

A STUDY OF FLORIDA PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS'
JOB SATISFACTION FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FLORIDA'S A+
SYSTEM FOR GRADING SCHOOLS

by

ROBERT W. PASWATERS, JR.
B.A. Cedarville College, 1989
M.A.T. Rollins College, 1994

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2006

Major Professor: Barbara A. Murray

© 2006 Robert W. Paswaters, Jr.

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was to examine the impact of Florida's A+ program of accountability on elementary principal job satisfaction. Specifically, the study was conducted to determine the relationship between a school's grade and principal job satisfaction. Of primary interest was the extent to which school accountability impacted principal satisfaction with the facets of Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, People on the Present Job, and the job as a whole. The instruments used, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) were provided through the JDI Research Office housed at Bowling Green State University. The JDI and JIG results were analyzed using statistical analyses, comparisons of median scores within established satisfaction ranges developed for the JDI, and national norms also provided by the JDI Research Office.

The data were derived from the responses of 65 (39.6%) public elementary school principals in three Florida counties. Overall, the findings demonstrated that 93.7% of responding principals reported overall satisfaction with their jobs as measured by the JIG. High levels of satisfaction were also reported on the JDI in the areas of Work on Present Job, Supervision and People on your Present Job.

The two areas that were the least satisfying for responding principals were the facets of Pay and Opportunities for Promotion where a majority expressed feelings of ambiguity or dissatisfaction. In an analysis of the impact of school grades (A, B, or C),

there was not a significant relationship between the grade received by the school and principal satisfaction on either the JDI or the JIG.

For Michelle, Kate, and Megan

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Drs. Ken Murray, Peter Colby, and Tary Wallace for their insights and advice throughout this study. Thank you to Dr. Barbara Murray, my advisor and committee chair, for your direction and support throughout the entire process. Thank you to Dr. Lynn for sharing your expertise and encouragement.

I would like to thank my parents Bob and Margaret Paswaters for a life-long example of dedication and faithfulness. Your support, love, encouragement, and prayers have been something I could always count on throughout my life. I would also like to thank my in-laws, Paul and Helen Dalton for stepping in with meals and babysitting which helped lessen the load.

I would like to thank my wife, Michelle, for your unfailing love, encouragement, and patience throughout this challenging process. To my girls, Kate and Megan, who have endured hours without their Daddy; I'm back!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study	5
Theoretical Framework.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Definition of Terms	7
Assumptions.....	8
Methodology.....	8
Instrumentation	9
Data Collection	9
Data Analysis.....	10
Significance of the Study.....	10
Limitations of the Study	11
Organization of the Study.....	11
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Introduction.....	13
Challenges of the Principalship	13
Principal Shortage.....	18
School Accountability.....	20
Early Initiatives in Florida	20
Florida's A+ Plan for Education.....	22
Florida's Response to National Legislation.....	24
Impact of Accountability on Principals' Job Satisfaction	28
Impact on Working Conditions.....	28
Impact on Pay	31
Impact on Job Stability and Promotion.....	33
Impact on Relationships with Supervisors.....	36
Impact on Coworker Relationships.....	38
Theoretical Frameworks of Motivation and Satisfaction	40
Current Research on Principal Satisfaction	48
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	51
Introduction.....	51
Problem Statement.....	51
Population.....	52
Instrumentation.....	54
Instrument Reliability	56
Data Collection	57

Data Analysis.....	58
Data Analysis for Research Question 1	59
Data Analysis for Research Question 2	60
Data Analysis for Research Question 3	60
Data Analysis for Research Question 4	61
Data Analysis for Research Question 5	62
Summary.....	63
 CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	 64
Introduction.....	64
Population and Demographic Characteristics.....	64
Research Question 1	66
Research Question 2	73
Research Question 3	75
Research Question 4	77
Research Question 5	78
Summary.....	86
 CHAPTER 5 summary, conclusions, and recommendations	 87
Problem Statement.....	87
Methodology.....	87
Population and Data Collection	87
Instrumentation	88
Data Analysis.....	88
Summary and Discussion of the Findings	91
Research Question 1	91
Research Question 2	93
Research Question 3	94
Research Question 4	95
Research Question 5	95
Conclusions.....	97
Implications and Recommendations.....	104
Recommendations for Future Research.....	105
 APPENDIX A DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEYED SCHOOL DISTRICTS	 107
 APPENDIX B INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL AND INFORMED CONSENT	 109
 APPENDIX C SCHOOL DISTRICT PERMISSION	 112

APPENDIX D JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX (1997 REVISION) AND JOB IN GENERAL	116
APPENDIX E ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION REQUESTED...	122
APPENDIX F PERMISSION TO USE JDI INSTRUMENT	124
APPENDIX G CONTACT 1: SURVEY PRE-NOTICE EMAIL.....	126
APPENDIX H CONTACT 2: SURVEY REQUEST EMAIL	128
APPENDIX I CONTACT 3: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL.....	130
APPENDIX J POST CARD REMINDER	132
APPENDIX K PRINCIPALS' OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES	134
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Yearly Progression to Meet NCLB Requirements for Student Performance	26
Table 2 Yearly Consequences for Schools Failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).....	26
Table 3 Maslow’s Five Levels of Need	43
Table 4 Matrix Connecting the JDI Facets of Satisfaction with District and State Policies	53
Table 5 Coefficient Alpha (α) Values for the JDI and JIG	56
Table 6 Personal and Professional Characteristics of Respondents (N=65).....	65
Table 7 Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Subscales.....	67
Table 8 Distribution of Scores for Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Subscales	68
Table 9 Respondents’ Reported Satisfaction on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI).....	70
Table 10 Comparison of Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Median Scores with National Norms.....	72
Table 11 Median Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Subscale Scores by School Grade.....	73
Table 12 Spearman Rank Coefficients between School Grade and the JDI Subscales	75
Table 13 Distribution of Scores for the Job in General (JIG) Scale	75
Table 14 Respondents’ Reported Satisfaction on the Job in General (JIG) Scale.....	76
Table 15 Comparison of Job in General (JIG) Median Scores with National Norms	77
Table 16 Median Job in General (JIG) Scale Scores by School Grade	78
Table 17 t-Test for Job in General (JIG) Scale by Gender of Elementary School Principals (N=64).....	78
Table 18 Distribution of Median Scores for the Job in General (JIG) Scale by Gender ..	79

Table 19 Male and Female Respondents' Reported Satisfaction on the Job in General (JIG) Scale	80
Table 20 Central Tendency Measures of Job in General (JIG) by Principal Ethnicity	80
Table 21 Central Tendency Measures of Job in General (JIG) by Longevity in the Principalship	82
Table 22 Comparison of Job in General (JIG) Median Scores with National Norms and Longevity	83
Table 23 Policy Challenges identified by Respondents (N = 49).....	85

CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS

Introduction

The school accountability movement in Florida began with legislation (Section 229.551, F.S.) passed in 1968 (FDOE, 2005). This legislation called for the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) to improve educational effectiveness. In 1969, the State Legislature appropriated annual funds designed to enable educational research by the FDOE. The legislature then authorized the Commissioner of Education in 1970 to develop a plan for evaluating educational effectiveness. The Commissioner developed a plan called the Statewide Assessment Program which was codified by the State Legislature in the Educational Accountability Act (Section 229.57, F.S.) of 1971. The State Board of Education (SBOE) approved the plan's objectives, and the first statewide assessment of students in grades 2 and 4 followed (FDOE).

In 1974, an amendment to the Educational Accountability Act of 1971 required the State (Florida) to employ assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics by 1976. In 1976, the Legislature enacted another Educational Accountability Act that expanded prior legislation to include the development of assessments for grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 (FDOE, 2005). This legislation also required the nation's first test for high-school graduation. Over the next seven years, this legislation faced a number of challenges in court. In 1983, the U.S. District Court ruled in the Debra P. v. Turlington case that the State of Florida could deny graduation for students that did not pass the State's minimum

competency test (SSAT-11). The report, *A Nation at Risk*, was also published in 1983 by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (Adelman, 1983). This scathing report on the declining state of education in America accentuated the need to improve achievement levels in public education (Adelman). In 1984, the SSAT-11 was renamed the High School Competency Test (HSCT).

In 1991, School Improvement and Accountability legislation called *Blueprint 2000*, called for sweeping changes in Florida schools through the establishment of the Florida Commission of Educational Reform (FDOE, 2005). The *Blueprint 2000* legislation committed to improving student achievement and increasing school accountability by providing rewards to higher achieving schools and assistance to failing schools. School boards were tasked with the responsibility of identifying failing schools and reporting their status to the State (FDOE). In 1992 the first writing assessment (Florida Writing Assessment Program) was administered to fourth grade students. In 1995, procedures for assessing students were recommended by the Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability. These recommendations called the *Comprehensive Assessment Design (CAD)* were subsequently adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE). Content standards were adopted by the SBOE in 1996 and later recognized as the standards for Florida students by the legislature (Section 229.565, F.S.).

The legislature also authorized the implementation of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) in 1996. The FCAT was field tested in 1997 for grades 4, 5, 8,

and 10 and administered for the first time in 1998 (FDOE, 2005). In 1998, Governor Jeb Bush enacted Florida's A+ program for evaluating public schools (George, 2001). Schools under this program of accountability received a grade from A to F based on student performance on the FCAT. One outcome of this standards-based assessment, and the accompanying rewards and punishments, was an unprecedented emphasis on academic scores (George).

This emphasis met with mixed reviews. Some (Evers & Walberg, 2002; Stevenson & Stigler, 1992) praised such accountability efforts. Jones (2003) described current accountability measures as counterproductive to schools' stated objectives. He described a number of unintended and detrimental outcomes of evaluating students and schools based on a single test. These included identifying schools as failing when public surveys demonstrated the opposite, higher drop-out rates, an increasing number of students identified for special education programs, a narrowing of the curriculum to test-taking strategies, and an exodus of teachers from the teaching profession. Other researchers and educational practitioners such as George (2001), Pierce (2001), Pounder and Merrill (2001), and Tucker and Coddling (2002), expressed concerns over the potential negative effects on schools, especially school principals. One such documented outcome was an increase in pressure placed on school principals by superintendents and school board members. Tucker and Coddling described this pressure in terms of an expectation that principals would dramatically increase test scores regardless of social background, student ability or inability to speak English, and meager budgets. Tucker and

Codding pointed out that, if school personnel had been able to make dramatic improvements in student performance outcomes before, they would have done so. Groff (2001) also cited the increased focus on improved student scores as a source of increased pressure on principals who were now being held accountable for their school's academic performance. Taylor and Williams (2001) described the actions of one superintendent whose strategy was to remove any principal whose test scores did not meet his expectations.

Another outcome of school accountability was an intensification of the principal shortage. Autovino, Baker, Loucks, & Wolf (1998) described the increased stress placed on principals due to the School Report Card. Their survey of principals revealed that virtually every respondent was concerned about being held personally responsible for the School Report Card. One example cited was of a principal who was voluntarily leaving the principalship to return to teaching because of the increased stress brought on by increased accountability. A related outcome has been a decline in potential and qualified candidates willing to become school principals (Hertling, 1999; Osborn, 2004; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Stockman, 2005; Tucker & Codding, 2002).

