, MS 39305

Marion Park Complex  
2815 25th Street  
Meridian, MS 39301

Lawrence County School District  
Lawrence County High School  
703 Tommy Jolly Drive  
Monticello, MS 39654

New Hebron Attendance Center  
120 Main Avenue Ext.  
New Hebron, MS 39140

Topeka Tilton Attendance Center  
Hwy 27 South  
Monticello, MS 39654

Lawrence County Technology & Career Center  
P O Box 578  
Monticello, MS 39654

Leake County School District  
Carthage High School  
704 N Jordan Street  
Carthage, MS 39051

South Leake High School  
P O Box 159  
Spruce Street  
Walnut Grove, MS 39189

Edinburg Attendance Center  
Route 8 Box 103  
Mars Hill Road  
Carthage, MS 39051

Thomastown Attendance Center  
Route 2 Box 345  
7100 Hwy 429  
Carthage, MS 39051

Leake County Vocational Technical Center  
703 N West Street  
Carthage, MS 39051

Tupelo Public School District  
Tupelo High School  
4125 Cliff Gookin Street  
Tupelo, MS 38801

The Filmore Center  
903 Fillmore Drive  
Tupelo, MS 38801

Lee County School District  
Mooreville High School  
P O Box 60  
Mooreville, MS 38857

Saltillo High School  
P O Box 460  
Saltillo, MS 38866

Shannon High School  
P O Box 8  
Shannon, MS 38868

Nettleton School District  
Nettleton High School  
Maple Street  
Nettleton, MS 38858

LeFlore County School District
Amanda Elzy High School
Route 4 Box 100
Greenwood, MS 38930

T Y Fleming School
Route 2 Box 1A
Minter City, MS 38944

LeFlore County High School
P O Box 564
Itta Bena, MS 38941

LeFlore County Vocational Center
P O Box 1158
Greenwood, MS 38930

Greenwood Public School District

Greenwood High School
1209 Garrard Avenue
Greenwood, MS 38930

Greenwood Career & Technical Center
Sycamore Avenue
Greenwood, MS 38930

Lincoln County School District

Bogue Chitto Attendance Center
385 West Monticello Street
Bogue Chitto, MS 39629

Enterprise Attendance Center
1601 Hwy 583 SE
Brookhaven, MS 39601

West Lincoln High School
948 Jackson Liberty Drive SW
Brookhaven, MS 39601

Brookhaven School District

Brookhaven High School
443 E Monticello Street
Brookhaven, MS 39601

Brookhaven Technical Center
325 E Court Street
Brookhaven, MS 39601

Columbus Municipal School District

Columbus High School
215 Hemlock
Columbus, MS 39702

Franklin Academy
501 N Third Avenue
Columbus, MS 39701

McKellar Technology Center
810 N Browder Street
Columbus, MS 39702

Lowndes County School District

Caledonia High School
111 Confederate Drive
Caledonia, MS 39740

Stokes Beard Magnet School
311 Martin Luther King Drive
Columbus, MS 39701

West Lowndes High School
1380 Motley Road
Columbus, MS 39701

New Hope High School
3419 New Hope Road
Columbus, MS 39702

Lowndes County Vocational Complex
664 Frontage Road
Columbus, MS 39701
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madison County School District</th>
<th>Holly Springs School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Commerce Center</td>
<td>Holly Springs High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633 West Peace Street</td>
<td>165 N Walthall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton, MS 39046</td>
<td>Holly Springs, MS 38635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Central High School</td>
<td>Holly Springs Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417 Highland Colony Parkway</td>
<td>Technical 410 E Falconer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, MS 39110</td>
<td>Holly Springs, MS 38635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeland High School</td>
<td>Marshall County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586 Sunnybrook Road</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeland, MS 39158</td>
<td>Byhalia High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velma Jackson High School</td>
<td>300 Hwy 309 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Loring Road</td>
<td>Byhalia, MS 38611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden, MS 39045</td>
<td>Monroe County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Public School District</td>
<td>Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton High School</td>
<td>40201 Hamilton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529 N Mace Street</td>
<td>Hamilton, MS 39746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton, MS 39046</td>
<td>Hatley High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Career Center</td>
<td>60186 Hatley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487 N Union Extension</td>
<td>Amory, MS 38821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton, MS 39046</td>
<td>Monroe County Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County School District</td>
<td>Technical 50057 Airport Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Marion High School</td>
<td>Aberdeen, MS 39730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 East Marion School Road</td>
<td>Aberdeen School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, MS 39429</td>
<td>Aberdeen High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Loftin Vocational</td>
<td>P. O. Drawer 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Career Center</td>
<td>100 Bulldog Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140 Hwy 13 South</td>
<td>Aberdeen, MS 39730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, MS 39429</td>
<td>Shivers Jr High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia School District</td>
<td>P. O. Drawer 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia High School</td>
<td>316 N. Franklin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009 Broad Street</td>
<td>Aberdeen, MS 39730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, MS 39429</td>
<td>Amory School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amory High School
Sam Haskell Circle
Amory, MS 38821