In describing the increased accountability related to student achievement, Samuel Sava, Executive Director for the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) spoke to the struggle and the link between high turnover and increased stress levels of administrators (Harmel, 1999). This sentiment was echoed by Jill Levy, Executive Vice President of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators of New York

who lamented the pressures being encountered by principals due to increased responsibilities and decreased support and the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of administrators who, increasingly expressed interest in leaving the system (Olson, 1999).

This research was undertaken to build on prior studies of public school principals' job satisfaction and to provide new insights into the impact of the A+ program of accountability on elementary principals' job satisfaction in Florida.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to examine the impact of Florida's A+ program of accountability on elementary principal job satisfaction. Specifically, the study was conducted to determine the relationship between a school's grade and principal job satisfaction. Selected variables such as size of district, gender, ethnicity and years in the principalship were also investigated to determine if a relationship existed between these variables and principal job satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

An encyclopedic definition of job satisfaction addresses the contentment of individuals with their jobs as follows:

There are a variety of factors that can influence a person's level of job satisfaction; these factors include the level of pay and benefits, the perceived fairness of the promotion system within a company, the quality of working conditions, leadership and social relationships, and the job itself (the variety of tasks involved, the interest and challenge the job generates, the clarity of the job description/requirements. (*Wikipedia*, 2005).

An assessment of principal job satisfaction, when examined in terms of the factors that lead to satisfaction, should provide valuable insights into the attitudes toward work and the motivations of elementary principals in Florida. A number of researchers (Borquist, 1987; Callarman, 1984; Emerson, 1995; Miller, 1985; Peris, 1984; and Planner-Hardy, 1983) have measured the job satisfaction of school principals.

The dominant theory of motivation and satisfaction developed in this study was based on Expectancy Theory. Expectancy Theory has often been utilized in studies of job satisfaction (Behling & Starke, 1973), and expectancy-value theories have a long standing history in research involving human actions/motivations (Atkinson, 1957; Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977; Bauman & Fisher, 1985; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Edwards, 1961; Erez & Isen, 2002; Fishbein, 1967; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1981; Hirokawa & Scheerhorn, 1986; House, 1997; Rogers, 1975; Savage, 1954). Vroom (1964) developed the proposition that an individual's choice, when faced with uncertain outcomes was affected by preference and by the degree to which the individual believed the outcome was probable. Vroom defined this belief as expectancy or a momentary belief that a specific act would result in a particular outcome and thus satisfaction.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this research project:

1. What factors contribute to the level of job satisfaction for Florida's principals?
2. What is the relationship between school grade and the five dimensions of job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI)?

3. What is the overall level of job satisfaction for elementary principals in Florida?
4. What is the relationship between the school grade and overall job satisfaction as measured by the Job in General Scale (JIG)?
5. Do significant differences in job satisfaction, as measured by the Job in General Scale (JIG), exist based on principal gender, principal ethnicity, and longevity in the principalship?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided for terms used in this study.

Florida A+ Program--a standards-based accountability program signed into law in 1998 by Governor Jeb Bush that assigns grades (A to F) to public schools in Florida based on student performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test.

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)--a criterion referenced test that students in grades 3 through 12 take each year to assess their level of mastery of the skills and content embodied in the Florida Sunshine State Standards. The test measures both achievement level (1-5) with level 3 and above being proficient, and student growth from one year to the next in the areas of mathematics and reading. Writing is tested in grades 4, 8, and 10. Science is tested in grades 5, 8, and 11.

Florida Sunshine State Standards--Academic standards that represent the knowledge and skills Florida students are expected to master at each grade level and subject area.

Job Descriptive Index (JDI)--a survey instrument designed to measure job satisfaction using five facet scales: Work on Present Job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and coworkers.

Job in General Scale (JIG)--a measure of an individual's general feelings toward a job that covers all aspects of job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction--“refers to affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying. Positive attitudes toward the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction and negative attitudes toward the job are equivalent to job dissatisfaction” (Vroom, 1964).

Assumptions

1. Survey participants would provide honest responses to all survey items.
2. The JDI and JIG instruments were adequate to provide valid measures of job satisfaction of all respondents..
3. Demographic data provided by the Florida Department of Education was accurate for all school districts in the study.

Methodology

The population for this study was comprised of public elementary school principals in three Florida school districts during the 2006-2007 school year (Appendix A). Private school, charter school, and multi-level school principals were not included in the study. Principals were contacted at least four times to maximize survey returns. The

first contact involved an email pre-notice followed by two emails with embedded links to the on-line survey. The fourth and final contact was a post card inviting non-responders to take part in the study.

Prior to conducting the research, all aspects of the research methodology were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Central Florida (Appendix B). Permission was also sought and granted by each school district prior to any contact with the school principals (Appendix C). The names and email addresses of the elementary principals surveyed were obtained from school district web sites.

Instrumentation

The researcher used instruments maintained by Bowling Green State University. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) consists of five facet scales measuring the areas of: Work on Present Job, Present Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People on your Present Job. The Job in General (JIG) Scale is designed to give an overall measure of job satisfaction. The questionnaire incorporated supplemental questions (Appendix D) designed to gather pertinent demographic variables. The JDI, JIG, and demographic data were used in developing an overall profile of elementary principal job satisfaction and answering the research questions.

Data Collection

A survey of elementary public school principals in three Florida counties was conducted utilizing the JDI and JIG instruments with additional demographic questions

(Appendix E). Initial emails were sent to all elementary principals in the respective districts notifying them that they would soon receive a questionnaire related to job satisfaction. Subsequent emails contained active links to the online questionnaire accessed through unique logons and passwords.

Data Analysis

The first phase of the data analysis required entering principals' responses to each question into SPSS. The JDI and JIG User's Manual (Balzer et al., 2000) provided guidance in the initial recording and analysis of the item responses. Responses were assigned numerical values as described in the User's Manual to allow for negative and positive item variations. Initial analyses involved a comparison of median scores for each scale with established national norms.

The second phase of the data analysis consisted of a comparison of median scores from prior studies of Florida Principals that also utilized the JDI and JIG. This phase determined the extent to which prior median facet scores varied from median facet scores derived from the current study.

The final phase of the data analysis entailed statistical and logical analyses, dependent upon the specific question.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the extent to which Florida's A+ program of grading schools had impacted the job satisfaction of elementary

principals. This information was significant in that it had the potential to provide valuable insights to educational institutions, district supervisors and State officials and to enable them to better evaluate the impact of the A+ grading system on the job satisfaction of elementary school principals. This information also provided the opportunity for district personnel to better understand those factors that impact job satisfaction. It could also be of assistance to school district leaders in combating the documented principal shortage by providing insights for developing strategies that could be useful in attracting and retaining top performers.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited by the focus of the JDI and JIG instruments which focused on the five facet scales of Work on Present Job, Present Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People on your Present Job. The research was also limited by the extent to which the five domains were able to be associated with district and/or state policies and practices related to school grading and accountability.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 introduced the purpose and significance of the study and design components. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature as it pertains to the purpose and significance of the study. Chapter 3 presents the procedures and methodology utilized in data collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 contains a summary of the data analysis.

Chapter 5 presents a summary and discussion of the study findings with implications for practice and future research.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of the literature chapter has been divided into four sections. The first section presents literature and background information related to the challenges of the principalship with an emphasis on the changing role of principals over time. The second section presents a review of literature related to the school accountability movement and its impact on principals both nationally and in the State of Florida. The literature related to the definition and theories of job satisfaction is reviewed in the third section. The final section contains a review of current research related to job satisfaction and the principalship.

Challenges of the Principalship

The movement to standardize public education by state governments along with the growth in size and complexity of public schools in the last half of the nineteenth century drastically changed the role of the school principal (Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy & Wirt, 2004). In the early years of the 20th century, select teachers were asked to fulfill managerial duties in addition to teaching, a role that would develop into the modern day principal, as these individuals became professional administrators that did not teach any classes (Cuban, 1988). Scientific or bureaucratic management theory was the dominant theory of management during this period, as exemplified by the

industrialist Frederick W. Taylor and the German economist, Max Weber (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Weber (1921/1968) viewed a highly structured bureaucracy as the most efficient and rational approach to imposing authority over others. He described workers in terms of a mechanical apparatus working in a bureaucratic machine. Weber (1946/1958) wrote that, “The principles of office hierarchy and of levels of graded authority mean a firmly ordered system of super- and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones” (p. 197). Taylor (1911) described workers as inherently lazy, trying to find ways to do as little as possible while making sure other workers behaved likewise. His reductionist approach to work resulted in an emphasis on breaking down tasks to the smallest, most efficient tasks and specialization. Patterson (1993) described this era of the industrial model as characterized by the central models of power and control. In this hierarchical structure, the leader directed and controlled those under them through “bossing.”

Sergiovanni et al. (2004) highlighted the connections between early management philosophies and education by discussing the influence of Frederick Taylor’s ideas on scientific management and their importance in schools during the early decades of the twentieth century. Donaldson (2001) described this connection between the role of school administrators and the bureaucratic leadership model as having the following characteristics:

1. Formal authority was vested in specific administrative roles to assure school-wide safety, orderliness, and productivity.

2. The people in these roles organized a rational institutional process so that the school's core work with students was uniform and met state standards.
3. Leaders were well informed, had access to governing and funding bodies, and were able to control personnel.
4. Leaders shaped the school to meet emerging needs in the environment and among its students.

In the middle of the 20th Century, the bureaucratic model for education was criticized by educational leaders such as McCall (1951), Kilpatrick (1951), Axtelle (1951) and Hoy and Miskel (1991). Much of the criticism centered on the perceived intrusion of government and other external forces into educational policies and practices.

McCall (1951) wrote:

For, since the end of education is the development of men, not merely for citizenship or social adjustment, but for a properly human life, education shares in the autonomy of the human person with respect to the absolutes of human existence: truth, beauty, goodness. This, it must be added, is a matter of moral autonomy in the socio-political sphere, where education has the right to resist to the fullest - in the name of the sacredness of the person and its own obligation to help this person form itself – any encroachment of its autonomy by any agency of the State or the culture. (pp. 248-249)

Axtelle (1951) wrote of the dangers of advancing technology and global competition that he feared would result in a neighborhood with no community. He wrote “Yet the powers that technology puts at men's disposal in their struggle with one another threatens to destroy what we know as Western Civilization” (p. 251). Brubaker and Nelson (1974) wrote that while the bureaucratic structure might appear to be the best organizational structure for educational governance, it is not the most effective model for

instruction. He argued that a professional organization model provided a more efficient avenue towards meeting educational goals such as “effective citizenship, command of the fundamental processes, worthy home membership, productive use of leisure time, development of ethical character, and the promotion of good health” (p. 66).

Brubaker and Nelson (1974) also argued that when governments make educational decisions they are fundamentally political decisions. They claimed that governmental decisions were based on a political evaluation of future popular reaction. They wrote, “The over-riding variable in the decision will be the assessment of public reaction to it, rather than its efficacy or soundness from an educational standpoint” (p. 61).

Major social and political events reshaped public schooling in the second half of the twentieth century (Sergiovanni, et al., 2004). The civil rights movement, Vietnam War, Watergate, and other societal upheavals changed the landscape of the country. Federal mandates to provide a free and appropriate education for minority, special education and English Language Learners changed the landscape of schooling (Sergiovanni, et al.). This emphasis on educating all children was reflected in the 1983 publication, *A Nation At Risk*. The premise proposed by the report and reported by Adelman (1983) was that,

All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself. (p.1)

A major finding of the report was that American schools were mediocre as measured by the academic performance of American students compared with students in other countries. This climate, according to Sergiovanni et al (2004), began an unprecedented reform movement to produce gains in academic performance through increased emphasis on standards and accountability. A bi-product of this movement was increased pressure on the principal to provide the instructional leadership necessary to accomplish those gains in student achievement. This trend continued and intensified in the 1990s as student achievement on standardized tests became the benchmark for success.

The responsibility to meet student performance standards fell squarely on the school principal and was further reinforced through performance-based funding (Doud & Keller, 1998). The increase in accountability for the principal also resulted in greater decision making freedom as decision making became more decentralized (Sergiovanni, et al., 2004). Accountability and high-stakes testing required principals to have strong technical and managerial skills, while the transition toward a more participatory system of management required interpersonal skills necessary for culture building (Sergiovanni et al.). Marsh (2000) pointed out that these changes left principals feeling overwhelmed as they struggled with ambiguous and overwhelming roles.

Peterson (2001) described the addition of roles such as shared decision making, budgeting, collaborative government, and increased accountability to the myriad of tasks for which principals were responsible. Findings from a study of principals in Virginia

indicated that with the increased complexity of the job, principals felt they lacked the authority and resources necessary to complete the job despite putting in long hours (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Increasing complexity and related pressures also led to challenges in staffing the principalship.

Principal Shortage

A substantial body of literature exists that suggested a looming crisis in staffing the principalship of the future. Thomas F. Koerner, then Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), was quoted by Hopkins (1998) as saying that, “Schools are going without principals, retired principals are being called back to full-time work, and districts have to go to great lengths to recruit qualified candidates” (p. 1). The principal’s role had become increasingly complex and rigorous to the point that many in educational circles did not want the stress that came with the job (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Samuel Sava, Executive Director for the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), identified a link between high turnover rates and increased stress (Harmel, 1999). Jill Levy, the Executive Vice President of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators of New York was quoted by Olson (1999) as saying that, “More and more responsibility is being heaped on principals and less and less support. With that, people are looking to get out of the system. They can no longer handle the pressure” (p. 21).

Pierce (2001) quoted a teacher who wondered why she would give up a job she loved to work longer hours for less money. Pounder and Merrill (2001) documented the

story of one potential administrator who considered filling the principal role for a short period of time, but felt a long term commitment would mean sacrificing his family. He ultimately concluded that the long hours, racial tensions and divisions, state regulations, and increased accountability made it virtually impossible to be an effective school leader (Pounder & Merrill). The Educational Research Service (ERS, 1999) predicted that 40% of all public school principals would retire or leave the principalship by 2010. The Educational Research Service (ERS) also found that with fewer people pursuing advancement, and with the average age of principals at 50 years of age, that districts were struggling to find strong leaders. Between 1988 and 2003, there was a 42% turnover rate in elementary principals nationwide, and the problem was even greater at the high school level (Lovely, 2004).

This issue was clearer when principal shortages were examined state by state. Lovely (2004) quoted a *Los Angeles Times* article (July 2001) reporting that although California certified 2,000 to 3,500 new administrators each year, only 38% of these pursued administrative positions. The remaining individuals either stayed in the classroom or pursued a different career. In Kentucky and Texas, administrative openings that in the past drew dozens of openings, drew only a handful of applicants (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). North Carolina, Idaho, Oregon, Nevada, and California developed campaigns to recruit qualified administrators from neighboring states by offering special incentives and perks (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran). They also cited New York City school districts which were forced to fill positions with non-certified

administrators. In 2001, the Chicago school district addressed the crisis by developing a special program to recruit and train professionals outside the field of education to fill administrative posts (Konkol, 2001). Groff reported in 2001 that one of every five principals in Vermont had either retired or resigned at the end of the year. He also documented that 163 schools in New York City began the school year with a temporary principal (Groff, 2001).

School Accountability

Early Initiatives in Florida

The following timeline of events related to accountability in Florida was detailed in the Assessment and Accountability Briefing Book produced by the Florida Department of Education (FDOE, 2005). The era of accountability began in Florida with the enactment of the Educational Accountability Act of 1971. This act authorized the Commissioner to implement the Statewide Assessment Program, and the resulting program was successful in collecting educational data on students in Grades 2 and 4.

In 1976, the Educational Accountability Act of 1976 expanded the assessment of students to include students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11. This legislation also authorized the first high school graduation test by requiring students graduating in 1978-1979 to pass a functional literacy test as a prerequisite for receiving a high school diploma. A number of legal challenges ensued and the implementation of the SSAT-II test as a prerequisite for graduation was delayed until 1983.

In 1984, beginning with the March assessment, tenth grade students took a newer version of the SSAT-II that raised standards to encourage students and teachers to reach higher achievement levels. The test was based on revised Minimum Student Performance Standards adopted by the State Board of Education. The name of the newer test was changed to the High School Competency Test (HSCT). School Improvement and Accountability legislation in 1991, commonly referred to as Blueprint 2000, established the Florida Commission of Education Reform and Accountability and called for sweeping changes in schools. In 1992, the Florida Writing Assessment Program (FWAP) was administered for the first time to fourth grade students. The State Board of Education in 1995 established student achievement criteria that included norm-referenced test (NRT) scores for Grades 4 and 8, writing scores for Grades 4, 5, and 10, and HSCT scores for 11th grade students.

Florida's Curriculum Framework (content standards) was adopted by the State Board of Education in 1996 for seven subject areas. In January of 1998 the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) was administered for the first time to students in Grade 4 (reading), Grade 5 (mathematics), and Grades 8 and 10 (reading and mathematics). These tests established baseline data and included performance tasks. Achievement levels ranging from 1 to 5 were also established for FCAT scores. In 1998 the Florida School Recognition Program was funded for the first time and \$5.4 million were allocated to 140 schools in the form of monetary awards as recognition for high achievement levels.

Florida's A+ Plan for Education

In 1999, the Florida Legislature enacted new accountability legislation called the A+ Plan for Education. This legislation increased standards and accountability for students, schools, and educators. The concept of annual learning gains was added to the accountability system with the addition of tests in Grades 3 through 10. The revisions also included a science assessment, norm-reference assessments in math and reading, and a system for calculating the academic growth of each student over a year's time. The State Board of Education identified five school performance levels (A through F), and the 1999 FCAT results were used to assign letter grades to schools based on overall performance. The State Board of Education established the FCAT scores that high school students were required to earn as one of the requirements for receiving a standard high school diploma.

Section 1008.25 (5) (b) was amended in 2002 to require the mandatory retention of third grade students that received a Level 1 score on the FCAT reading assessment. Annual growth scores for FCAT reading and mathematics, utilizing a development scale, were reported for the first time, and these developmental scale scores were used as part of the A+ plan school performance grading program. FCAT science was also added to the battery of tests for the first time.

In 2005, English Language Learners and Special Education Students were included in the school grade calculation under learning gains in mathematics, reading, and in the calculation for growth for the bottom quartile of readers. The 2006 Guide to Calculating School Grades (FDOE, 2005, p.3) technical assistance paper described the

six performance measures used to determine a school's overall grade. School grades were calculated based on the accumulation of percentage points for the following:

1. One point for each percent of students who meet high standards by scoring at or above FCAT Achievement Level 3 in reading.
2. One point for each percent of students who meet high standards by scoring at or above FCAT Achievement Level 3 in mathematics
3. One point for each percent of students who meet high standards by scoring 3.5 or higher on the FCAT writing assessment. In the event that there are not at least 30 eligible students tested in writing, the district average in writing is substituted.
4. One point for each percent of students making learning gains in reading.
5. One point for each percent of students making learning gains in mathematics
6. One point for each percent of the lowest performing students making learning gains in reading. In the event that there are not at least 30 eligible students, the school's reading learning gains are substituted.

Two other factors that could potentially impact school grades included the percent of students tested and the adequate progress of the lowest students in reading. Failure to test at least 95% of eligible students or a failure for at least 50% of the lowest readers to demonstrate learning gains could result in the reduction of a school's grade by one letter grade.

In 2006, an additional component for writing will be incorporated into the test. Science will also be incorporated into the grading criteria along with learning gains for the bottom quartile of students in mathematics.

Florida's Response to National Legislation

A major development in the era of accountability was the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001. This legislation represented the most comprehensive change to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) since it was enacted in 1965. The NCLB Act contained four principles: increased accountability for results, greater local control, greater choice for parents, and an emphasis on research proven teaching methods. The State of Florida developed the following statement in accordance with the NCLB legislation.

The No Child Left Behind Act requires all states to utilize state assessments to determine if a school has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the proficiency of all students. Adequate Yearly Progress is one of four measures that will be used to determine how well schools are performing in Florida. The others are: school grades, individual student progress towards annual learning targets to reach proficiency, and a return on investment measure that links dollars spent to student achievement. All schools will be rated on each of these measures. Schools meeting all standards will be designated as highly effective and efficient. (FDOE, 2005)

The goal of NCLB was to ensure that all students, regardless of race or socio-economic status, obtained a quality education and could demonstrate proficiency through standardized testing on core academic subjects. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) was measured by the progress of all public schools and school districts toward enabling students to meet prescribed achievement levels. AYP was determined by examining

specific subgroups that were based on ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disability, and English language learners. In the State of Florida, proficiency was established if a student scored a Level 3 or higher on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). All subgroups were held to the same standard and were required to demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics. Any subgroup that did not meet the AYP standard resulted in the school's failure to make AYP. A safe harbor could be achieved for a specific subgroup if that subgroup improved by 10% over the previous year. The stated goal of NCLB was to have 100% of students proficient in reading and math by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. Table 1 displays Florida's planned progression towards meeting the NCLB goal of 100% proficiency (FDOE, 2005).

The Florida Department of Education also developed a yearly progression of consequences for schools that did not make AYP based upon FCAT scores (FDOE, 2005). These consequences are presented in Table 2.

The choice options for parents identified by the State included: (a) staying at the same school, (b) attending a School within a School Model Program, (c) school choice with transportation, (d) attending a State approved provider of Supplemental Education Services (SES), or (e) attending a district approved SES program (FDOE, 2005). In order to fund transportation services or SES programs, school districts were required to set aside a minimum of 20% of Title 1 funds. The Florida Department of Education reported in 2005 that 67 of 76 school districts would be in corrective action unless performance improved (FDOE, 2006).