Amory Vocational Technical Complex
1006 N Boulevard Drive
Amory, MS 38821

Montgomery County School District
Montgomery County High School
1003 Money Avenue
Kilmichael, MS 39747

Winona Separate School District
Winona High School
301 Fairground Street
Winona, MS 38967

The Tom Dulin Career & Technical Center
300 N Applegate Street
Winona, MS 38967

Neshoba County School District
Neshoba Central High School
1125 Golf Course Road
Philadelphia, MS 39350

Philadelphia Public School District
Philadelphia High School
248 Byrd Avenue
Philadelphia, MS 39350

Newton Municipal School District
Newton High School
201 W First Street
Newton, MS 39345

Newton Career Center
203 W First Street
Newton, MS 39345

Union Public School District
Union High School
101 Forest Street
Union, MS 39365

Newton County School District
Newton County High School
P O Box 278 16255 Highway 503
Decatur, MS 39327

Newton County Career & Technical P O Box 742
Hwy 15 N
Decatur, MS 39327

Noxubee County School District
Noxubee County High School
P O Box 490
Macon, MS 39341

Noxubee County Voc-Tech School
P O Box 387
Macon, MS 39341

Oktibbeha County School District
West Oktibbeha County High School
2459 Holland Street
Maben, MS 39750

East Oktibbeha County High School
1780 Moor High Road
Crawford, MS 39743

Starkville School District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starkville High School</td>
<td>Starkville High School</td>
<td>603 Yellowjacket Drive</td>
<td>Starkville</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millsaps Vocational Center</td>
<td>Millsaps Vocational Center</td>
<td>803 Louisville Road</td>
<td>Starkville</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Panola School District</td>
<td>North Panola High School</td>
<td>Hwy 51 N</td>
<td>Sardis</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>38666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Panola Vocational Center</td>
<td>North Panola Vocational Center</td>
<td>Compress Road</td>
<td>Como</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>38619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Panola School District</td>
<td>South Panola High School</td>
<td>P O Box 600</td>
<td>Batesville</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>38606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batesville Jr High School</td>
<td>Batesville Jr High School</td>
<td>507 Tiger Drive</td>
<td>Batesville</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>38606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Panola High School</td>
<td>South Panola High School</td>
<td>P O Box 600</td>
<td>Batesville</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>38606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl River County School District</td>
<td>Pearl River Central High School</td>
<td>5853 Highway 11 Carriere</td>
<td>Carriere</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picayune School District</td>
<td>Picayune Memorial High School</td>
<td>800 Fifth Avenue</td>
<td>Picayune</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picayune School District</td>
<td>PMHS Career&amp; Technology Center</td>
<td>600 Goodyear Boulevard</td>
<td>Picayune</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplarville Municipal School District</td>
<td>Poplarville Jr/Sr High School</td>
<td>1301 S Main Street</td>
<td>Poplarville</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplarville Career Development Center</td>
<td>Poplarville Career Development Center</td>
<td>1301 S Main Street</td>
<td>Poplarville</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry County School District</td>
<td>Perry Central High School</td>
<td>Hwy 98 E</td>
<td>New Augusta</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry County Vocational Complex</td>
<td>Perry County Vocational Complex</td>
<td>Hwy 98 E</td>
<td>New Augusta</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richton School District</td>
<td>Richton High School</td>
<td>701 Elm Avenue</td>
<td>Richton</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pike School District</td>
<td>South Pike High School</td>
<td>205 W Myrtle Street</td>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pike Vocational Center</td>
<td>South Pike Vocational Center</td>
<td>252 W Bay Street</td>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McComb School District</td>
<td>McComb High School</td>
<td>310 Seventh Street</td>
<td>McComb</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Technology Center</td>
<td>1003 Virginia Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McComb, MS 39648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pike School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pike Sr High School</td>
<td>1044 Jaguar Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit, MS 39666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc County School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pontotoc High School</td>
<td>8324 Hwy 15 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecru, MS 38841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc Ridge Vocational Technical Center</td>
<td>354 Center Ridge Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc, MS 38863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc City Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc High School</td>
<td>132 N Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc, MS 38863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentiss County School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumpertown High School</td>
<td>717 Hwy 4 W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booneville, MS 38829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Site High School</td>
<td>1020 Hwy 4 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Site, MS 38859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrasher High School</td>
<td>167 CR 1040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booneville, MS 38829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentiss County Vocational Technical School</td>
<td>302 W George E Allen Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booneville, MS 38829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwyn Public School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwyn High School</td>
<td>512 Hwy 145 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwyn, MS 38824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booneville School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booneville High School</td>
<td>300 B W George E Allen Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booneville, MS 38829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitman County School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Shannon Palmer High School Grades 8-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. Box 350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks, Mississippi 38646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitman County Vocational School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 3 South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks, Mississippi 38646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankin County School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon High School</td>
<td>408 College Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon, MS 39042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence High School</td>
<td>232 Hwy 469 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, MS 39073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Rankin High School</td>
<td>Pike 151</td>
<td>5805 Hwy 25</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisgah High School</td>
<td>Mendenhall High School</td>
<td>115 Pisgah High Road</td>
<td>Sandhill</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland High School</td>
<td>Mendenhall High School</td>
<td>1202 Hwy 49 S</td>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Public School District</td>
<td>Mendenhall High School</td>
<td>500 Pirate Cove Drive</td>
<td>Pearl</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton County School District</td>
<td>Morton High School</td>
<td>238 East 4th Avenue</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott County Technical Center</td>
<td>Simpson County Technical Center</td>
<td>3415 Simpson Hwy 49</td>
<td>Mendenhall</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith County School District</td>
<td>Smith County Vocational Complex</td>
<td>Hwy 35 S</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Municipal School District</td>
<td>Raleigh High School</td>
<td>Route 1 Box 500 Hwy 35 S</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mize Attendance Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 35 S</td>
<td>Mize</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>39116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianola School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gentry High School
801 B B King Road
Indianola, MS 38751