Table 1
Yearly Progression to Meet NCLB Requirements for Student Performance

School Years	Percent Proficient	
	Math	Reading
2001-02 through 2003-04	38%	31%
2004-05 through 2006-07	53%	48%
2007-08 through 2009-10	68%	65%
2010-11 through 2012-13	83%	82%
2013-2014	100%	100%

Note. Percentages represent scores of 3 or above on the FCAT in mathematics and reading.

Table 2
Yearly Consequences for Schools Failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Failure to make AYP	Consequences
Year 1	No consequences for Year 2
Year 2	Must offer all students meaningful choice options in Year 3
Year 3	Must offer meaningful choice and supplemental educational services to eligible students in Year 4
Year 4	Must offer meaningful choice, supplemental education to eligible students and corrective action in Year 5
Year 5	Must offer meaningful choice, supplemental educational services to eligible students, and plan for restructuring in Year 6

Packer (2006) reported that based on the 2005 FCAT assessment, 827 schools that received an A rating still failed to make AYP. He also made it clear that as the bar was raised, more and more schools would have a more difficult time making AYP and would be labeled as failing. He cited independent studies indicating that by the year 2014 between 75% and 99% of all schools would fail to make AYP. This trend was evident in Florida statistics which showed that 72% of Florida schools failed to make AYP in 2005.

This was an increase of 8% over the previous year. Additionally, more than 500 of these schools had failed to make AYP for the fourth year in a row (FDOE, 2006). The consequences of falling into corrective action under federal guidelines according to the FDOE included:

1. The State was required to defer programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds.
2. The State must institute and fully implement a new, research based, curriculum based on State standards.
3. The State must replace district personnel relevant to the failure of making AYP.
4. The State must remove failing schools from local jurisdiction and establish a different arrangement for public governance.
5. The State must replace the superintendent and school board with a receiver or trustee to be appointed by the State Educational Agency (SEA).
6. The State must abolish or restructure the district.
7. The State must offer school choice with transportation in conjunction with one of the other consequences described under points 1 to 6.

Section 1116 (b) (1) (7) (8) of NCLB stated that school districts were required to implement restructuring if the school failed to make AYP after one year of corrective action. In 2006, 33 schools were identified by the FDOE as being in danger of restructuring in the 2006-2007 school year (FDOE, 2006). Schools in restructuring

according to the FDOE were required to continue to offer choice and SES along with a plan for alternative governance structures for the school. Under federal guidelines, the FDOE identified five options under restructuring. These included:

1. The school would be reopened as a public charter school.
2. All or most of the school staff must be replaced (which may include the principal) who were relevant to the failure of the school to make AYP.
3. A private management company would be contracted to manage the school.
4. The operation of the school would be turned over to the state.
5. Other major restructuring of the school's governance that included fundamental reforms that provided substantial promise of attaining AYP.

Impact of Accountability on Principals' Job Satisfaction

The literature detailing the impact of accountability on principals job satisfaction was reviewed based on the following categories reflective of the five facets of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI): (a) impact on working conditions, (b) impact on pay, (c) impact on job stability and promotion, (d) impact on relationships with supervisors, and (e) impact on coworkers or employee relationships.

Impact on Working Conditions

The review of the literature highlighted a number of ways in which accountability has impacted working conditions for principals. Dorn (1998) equated the increased use of statistics by politicians and news organizations in judging schools to the demise of

professional authority for school administrators. The lofty expectations detailed by the NCLB legislation and State testing standards placed a great deal of pressure on principals to increase student achievement for all students. One principal, in responding to the NCLB expectations, wrote,

By 2014, every student will MEET or EXCEED expectations on the CRCT. Even the ones who come to you with ZERO skills in place as a 4 year old. Even the one's whose mothers are arrested for beating and kicking them in the middle of the street outside of our doors. Even the one's who have lead poisoning, mild autism, or some other organic brain altering condition. If they don't meet or exceed expectations on the CRCT then we FAIL as a school. Chilling, isn't it. (Charles, p. 1)

The frustration of another administrator was obvious in stating that, "School 1 raised its students' scores from the 18th to the 46th percentile, and got an F. School 2 raised its scores from the 51st to the 56th percentiles and got \$80,000 in bonus money" (George, 2001, p.10). Other administrators surveyed stated that test scores correlated more with the square footage of homes or the number of students fitted with orthodontia than they did to other factors (George). Kohn (2001) echoed this sentiment and argued that every empirical investigation related to standardized testing had resulted in socioeconomic status accounting for an overwhelming proportion of the variance in test scores of different populations of students.

A survey of principals indicated that some were leaving the principalship after years of service to return to the classroom due to the pressure of increased accountability (Autovino, et al., 1998). This sentiment was echoed by Cooley and Shen (2003) who pointed out that the principal's role demanded more of a principal than was reasonably

feasible. He described the political pressure being placed on schools that were increasingly blamed for producing students incapable of competing in a global economy.

Kohn (2001) argued that the real challenge for principals was to figure out how to buffer teachers from the test-related requirements coming from the central office and encourage meaningful learning. Ballowe, a deputy superintendent in South Carolina, described his frustration with increasing pressure to return to instructional practices diametrically opposed to the district's developmentally appropriate philosophy of education (Harrington-Lueker, 2000). He described the difficult process of moving away from ditto sheets and workbooks to multi-age classrooms and developmentally appropriate practices that recognize that all children are not at the same academic level at the same time. The standardized tests were now forcing administrators to return to the old practices. Harrington-Lueker described multiple examples of highly successful principals across the country. These principals were faced with balancing their commitment to and belief in child-centered practices as they enforced district mandates prescribing testing and activities they did not believe were in the best interest of students. Harrington-Lueker also stressed, however, that others did not believe that developmentally appropriate practice and standards for accountability are mutually exclusive; and she reported that assessments in many states were becoming more performance based. Other proponents of standardized testing argued that developmentally appropriate practice was the same thing as differentiated instruction. Principal Karen Smith of Oregon called that assertion an

“oxymoron.” She asked the question, “How can you have differentiated standards?” (Harrington-Lueker, p. 8).

Ediger (2002) addressed the impact on principals and stated that in some cases principal evaluations were based solely on how well the students did on a single test and served as the sole measure of the principal’s leadership. Ediger wrote that “Principals’ reputations are forever linked with the public ‘report cards’ on their school’s performance” (p. 90). Results of a study conducted by The Arizona School Boards Association (2003) indicated that principals felt their biggest challenge was insufficient funding and the unrealistic mandates of NCLB. Also cited by 43% of principals as the cause for talented principals leaving the principalship were unreasonable demands of higher standards and accountability. Bonstingl (2001) stated that many principals and teachers were at the very least personally discouraged with some simply holding on for retirement while others were losing their jobs as a result of high stakes testing.

Impact on Pay

The increased accountability for principals has also had an effect according to the literature on principal salaries and their perception of how much money they made. Groff (2001) quoted Darrel C. Rud, the president of NAESP who said that, “When you look at the increased stress, longer hours and increased accountability principals are facing these days, they are frustrated that their average salary is not much more than what veteran teachers are being paid” (p. 3). Pierce (2000) supported this sentiment in stating that many principals were concerned about the future of the principalship. She stated that

increased stress and inadequate compensation were making the position less and less desirable. In some states like Texas, Colorado, and Florida, improved or high academic achievement could result in bonus money for teachers and administrators (Bushweller, 1997; 1999). Bushweller (1999) also referenced several counties, including Charlotte County, Florida where principal salaries were directly tied to school performance. In Florida, performance-pay packages for teachers and principals were being addressed under state law to reward high performing schools. In Douglas County, Colorado, principal pay was directly tied to test scores. Principals who were rated as unsatisfactory based on test scores received no salary increase, not even a cost-of-living adjustment. Principals that were rated as satisfactory received both a cost-of-living increase and bonuses of \$2,000 or more (Bushweller, 1999).

Charges of inequity within merit pay systems were also present in the literature. In one analysis of principal merit pay by the *Willamette Week* in Portland Oregon, it was determined that principals from high poverty schools received less merit pay than principals in more affluent schools (Jaquiss, 1999). He also found that principals on the east side of the district made less than those on the west side and that African-American principals were paid 26% less than their colleagues of different races. Abernethy (2005) cited a school board member in a different school district who expressed concern that high poverty schools would not be able to attain performance standards and principals in those schools would never get a bonus. Conversely, some school districts like Florida's Palm Beach County School District were offering principals incentives of up to 20% of

their salaries to take on schools serving high numbers of disadvantaged students (Urban Educator, 2003).

In Columbus Ohio, performance pay based on student scores could add \$1,000 to principal salaries (Bushweller, 1999). In schools that did not show improvement for three years, however, the principal was fired and the school reconstituted. The Columbus plan was similar to the Douglas County plan in that principals who did not receive satisfactory evaluations did not receive any increase in salary the following year. In Charlotte County, principals could earn a performance-based bonus of 3% which then became a part of their base salary the next year (Bushweller).

Florida's Performance Pay Program was enacted into law (1012.22(1)(c)4 & 1012.34(3), Florida Statutes) in 1998 (FDOE, 2006). This law required that school districts adopt salary schedules that based at least 5% of principals' salaries on annual performance. The State defined annual performance as the academic performance of students in the school. This made it possible for principals to earn an additional bonus of at least 5% based on test scores.

Impact on Job Stability and Promotion

Job stability and opportunities for promotion were also addressed in the literature. Greater accountability brought the real fear that if scores did not improve at an appropriate pace, the administrator would be removed (Osborn, 2004). One superintendent boasted publicly that almost half of the district's principals had retired, resigned, or been fired during the first year due to inadequate student growth (Taylor &

Williams, 2001). Bushweller (1997) reported that principals in Texas could lose their jobs if test scores did not meet district expectations. Ediger (2002) found that school districts were using test scores to determine contracts. Stewart (2006) highlighted the plight for principals in Pensacola, Florida who held one-year contracts at poor-performing schools and were in danger of losing their jobs.

With the rise in accountability and the possibility of dire consequences to the principal, principals were increasingly tempted to try to cheat the system (Dorn, 1998; Francis, 2006). They described the consequences of losing students and funding through school choice, and the possibility of school reconstitution or closure as a motivator for principals to look for ways to “game the system”. The report, *Dereliction of Duty*, produced by the People for the American Way (2004) cited specific examples of schools in Florida that were closed due to poor test scores and dwindling enrollment and funding due to choice. The report also quoted one principal in Miami-Dade County who sent a memo to teachers asking them to identify students with attention, behavior, attendance, or academic deficiencies. The report quoted the principal as writing, “These are the kids we’ve got to get outta here if they are low on the FCAT” (p. 9). One study by Figlio and Getzler in 1996 examined the impact of the FCAT on six counties in Florida. What they found was that schools were “gaming” the test by shaping the population of students that took the test. They found that schools were re-classifying students in special education programs to remove them from the pool of tested students in order to increase test scores (Francis, 2006). Keen (2006), cited a University of Florida study that found some schools

were utilizing disciplinary punishments to ensure that low performing students did not take the test.

In other instances, principals were fired or reassigned for real or perceived cheating on state tests (Burney, Kummer, & Ott, 2006). They cited one example of a very visible case in New Jersey in which a principal was fired for stating that he had been encouraged to cheat on the state tests by a district assistant superintendent. According to the principal, the assistant superintendent had encouraged him to open a copy of the test, create an answer key, and then change answers after the test was completed. The principal claimed his conscience would not allow him to cheat, but when he reported the conversation to others, he was subsequently fired. Million (2000) cited another example of an elementary principal in a top-ranked, affluent school in Maryland who was fired for cheating on the test. According to another principal cited by Million, the pressure was not because the school might fail, but because of pressure to stay at the top. The Fair Test Examiner (2006) cited a number of examples of cheating. Among these was the firing of a principal in Brevard County and the discipline of three assistant principals for moving special needs 9th and 10th grade students into 11th grade so their scores would not count towards the school's grade. In Broward County, Cherin (2006) pointed to a trend over the past three years in which a number of principals, especially Black administrators, were being moved, demoted, or in some cases forced to resign due to test scores and district pressures. In Orange County Florida, an elementary principal was demoted from

principal to staffing specialist (a cut in pay of \$25,000) for hand grading a sample of fifth grade tests to see how the students had done on the test (Billman, 2002).

In some cases, principals were simply walking away from their jobs due to the pressure of testing. Noguera (2005) cited one example of a school principal in Miami whose school had received two “F” grades for two consecutive years. The principal was certain that the school would receive another failing grade due to the fact that two thirds of the students were from Haiti and did not speak English. The consequence of a third “F” would have resulted in the State taking over the school, but according to Noguera (2005), the principal had already determined to quit his job. He quoted the principal as saying,

I’m tired of being humiliated. We work hard here--the faculty is dedicated and gives its all, and the kids are great. They try their best and we have very few behavior problems. They just can’t be expected to pass an exam in a language they don’t understand. The worst thing about this is the state doesn’t have any suggestions for what we should do differently. They’re just applying the pressure and I’m fed up with it” (Noguera, 2005, p. 1)

Impact on Relationships with Supervisors

Relationships between district office supervisors and school principals were also affected by accountability, as district personnel developed programs and strategic plans that principals were accountable for implementing (Bouchard, Cervone, Hayden, Riggins-Newby & Zarlengo, 2002; Maxwell, 1994; Sweeney, 2000). Dorn (1998) questioned the assumption that central offices and news outlets were the right organizations to hold schools accountable for performance. Pierce (2000) argued that too many central offices play a game of “principal musical chairs” in which principals are

removed before their schools have time to show improved performance. In this climate, principals had a hard time changing teacher practice because they believed the central office would move the principal before they had to change (Pierce).

Burney, Krummer, and Ott (2006) suggested that some principals were under implicit or even explicit pressure from district personnel to violate ethical standards and cheat on standardized tests in order to increase scores. According to Hertling (1999), some of this pressure may have come from performance contracts which tied increases and decreases in the superintendent's salary to the performance of schools on state tests. Taylor and Williams (2001) and Sweeney (2000) highlighted the impact of personnel changes in the district office which had a direct impact on the relationships between district office personnel and school principals. Sweeney gave the example of a new superintendent in Pasadena that reassigned five central office administrators, five principals and vice-principals based on performance after two months on the job. Taylor and Williams (2001) emphasized the need for a positive working climate between district officials and principals. They cited one example in which a superintendent's overbearing approach to accountability left principals feeling stressed, distrustful, and isolated. They also cited other examples, such as Flagler County Florida, in which the district worked closely with school administrators to meet the specific goals of different schools. They further praised such efforts by districts that used accountability as a process, not a trust-destroying threat. The importance of good relationships between district personnel and school administrators was paramount in Florida where the state mandated school districts

to implement fidelity checks on schools to ensure they were fully implementing state curriculum mandates (FDOE, 2006). The impact of low levels of satisfaction and high levels of inter-role conflict and stress were addressed by Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, and Morrell (2000) as causes for health problems in administrators and increased costs for institutions.

Impact on Coworker Relationships

Accountability through high-stakes testing also had an impact on coworker relationships as principals were expected to fill different roles (George, 2001; Lashway, 2001; Noguera, 2005; Pierce, 2002). Pierce described the need for principals to become skilled at becoming instructional leaders who were able to develop teams of teacher leaders capable of assisting in running the school. George echoed the need for principals to become instructional leaders in order for them to survive standards-based reforms. DuFour (2002) described the need for principals to move beyond the role of instructional leader to the role of leader of a professional community that emphasized learning. Brazer (2004) described the need for principals to promote collaborative decision-making. Lashway described three essential activities for principals. They were: (a) to lead their staffs in the search for effective strategies, (b) to find organizations resources to support standards-based approaches, and (c) to provide supportive leadership that both supported standards and protected school traditions and values. Stewart (2006) described principal approaches to accountability that included pep rallies, parties, family fun nights, and FCAT handouts to build enthusiasm for the test. The Institute for Educational Leadership

(IEL) in its Report of the Task Force on the Principalship found that principals “must rally students, teachers, parents, local health and service agencies, youth development groups, local businesses, and other community residents and partners around the common goal of raising student performance” (Usdan, 2000).

Noguera (2005) highlighted the need for principals to be powerful change and sustaining agents in the culture of the school. He focused on principals’ responsibility for the relationships between adults and students in the school and the climate or atmosphere of teaching and learning. He wrote that, “Administrators who ignore the need to bring about such (cultural) changes run the risk of engaging in reforms that produce superficial change at best but that do not result in significant and sustained improvement in the academic outcomes of students” (p. 4). Allen (2003) supported the notion that the principal was the ‘prime shaper’ of school culture and bore the responsibility of listening to the input of teachers, students, and parents. Matus (2006) described merit pay as a potentially serious impediment to this kind of collaborative teamwork.

A principal’s approach to accountability could also damage relationships in the school. Booher-Jennings (2006) gave the example of a principal that displayed charts at faculty meetings that ranked teachers by the percentage of their students that passed the test. The pressure for teachers to focus on the test was highlighted in one survey in which 67% of the principals stated that teachers had little time to teach content not on the state tests (Matus, 2006). Ave and Tobin (2006) described teachers in Hillsborough and Pinellas counties that were discouraged and ready to revolt against what they were being

told to do in the classroom. In Pinellas County, 58% of the teachers said that morale was poor or fair and declining. Of those teachers surveyed, 52% said they had considered leaving the teaching profession in the past year. Teachers reported that they were forced to teach scripted lessons, and administrators were conducting “fidelity checks” to ensure compliance. Jade Moore, Executive Director of the Pinellas Classroom Teachers Association cited a 66% increase in teacher absenteeism as one measure of teacher displeasure with accountability practices (Ave & Tobin).

Performance pay for teachers was another area of real concern for Florida teachers where performance pay was in its infancy (Denardo, 2006; Lewis, 2006; Winchester, 2006) In Texas, where performance pay was already implemented, Bushweller (1997) described divisions that arose between teachers that received bonus pay and those that did not. One study on the impact of accountability on educators found that principals played a pivotal role in how teachers experienced accountability (Woody, 2005). She found that the principals either acted as a buffer from student performance standards, or as a source of pressure in emphasizing the need to increase test scores.

Theoretical Frameworks of Motivation and Satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction found its theoretical basis in the realm of work motivation. The presence of positive or beneficial work place behaviors implied that the realities, environment, and conditions in the work place somehow provided for the needs or desires of the individual, thus producing a sense of satisfaction. It was, therefore, useful to review organizational theory as it relates to motivation and job satisfaction.

Douglas McGregor (1966) distinguished between the conventional view of management (Theory X) and new concepts of management (Theory Y). McGregor's theory stood in contrast to the scientific management theorists of the early 20th century. Frederick Taylor, the father of scientific management theory, relied on time and motion studies to determine the most efficient methods for performing a task in the least amount of time. Similarly, industrialists such as Henry Fayol depended on a task oriented rather than people oriented approach.

McGregor (1966) asserted that this managerial approach was based on the mistaken assumption that satisfied needs motivate individuals. He proposed a hierarchy of needs beginning with physiological and safety needs, social needs, ego needs, and finally self-fulfillment needs. McGregor argued that as lower level needs were satisfied, they ceased to motivate the individual. The motivation then became the higher need as the lower need was satisfied, and so on up the scale.

Mayo's Hawthorne Studies also contrasted with the scientific management theorists (Mayo, 1986). His research demonstrated that social components had a greater impact on productivity and worker satisfaction than did factors related to the worker's self interest. Frederick Herzberg, through a number of interviews with employees in the 1950s, developed his own theory of motivation. According to Herzberg, there were two dimensions to job satisfaction, namely motivation and hygiene (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Herzberg described hygiene issues as factors that did not motivate workers and could lead to increased worker dissatisfaction.

Marsland, Syptak, and Ulmer (1999) supported Herzberg's findings and described hygiene factors as those things that could dissatisfy when absent or mishandled. Examples of hygiene topics included salary, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, company policies, and supervision. They categorized these hygiene factors in terms of a worker's environment. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) described motivators as those things that create satisfaction by meeting the need of the worker for meaning and personal growth. Motivating factors such as recognition, the work itself, advancement, achievement, and responsibility were identified. Herzberg proposed that once hygiene factors were successfully addressed, the presence of motivators then determined the levels of job satisfaction and worker productivity.

Abraham Maslow first published his hierarchy of needs in 1954. The attainment or fulfillment of each subsequent or higher level of need was predicated upon the satisfaction or substantial satisfaction of the prior or lower need, a concept he termed prepotency. Gawel (1997) later developed a hierarchical structure, displayed in Table 3, to summarize Maslow's five different levels of need (p.2).

Locke developed discrepancy theory and argued that a person's level of satisfaction was not based on the fulfillment of needs, but was based on what the individual perceived as being important (Locke, 1976). Discrepancy theory was based on the proposition that workers would be dissatisfied with their jobs when they received less than they wanted. Bandura, a social psychologist, expanded this line of thinking in developing the social influence hypothesis. His theory varied from discrepancy theory in

that he believed that individuals valued those things they perceived others around them valued (Bandura, 1986).

Table 3
Maslow's Five Levels of Need

Level	Type of Need	Examples
1	Physiological	Thirst, sex, hunger
2	Safety	Security, stability, protection
3	Love and belongingness	To escape loneliness, love and be loved and gain a sense of belonging
4	Esteem	Self-respect, the respect of others
5	Self-actualization	To fulfill one's potentialities

The dominant theory of satisfaction and work motivation relevant to this study was based on Vroom's Expectancy Theory. Vroom (1964) argued that individuals made choices based on preference and the degree that the individual believed that the enacted choice would result in a desired outcome. Satisfaction was then determined by the perceived probability and actuality that the desired outcome would be attained. He equated preference to valence, a term that referred to "affective orientations towards particular outcomes" (p. 15). Vroom wrote that, "The strength of a person's desire or aversion for them (outcomes) is based not on their intrinsic properties but on the anticipated satisfaction or dissatisfaction associated with other outcomes to which they are expected to lead" (p. 15). For Vroom, the power or force of a motivation was derived from a multiplication of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. The expectancy theory

equation developed by Vroom was as follows: Motivational Force = Expectancy x Instrumentation x Valence.