Drew High School
288 Green Avenue
Drew, MS 38737

East Tallahatchie School District

Charleston High School
411 E. Chestnut Street
Charleston, MS 38921

West Tallahatchie School District

West Tallahatchie High School
P O Box 129
Webb, MS 38966

Tate County Schools

Coldwater High School
671 West Street
Coldwater, MS 38618

Independence High School
505 Sycamore Road
Independence, MS 38638

Senatobia Tate County Vocational Technical Center
165 W Central Avenue
Coldwater, MS 38618

Senatobia Municipal School District

Senatobia JR/SR High School
221 Warrior Drive
Senatobia, MS 38668

North Tippah School District

Falkner High School
Hwy 15 N
Falkner, MS 38629

South Tippah School District

Blue Mountain High School
P O Box 97
Blue Mountain, MS 38610

Pine Grove High School
3510A CR 600
Ripley, MS 38663

Ripley High School
720 S Clayton Road
Ripley, MS 38663

North South Tippah Voc-Tech Center
P O Box 533
Ripley, MS 38663

Tishomingo County School District

Tishomingo County High School
701 Hwy 72
Iuka, MS 38852

Tishomingo County Voc Tech
Hwy 25 N
Tishomingo, MS 38873

Rosa Fort High School
1100 Rosa Fort Drive
PO Box 997
Tunica, MS 38676

Tunica County School District

Tunica County Vocational Technical Center
2400 Hwy 61
Tunica, MS 38676
Union County School District

East Union Attendance Center
1548 State Hwy 9 S
Blue Springs, MS 38828

Ingomer Attendance Center
1384 CR 101
New Albany, MS 38652

Myrtle Attendance Center
P O Box 40
Hawk Avenue
Myrtle, MS 38650

West Union Attendance Center
1610 State Hwy 30 W
Myrtle, MS 38650

New Albany School District

New Albany High School
Hwy 15 North
PO Box 1771
New Albany, MS 38652

New Albany/Union County Vocational Center
203 Highway 15 North
New Albany, MS 38652

Walthall County School District

Dexter High School
927 Hwy 48 E
Tylertown, MS 39667

Tylertown High School
204 High School Road
Tylertown, MS 39667

Walthall County Career and Technology
803 Ball Avenue
Tylertown, MS 39667

Vicksburg Warren School District

Bowmar Avenue Magnet School
912 Bowmar Avenue
Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180

Vicksburg High School
3701 Drummond Street
Vicksburg, MS 39180

Warren Central High School
1000 Hwy 27
Vicksburg, MS 39180

Hinds Community Vicksburg Center
1624 Hwy 27 S
Vicksburg, MS 39180

Hollandale School District

Simmons High School
PO Box 428
Hollandale, MS 38748

Leland School District

Leland High School
403 E Third Street
Leland, MS 38756

Leland Vocational Complex
S Deer Creek Drive
Leland, MS 38756

Western Line School District

O'Bannon High School
Raceway Road
P.O. Box 5816
Greenville, MS 38701

Riverside High School
939 Riverside Road
Avon, MS 38723
Greenville Public Schools
Greenville High School
419 E Robertshaw Street
Greenville, MS 38701