Scholl (2002) described motivational force as the force moving an individual to choose, whether knowingly or unknowingly, among behavioral alternatives. This force, he wrote, also determined whether a certain behavior was sustained or ceased to exist. Expectancy, according to Scholl, was the perceived belief that a specific behavior would result in the attainment of a desired level of performance. The basis for the development of perceptions or beliefs was grounded in the individual's prior experience, self efficacy (confidence), and perception of the difficulty inherent in the desired performance goal and the individual's ability to control performance outcomes. Scholl's belief regarding instrumentality referred to the perceived probability that attainment of certain performance standards would result in desired rewards/outcomes. He described the variables that affect instrumentality as trust in leaders, control of awards, and the presence of formalized policies that determine the giving of awards. Valence was described as the value an individual places on the awards as determined by the individuals goals, needs, values, and motivational sources (Scholl). In his 2002 work, Scholl expressed the expectancy model as: $MF = E \times I \times V$. This implied, according to Scholl, that individuals, when choosing between different options, typically choose the one that provides the greatest motivational force.

Vroom (1964) identified job satisfaction as the valence of the job role to the worker. In this context, he differentiated between different valences or degrees of job

satisfaction within different work roles and a general valence of overall satisfaction.

Vroom asserted that the individual valences that were most satisfying included “high pay, substantial promotional opportunities, considerate and participative supervision, an opportunity to interact with one’s peers, varied duties, and a high degree of control over work methods and work pace” (p. 173).

Vroom (1964) also suggested that an individual’s level of job satisfaction was directly related to an individual’s self conception. If an individual believed that a particular task required skills valued by the individual, then subsequent success would validate the individual’s self conception and lead to satisfaction. When a person failed, however, and the abilities required for the task were not valued or possessed according to the self conception of the individual, then dissatisfaction followed.

Lawler (1994) proposed that job satisfaction was a consequence of performance as influenced by both the kind of reward received and the connection of that reward to the performance. He argued that extrinsic rewards such as pay and promotion play a vital role in motivation and the overall culture of the organization. These extrinsic rewards defined what behaviors were valued. They also motivated management styles and types of performance and ultimately helped to determine how satisfying work experiences were for the worker.

Over time, a number of valences have been identified. Six factors influencing job satisfaction were identified (Bavendam Research, 2000). These included opportunity for promotion, stress, leadership, work standards, fair rewards, and authority/freedom in job

performance. Scholl (2002) identified pay increases and bonuses, promotions, time off, new and interesting assignments, recognition, intrinsic satisfaction from validating one's skills and abilities, and intrinsic satisfaction from knowing that one's efforts had the potential to be a positive influence in helping someone. Gappa (2000), in a study of college faculty, identified rewards and recognition; opportunities for growth; work-life balance; perceptions of the work environment; and training and development as key factors contributing to satisfaction.

Spector (1997) identified eight factors which included pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Bryson, Cappellari, and Lucifora (2005) suggested that job satisfaction was related to objective realities of a worker's experience. They further argued that job satisfaction should be evaluated on the basis of different aspects of the job. Some of the aspects they suggested were task discretion, participation in decision making, pay, being with a good employer, the work itself, and promotion.

There was a great deal of commonality in these various listing of factors contributing to job satisfaction and those contained in the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The JDI provided an adequate representation of these factors in that it measured (a) Work on Present Job, (b) Pay, (c) Opportunities for Promotion, (d) Supervision, and (e) People on Your Present Job (attitudes toward coworkers). Spector (1997) acknowledged a limitation of the JDI in assessing only five facets but defended the facets included in the JDI as representing the five areas most commonly assessed in job satisfaction. Lawler

(1994) also argued that these five facets were the most common factors and actually structured his work, *Motivation in Work Organizations* around these same five facets (p. 83).

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2006) described Expectancy Theory as a well-accepted theory on motivation and related the theory to educational staff behaviors. Forest (2006) described expectancy-valence theory as the analytical framework used most often to evaluate work motivation. The Consortium for Research in Education related valence to the value or positive outcomes of meeting student achievement goals. Examples of positive outcomes could include bonus pay or personal satisfaction (Consortium for Policy Research in Education). Conversely, valence could refer to undesirable outcomes such as public disapproval that have been associated with a failure to reach student achievement goals. The Consortium related instrumentality to the educators' perception regarding the necessity of reaching the goal of improved achievement in order to receive desired outcomes. Expectancy in this context, according to the Consortium, was based on educators' perceptions that their efforts would result in improved student achievement.

Darboe (2003) set out to test Vroom's expectancy theory in the context of a study of job satisfaction among plant science graduates. Darboe's findings supported Vroom's hypothesis that task performance was positively related to the relevance the task had for the worker. A belief that the task could be performed successfully resulted in experiencing a positive valence. On the other hand when an individual experienced a

negative valent outcome, failure ensued. Darboe found a strong association as indicated by a Cramer V coefficient of 0.552. This result was statistically significant with a probability value of less than 5%. Peris, in his 1984 study of high school principals in New York, also utilized expectancy motivation theory as a predictor of job satisfaction. He found that the study “strongly confirmed” (p. 95) expectancy motivation theory as a predictor of motivation. Peris asserted that expectancy theory held promise in improving principal performance through personnel policies and practices that included merit opportunities. Marsden and Richardson (1994) utilized expectancy theory to consider the effects of the introduction of performance pay for Inland Revenue staff in the U.K. Their study of 2,400 Inland Revenue staff indicated that performance pay led to some adverse effects in terms of a lowering of morale and cooperation.

Current Research on Principal Satisfaction

Past research examining various aspects of job satisfaction and the public school administrator produced mixed results. In 1984, Callarman conducted a study of high school and middle school principals in Central Florida utilizing the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) questionnaire. Her research focused on the difference in satisfaction levels between principals in schools designated as smaller or larger. Callarman’s findings demonstrated that principals in larger schools were somewhat more satisfied than principals in smaller schools. Her supposition was that this difference could be, in part, accounted for by the fact that larger schools provided more support to principals in terms of personnel and funding (Callarman, 1984). Callarman also found a difference in satisfaction levels on

those indicators over which principals had more control such as co-workers, supervisors, and work. Institutionally imposed indicators such as pay and promotion were less satisfying.

Miller (1985) found similar results in his research of secondary principals in Minnesota. He found that while principals demonstrated a general satisfaction with their jobs overall, they were more satisfied with the intrinsic aspects of the job. The extrinsic aspects that were less satisfying included recognition, advancement, and compensation. Additionally, Miller found that background variables such as sex, age, years of administrative experience, and level of education were not significantly related to satisfaction. Peris (1984), in his study of job satisfaction for New York principals, also demonstrated a greater need for intrinsic awards as they received higher rankings than did extrinsic factors. He did find, however, that both intrinsic and extrinsic awards were valued by the principals as work outcomes.

Borquist (1987) conducted a job satisfaction study for school administrators in Portland Oregon. Her findings demonstrated that the strongest satisfiers for these administrators were the work itself, achievement, and interpersonal relationships. The strongest dissatisfiers were autonomy, amount of work, lack of feedback, constraints, and administrative policies.

Emerson (1995) conducted a job satisfaction study for school principals in Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DoDDS). Satisfiers for these respondents included relationships with staff, colleagues and students, as well as salary and standard

of living. Non-educational duties, namely, amount of time devoted to non-educational duties, number of hours worked, extra tasks, amount of work required, and regional decision-making process were sources of dissatisfaction (Emerson).

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodology and procedures employed in determining the job satisfaction of elementary principals in Florida following the implementation of Florida's A+ system for grading schools. Collection and analysis of the survey (Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale) data served to identify principals' attitudes towards their work. Comparative and descriptive analysis of the data to national norms, prior studies, and school grades provided the basis for determining satisfaction levels relative to similar professions and like professions prior to the implementation of the A+ program.

Chapter 3 is divided into six sections. The first section contains a statement of the problem. The second section describes the population of the study. The third section details the instrumentation employed in the research. The fourth section addresses instrument reliability and validity. The fifth section describes the procedures employed for data collection and the sixth section details the data analysis. Chapter 3 concludes with a summary of the aforementioned six sections.

Problem Statement

This study sought to examine the impact of Florida's A+ program of accountability on elementary principal job satisfaction. In order to accomplish this, it was

necessary to link the five facets of the JDI with outcomes of Florida's A+ program of grading and accountability. Table 4 presents the JDI categories linked to policies and outcomes related to the school grade and achievement under Florida's A+ system.

Population

The population of this study was comprised of 164 elementary school principals in public schools representing three Florida counties. Principals were identified based on information available on school district web pages. Principals from private or charter schools were excluded from the study.

Chosen to reflect varied geographical, racial, cultural and demographic characteristics, the districts were selected to be representative of the diversity of the county system of school districts in Florida. The following selections ensured that large, medium and small districts were included in the study: 1 large school district (District A) with over 30,000 elementary students, 1 moderate sized district (District B) with 20,000 to 30,000 elementary students; and 1 small district (District C) with less than 20,000 elementary students. Appendix A presents relevant demographic characteristics of these counties obtained from the Florida School Indicators Report as of the 2003/2004 school year (FDOE, 2005).

Table 4
 Matrix Connecting the JDI Facets of Satisfaction with District and State Policies

Job Descriptive Index Facets	Impact of Policies and Outcomes Related to Florida's A+ Plan
Work on Present Job	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decreased or continued poor performance results in greater constraints and less freedom as the District and State take greater control of programming and decision making. 2. Decreased or continued poor performance results in greater scrutiny and criticism from the District, State, press, and community. 3. Increased or high performance results in greater freedom to determine policies and procedures with less control from the State and District. 4. Increased or high performance results in positive press from the District, State, press, and community.
Present Pay	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decreased or continued poor performance results in poorer evaluations that exempt the principal from State merit pay. 2. Decreased or continued poor performance may also result in demotion which has a negative impact on pay. 3. Increased or high academic performance increases the opportunity for merit pay and incentive monies from the State that can be used for bonuses. 4. Increased or high performance improves promotional chances that have a positive impact on pay.
Opportunities for Promotion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor academic performance has a negative impact on promotional opportunities. 2. Poor academic performance may lead to demotion or a transfer to a less desirable work location/position. 3. Increased or high academic performance increases the opportunity for promotion or lateral transfers to desirable work locations.
Supervision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decreased or continued poor academic performance results in increased supervision and oversight by District and State officials. 2. Decreased or continued poor academic performance result in greater accountability through site visits by District and/or State officials. 3. Academic performance has a direct impact on the informal and formal evaluations of immediate supervisors.
People on Your Present Job	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decreased or continued poor academic performance increased pressure to make changes in personnel and instructional practices. 2. Decreased or continued poor academic performance results in poor staff morale and increased tension among coworkers. 3. Improved or high academic performance results in greater stability and improved morale.