Weston Sr High School
901 Archer
Greenville, MS 38701

Greenville Technical Center
Raceway Road
Greenville, MS 38704

Webster County School District
East Webster High School
Route 2 Box 468
Maben, MS 39750

Eupora High School
404 W Fox
Eupora, MS 39744

Webster County Vocational Center
102 Hall Road
Eupora, MS 39744

Wilkinson County School District
Wilkinson County High School
P O Box 875
Woodville, MS 39669

Martin L King Career Technology School
P O Box 1193
Woodville, MS 39669

Louisville Municipal School District
Louisville High School
200 Ivy Avenue
Louisville, MS 39339

Winston Louisville Vocational Center
204 Ivy Avenue
Louisville, MS 39339

Coffeeville School District
Coffeeville High School
16849 Oklahoma Street
Coffeeville, MS 38922

Water Valley School District
Water Valley High School
P. O. Box 647
550 Market Street
Water Valley, MS 38965

Yazoo County School District
Yazoo County High School
6789 Old Hwy 49 Frontage Road
Yazoo City, MS 39194

Yazoo City Municipal School District
Yazoo City Vocational Complex
1825 Martin L King Drive
Yazoo City, MS 39194
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Bayou Academy
P.O. Box 417
Cleveland, MS 38732

St. Joseph Catholic School
1501 VFW Road
Greenville, MS 38701-5841

Mercy Cross High School
870 Nativity Drive
Biloxi, MS, 39530

St. Joseph Catholic School
308 New Mannsdale Road
P.O. Box 2027
Madison, MS 39130-2027

Our Lady Academy
222 South Beach Blvd.
Bay St. Louis, MS 39520

Cathedral Middle/High School
701 Martin Luther King, Jr. Street
Natchez, MS 39120-2962

Resurrection Middle/High School
520 Watts Ave.
Pascagoula, MS 39567

Vicksburg Catholic School
St. Aloysius Middle/High School
1900 Grove Street
Vicksburg, MS 39183-3105

Sacred Heart School
608 Southern Avenue
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

East Holmes Academy
P.O. Box 247
West, MS 39192

St. John Catholic High School
620 Pass Road
Gulfport, MS 39501

French Camp Academy
One Fine Place
French Camp, MS 39745

Central Hinds Academy
2894 Raymond/Bolton Road
Raymond, Mississippi 39154

Jackson Academy
4908 Ridgewood Road
Post Office Box 14978
Jackson, MS 39236-4978

Chamberlain-Hunt Academy
124 McComb Avenue
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Jackson Prep
3100 Lakeland Dr
Jackson, MS 39232

Delta Academy
P.O. Box 70,
1150 Riverside Drive
Marks, MS 38646

Lamar Christian School
P.O. Box 880
Purvis, MS 39475
Laurel Christian School
1200 Highway 15 North
Laurel, MS 39440

Lee Academy
415 Lee Drive
Clarksdale, MS 38614

Magnolia Heights School
One Chiefs Drive
Senatobia, MS 38668-2923

North Delta School
330 Greenwave Lane
Batesville, MS 38606

Oak Hill Academy
800 North Eshman Avenue
West Point, MS 39773

Pillow Academy
69601 Highway 82 West
Greenwood, MS 38930

The Piney Woods School
Highway 49 South
Piney Woods, MS 39148

Presbyterian Christian School
221 Bonhombie Road
Hattiesburg, MS 39402

St. Andrew's North Campus
370 Old Agency Road
Ridgeland, Mississippi 39157

St. Joseph’s Catholic School
308 New Mannsdale Rd
Madison, MS 39110

St. Joseph High School
1501 VFW Road
Greenville, MS 38701

St. Patrick Catholic School
2700 Davis Street
Meridian, MS 39301

Southern Baptist Educational Center
7400 Getwell Road
Southaven, MS 38672

Education Center School
PO Box 55509
Jackson, Mississippi 39216-3722

Tupelo Christian Preparatory School
PO Box 367
5440 Endville Road
Belden, MS 38826

Winona Christian School
1014 S. Applegate Street
Winona, MS 38967

Washington School
1605 East Reed Road
Greenville, Mississippi 38703-7297

St. Aloysius High School
1900 Grove Street
Vicksburg, MS 39183
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