Instrumentation

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) has a proven track record and has been used in much of the prior research conducted on principal satisfaction. At the time of its initial development, Vroom (1964) described the JDI as “the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence today” (p. 100). He was critical of most other measures because, in his view, they were either adaptations of old measures or new one-time measures. This approach to measuring job satisfaction meant that studies could not easily be compared and did little to address the problems of scaling and validity. Since its development, the JDI has been described as the most widely used measurement of job satisfaction in the United States (DeMeuse, 1985; Zedeck, 1987). The JDI has also been used in a number of international studies including the work of Hu and Liu (2004) and Riad (1994) and was listed among approved research instruments in the *Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health* (Mayo Clinic, 2005).

The JDI was revised in 1987, 1996, and in 1997. These three revisions involved the renorming of items, the establishment of new national norms, and scale refinement. One study by Carson et al. (2002), assessing the construct validity of the JDI, determined that construct validity was supported by “(a) acceptable estimates of internal consistency and test-retest reliability, (b) results that conform to a nomological network of job satisfaction relationships, and (c) demonstrated convergent and discriminant validity” (p. 32).

In 1997, abridged versions of the JDI (AJDI) and JIG (AJIG) were developed. The AJDI contained 25 items overall as compared to 72 items in the JDI, and the AJIG

contained 8 items as compared to 18 in the JIG. Since the abridged versions have not been fully tested, the full versions of the JDI and JIG were used in gathering the data for this study.

At the time of the present study, the JDI research group was housed at Bowling Green State University and was involved in maintaining and updating the instrument, creating new instruments, and warehousing data from projects utilizing the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General Scale (JIG). Bowling Green State University agreed to provide the instruments for the purpose of gathering data used in this research project (Appendix F).

The JDI consists of five facet scales, each containing a list of 72 descriptive items, measuring five areas: (a) Work on Present Job, (b) Pay, (c) Opportunities for Promotion, (d) Supervision, and (e) People on your Present Job or coworkers (Balzer et al., 2000). Researchers, in expressing their views on the factors that affect job satisfaction, have consistently affirmed the relevancy of these five areas. The Job in General Scale (JIG), comprised of 18 items, provided an overall measure of job satisfaction. Each facet on the JDI and JIG offered respondents three alternative response choices. The choices included “Yes” if the item accurately described the job, “No” if the item did not accurately describe the job and “?” if a decision could not be made.

Additional questions were added to the questionnaire by the researcher in an effort to gain additional demographic data and to provide principals with an opportunity to respond to an open-ended question. Demographic information requested included

principal gender, principal ethnicity, and length of service as a principal. The open-ended question asked principals to identify the greatest policy challenge currently facing them and how it might be addressed. Individual school grade information was obtained from the FDOE website.

Instrument Reliability

Internal reliability estimates were calculated for each subscale of the 1997 JDI and JIG utilizing the 1600 cases of national norm data (Balzer, et al., 2000). Table 2 presents the coefficient alpha estimates of reliability (Cortina, 1996; Cronbach, 1951).

Table 5
Coefficient Alpha (α) Values for the JDI and JIG

Job Descriptive Index Subscales	α	n
Work	.90	1623
Pay	.86	1603
Opportunities for Promotion	.87	1611
Supervision	.91	1613
People on your Present Job (Coworkers)	.91	1615
Job in General Scale	.92	1629

Crocker and Algina (1986) defined a composite score as a total score based on two or more subtest scores. Under this definition, school grade would qualify as a composite score as it was determined from six different FCAT measures. The question as it related to reliability was, therefore, “What is the reliability of the composite for these six measures and thus grade?” In the technical assistance paper developed by the Florida

Department of Education (FDOE, 2005), there was no mention of the reliability for the A+ system of assigning grades to schools. The Assessment and Accountability Briefing Book (FDOE, 2005), likewise, did not report figures on the reliability of school grades. Reported reliability coefficients using Cronbach's Alpha for individual tests, however, ranged from .87 to .93 for mathematics and reading tests administered to students in grades 3 through 10 in 2003.

Data Collection

The five step method for collecting data, modeled after the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2000), was utilized. This approach has demonstrated success in producing accurate information and increased response rates (Dillman). First contact with the targeted 180 principals in the three counties was through an introductory email notifying principals that an important questionnaire would be arriving via email in the next few days (Appendix G).

The JDI. and JIG survey instruments were then sent to each of the 180 principals in the identified counties using an embedded link in an email message (Appendix H). This email requested that each principal access the embedded link, input the password code unique to each respondent, complete the questionnaire, and upload the completed questionnaire in order to return it to the researcher. After 14 days, another email with embedded survey link (Appendix I) was sent to each non-respondent. This email reminded the principals of the study and requested their timely participation. The email also provided an opportunity for non-respondents to request a paper survey if that was

preferred to the electronic format. The fourth contact with non-respondents entailed a hand-written post card (Appendix J), again reminding non-respondents of the importance of the study and requesting their participation. The researcher monitored the number of returned surveys on a daily basis; and a thank you email was sent to responding principals.

Data Analysis

All submitted and completed surveys were reviewed and scored by the researcher utilizing the JDI and JIG User's Manual (Balzer et al., 2000). In accordance with this manual, the scales were scored by assigning a numerical value to the "Yes", "No", and "?" responses. Favorably worded responses received a value of 3 for "Yes" responses, a value of 0 for "No" responses, and a value of 1 for "?" responses. Unfavorably worded responses were assigned a value of 3 for "No" responses, 0 for "Yes" responses, and 1 for "?" responses. Responding principals were also grouped according to demographic variables. The number and percentage of respondents were reported based on size of district (small, medium, large), gender (male, female), ethnicity (Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, Other), and longevity in the principalship (<1, 2-5, 6-10, 11-15, 15+).

The data analysis was completed using the *Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows*, Version 11.0 (2003). Frequencies and percentages were calculated. Results were displayed for each of the research questions using tables and figures when

appropriate with accompanying narratives for each of the research questions. The analyses used for each of the research questions are detailed in the following paragraphs.

Data Analysis for Research Question 1

Research Question 1 sought to describe those factors that contributed to job satisfaction for elementary principals in Florida. In compliance with the JDI and JIG User's Manual (Balzer et al., 2000), scores for the JDI Work, Supervision, and Co-workers facets were computed by summing the individual's responses to the items in each scale. The scores on the JDI Pay and Promotion facets were scored in the same way, but were then doubled to obtain the scale score as these facets contained only half as many items as the other scales. Scores for each facet scale ranged from 1 to 54. In the event that a respondent failed to mark a response on 1, 2 or 3 items within one of the 18 item scales, a value of 1 was assigned. If more than three responses were omitted, that particular scale was not scored. This same rule applied for the 9 item scales if 1 or 2 items were omitted.

The developers of the JDI defined the neutral point as the ambivalent range in which respondents hold neither strong negative or positive feelings about a certain aspect of their job. No exact neutral point is possible, but it was recommended that a score of 27 be considered as a reasonable neutral point. Thus, scores that were well above 27 (32 or above) indicated satisfaction, and scores that were well below 27 (22 or below) indicated dissatisfaction. Levels of satisfaction were plotted on a profile and compared to national norms developed specifically for the JDI which adjusted for background and job

differences (Balzer et al., 2000). Median scores and scores for the 25th and 75th percentiles were calculated to give an indication of the variability of satisfaction scores. A t-test for independent samples was conducted to determine if a significant difference existed between the median of the JDI scores and established national norms.

Data Analysis for Research Question 2

Research Question 2 focused on the relationship between facet scores and school grade and whether principals in schools with higher grades were more or less satisfied in the five facet areas than principals in schools with lower grades. Median scores were calculated for each facet on the JDI by school grade and examined to determine the relationship between level of satisfaction on each of the five facets and the school grade (A through F). A Spearman rank coefficient was utilized to calculate the relationship between the school grade and each of the five dimensions.

Data Analysis for Research Question 3

Research Question 3 focused on the overall satisfaction of elementary principals in Florida as measured by the JIG. In compliance with the JDI and JIG User's Manual (Balzer et al., 2000), scores for the JIG were computed by summing the individual's responses to the items in the JIG scale. Scores for the JIG scale ranged from 1 to 54. In the event that the respondent failed to mark a response on 1, 2 or 3 items within one of the 18 item scales, a value of 1 was assigned. If more than three responses were omitted, that particular scale was not scored.

The developers of the JDI defined the neutral point as the ambivalent range in which respondents hold neither strong negative or positive feelings about the job as a whole. No exact neutral point is possible, but it was again recommended that a score of 27 be considered as a reasonable neutral point. Thus, scores that were well above 27 (32 or above) indicated satisfaction, and scores that were well below 27 (22 or below) indicated dissatisfaction. Levels of satisfaction were plotted on a profile and compared to national norms developed specifically for the JDI which adjusted for background and job differences (Balzer et al., 2000). Median scores and scores for the 25th and 75th percentiles were calculated to give an indication of the variability of satisfaction scores. A t-test for independent samples was conducted to determine if a significant difference existed between the median of the JIG scores and established national norms.

Median JIG scores were then compared to median JIG scores on previous research conducted on school principals. A t-test for independent samples was conducted to determine if a significant difference existed between the median scores obtained in this research and scores obtained from prior research.

Data Analysis for Research Question 4

Research Question 4 focused on the relationship between overall job satisfaction and school grade and whether principals in schools with higher grades were more or less satisfied than principals in schools with lower grades. Median scores were calculated for the JIG by school grade and examined to determine whether or not there was a relationship between overall level of satisfaction and the school grade (A through F). The

results were presented in tabular form and discussed. A Spearman rank coefficient was calculated between the school grade and the JIG.

Data Analysis for Research Question 5

Research Question 5 focused on the differences between overall satisfaction of respondents as measured by the JIG and demographic characteristics (gender, ethnicity, and longevity in the principalship). In compliance with the JDI and JIG User's Manual (Balzer et al., 2000), scores for the JIG were computed by summing the individual's responses to the items in the JIG scale. Scores for the JIG scale range from 1 to 54. In the event that a respondent failed to mark a response on 1, 2, or 3 items within one of the 18 item scales, a value of 1 was assigned to that scale. If more than three responses were omitted, that particular scale was not scored.

Levels of satisfaction were plotted on a profile and compared to demographic national norms developed specifically for the JIG which adjusted for background and job differences (Balzer et al., 2000). Median scores and scores for the 25th and 75th percentiles were calculated to give an indication of the variability of satisfaction scores. A t-test was conducted to determine the difference between overall satisfaction of respondents as measured by the JIG and gender. While a t-test assumes normal distribution and homogeneity of variances for the populations under study, this test was utilized because of its robust nature rendering it virtually unaffected by marked non-normality (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Glass, 1996, and Spatz, 2001). Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) also supported this view in writing that, "Statisticians have found that t tests

provide accurate estimates of statistical significance even under conditions of substantial violation of these assumptions” (p. 315).

A one-way analyses of variance was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between demographic groups in the JIG score. Responses to an open-ended question provided in their entirety in Appendix K were also categorized, displayed and discussed in an effort to identify those policy challenges that might be helpful in understanding elementary principals’ overall level of satisfaction. Analysis of this question followed the logical, iterative steps identified by Gay, Mills, & Airasian (2006) for qualitative research data. These steps included (a) becoming familiar with the data and identifying potential themes in it (reading/memoing), (b) examining the data in depth to provide detailed descriptions of the participants and activity (describing), and (c) categorizing and coding pieces of data and grouping them into themes (classifying) (p. 469).

Summary

This chapter has provided a description of the methodology and procedures employed in determining the job satisfaction of public elementary school principals in select Florida school districts. The chapter contains a statement of the problem, description of the population, and information related to the instrument and procedures employed in the study. A summary of the data analysis with accompanying tables and narratives is presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the findings, conclusions and implications of the study.

CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study was developed to investigate the level of job satisfaction among elementary principals in Florida following the implementation of the A+ system of accountability. This study also built upon prior research of principal satisfaction and intended to contribute to the existent body of knowledge on principal satisfaction. The measurement instrument used was the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General provided by Bowling Green State University.

Population and Demographic Characteristics

The population of this study was comprised of 164 principals in three different Florida Counties during the 2006-2007 school year. Data were received from 65 principals who responded to the questionnaire. Demographic data obtained from respondents are represented in Table 6. The 65 respondents to the questionnaire were comprised of 20 males (30.8%) and 45 females (69.2%). A third of the respondents (n=22, 33.9%) reported being a principal for 2-5 years, while 9.2% of respondents reported being a principal less than year (n=6). Almost a quarter (22.5%, n=14) had been a principal for 6-10 years; 16.9% or 11 respondents had been a principal for 11-15 years; and 18.5% or 12 respondents reported being a principal for more than 15 years.

Over a third of respondents (42.8%, n=27) were principals at A schools, while an equal number of respondents were principals of B or C schools (28.6%, n=18). There

were no respondents from D or F rated schools and two respondents were at new schools that were as yet ungraded.

Table 6
Personal and Professional Characteristics of Respondents (N=65)

Characteristics	n	%
Gender		
Male	20	30.8
Female	45	69.2
Total	65	100.0
Years as Principal		
<1	6	9.2
2-5	22	33.9
6-10	14	21.5
11-15	11	16.9
15+	12	18.5
Total	65	100.0
School Grade in 2006		
A	27	42.8
B	18	28.6
C	18	28.6
D	0	0.0
F	0	0.0
Total	63*	100.0
Ethnicity		
African American	8	12.3
Caucasian	49	75.4
Hispanic	7	10.8
Other	1	1.5
Total	65	100.0
Size of District		
Small (<20,000)	14	21.5
Medium (20-30,000)	12	18.5
Large (>30,000)	39	60.0
Total	65	100.0

Note. Two schools did not receive a grade in 2006.

Fully three-fourths of the respondents described themselves as Caucasian (75.4%, n=49). A total of 12.3% or 8 of the respondents described themselves as African-American, and 10.8% or 7 respondents described themselves as Hispanic. Only 1 respondent or 1.5% of respondents claimed an ethnic background other than the three

mentioned. Over half (60.0%, n=39) of respondents were principals in a large school district with over 30,000 students. The remaining respondents were almost evenly divided between small (21.5%, n=14) and medium (18.5%, n=12) districts.

Research Question 1

What factors contribute to the level of job satisfaction for Florida principals?

When reporting the median scores for the subscales of the JDI, the JDI Manual (Balzer et al., 2000) strongly discouraged the analysis of individual scores, either within a sub-scale or as a total sub-scale score. Instead Balzer et al., encouraged analyzing a distribution of scores allowing the researcher to look at satisfaction trends within an organization and make comparisons with similar employee groups in other organizations. They also encouraged using median scores when analyzing JDI and JIG outcomes. All reporting of median scores, therefore, can be assumed to represent median scores.

In determining whether an employee was satisfied or dissatisfied, Balzer et al. (2000) proposed establishing a neutral point on the 54 point scale that represented a balance of positive and negative feelings (ambivalence) about the job or specific aspects of the job. They pointed out that while in theory there was no actual neutral point, the JDI developers had found that a middle range around a score of 27 was reasonably close to the middle range of possible scores and indicated ambivalence. They determined that scores well above 27 (32 or above) indicated satisfaction while scores well below 27 (22 or below) indicated dissatisfaction.

A Cronbach Alpha test of reliability was conducted for respondents' scores on the five subscales of the JDI. Table 7 presents the results for this analysis in addition to reliability scores reported by the JDI Research Office (Balzer et al., p. 43).

Table 7
Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Subscales

Subscales	Current Study	JDI Research Office
Work on Present Job	.29	.90
Pay	.73	.86
Opportunities for Promotion	.91	.87
Supervision	.87	.91
People on your Present Job	.82	.91

Note. Zero variance was reported within the Work on Present Job Subscale (see Appendix D) for W11 (challenging), W15 (dull), W16 (uninteresting), and W18 (uses my abilities).

Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients demonstrated that the reliability reported for Work on Present Job of .29 was substantially lower than the reliability coefficient for this subscale reported by the JDI Research Office (.90). The analysis reported a zero variance for items W11 (challenging), W15 (dull), W16 (uninteresting), and W18 (uses my abilities). These items were, therefore, removed from the analysis resulting in a 22% decrease in sample items under the subscale of Work on Present Job. The reported Cronbach alpha for Pay was .73 as compared to .86 reported by the JDI Research Office. Cronbach alpha coefficients for Opportunities for Promotion and Supervision were .91 and .87 respectively as compared with JDI reported coefficients of .87 and .91. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for People on your Present Job was .82 as compared to .91 reported by the JDI Research Office.

Table 8 presents the data on the job satisfaction of the surveyed elementary principals as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The range of scores for each subscale along with scores at the 25th, 50th and 75th percentiles are displayed to provide an indication of the variability or spread of satisfaction scores. The distribution of median scores indicated that the highest level of satisfaction was reported in the People on your Present Job subscale. Scores in this scale ranged from a median score of 9 to a median score of 54. When using the scores for satisfaction (32 and higher) suggested by Balzer et al. (2000), scores at the 25th percentile of 42, 50th percentile of 48, and 75th percentile of 52 suggested a high level of satisfaction with People on your Present Job.

Table 8
Distribution of Scores for Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Subscales

Subscales	Range	Median Scores		
		25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile
Work on Present Job	19-54	45	49	52
Pay	0-54	18	28	36
Opportunities for Promotion	0-54	12	23	44
Supervision	10-54	43	50	54
People on your Present Job	9-54	42	48	52

Note. Lowest possible score is 0; highest possible score is 54. Range indicates the range of scores for each scale from lowest median score to highest median score. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54.

Respondents also reported high levels of satisfaction with Work on Present Job and Supervision. Scores on the subscale of Work on Present Job ranged from 19 to 54 with scores of 45 (25th percentile), 49 (50th percentile), and 52 (75th percentile). Scores on

the subscale of Supervision were similar as scores ranged from 10 to 54 with scores of 43 (25th percentile), 50 (50th percentile), and 54 (75th percentile).

The subscales of Opportunities for Promotion and Pay provided the lowest levels of job satisfaction for responding principals when compared with the other subscales. Scores on the promotion subscale ranged from 0 to 54, and the score for the 25th percentile was 12; the score for the 50th percentile was 23; and the score for the 75th percentile was 44. Scores for the Pay subscale ranged from 0 to 54. The score for the 25th percentile was 18; the score for the 50th percentile was 28; and the score for the 75th percentile was 36.

Table 9 presents frequency distribution data on the reported job satisfaction of the surveyed elementary principals as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Displayed are the levels of satisfaction (Satisfaction, Ambivalence and Dissatisfaction) for each of the JDI subscales.

An analysis of frequency distribution for People on your Present Job demonstrated either strong satisfaction or dissatisfaction in that 95.1% of respondents had median scores higher than 32. Only 4.8% of respondents had median scores demonstrating dissatisfaction (22 or below), and no respondents had median scores falling in the ambivalent range from 23 to 32. Frequency distributions for the subscale of Work on Present Job demonstrated that 92.2% of respondents had median scores greater than 32, 3.1% had median scores below 22, and 4.7% fell in the ambivalent range.

Frequency distributions for Supervision demonstrated that 87.3% of the respondents were satisfied with their supervisors, 4.8% were unsatisfied, and 7.9% fell into the ambivalent range. Half of all respondents (50%) reported median scores below 22 while less than a third (31.2%) reported median scores of 32 or higher. 18.8% of the median scores fell into the ambivalent range.

Table 9
Respondents' Reported Satisfaction on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

Satisfaction Level	n	%
Work on Present Job		
Satisfaction	60	93.7
Ambivalence	2	3.2
Dissatisfaction	2	3.1
Total	64	100.0
Pay		
Satisfaction	23	35.6
Ambivalence	19	30.0
Dissatisfaction	22	34.4
Total	64	100.0
Opportunities for Promotion		
Satisfaction	21	32.8
Ambivalence	11	17.2
Dissatisfaction	32	50.0
Total	64	100.0
Supervision		
Satisfaction	56	88.9
Ambivalence	5	7.9
Dissatisfaction	2	3.2
Total	63	100.0
People on your Present Job		
Satisfaction	59	96.7
Ambivalence	0	0.0
Dissatisfaction	2	3.3
Total	61	100.0

Note. Satisfaction levels were based on the recommendations of the JDI Research Office (Balzer et al., 2000) and reflect the median score of all respondents on each JDI subscale. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54. All respondents did not complete each subscale.

An analysis of frequency distribution for Pay indicated an almost equal division of scores in each of the three categories of satisfaction, ambivalence, and dissatisfaction.

34.4% of the respondents indicated dissatisfaction with Pay (median scores of 22 or below), 32.8% reported ambivalence with current Pay (median scores from 23 to 31), and 32.8% reported satisfaction (median scores of 32 and above).

The JDI Research Group at Bowling Green State University developed national norms allowing for differences within organizations related to employee backgrounds and work situations. These norms allowed for comparisons as to how survey respondents' satisfaction compared with that of similar national groups in percentile terms utilizing median scores on the JDI subscales. The national norms for manager and government were chosen for comparison purposes. Given the substantial documentation of the managerial roles of principals (Drake & Roe, 1999, Owens, 2001, & Sergiovanni, 2006) and the government employee status of public school principals, it was appropriate to use the national norms for managers and for government workers. Comparison of the JDI subscale median scores with national norms is presented in Table 10.

An analysis of the median scores for each of these three groups demonstrated both similarities and differences. For comparison purposes, the neutral zone suggested by Balzer et al. (2000) was again used to determine relative dissatisfaction (0-22), ambivalence (23-31), and satisfaction (32-54). On the whole, principal respondents in this survey were relatively more satisfied than managers or government workers represented in the national norms. On the Work on Present Job subscale all three groups reported satisfaction with principal respondents reporting median scores of 49 as compared to managers with median scores of 44 and government workers with median scores of 40.

Principal respondents also reported higher median scores in the subscale of Opportunities for Promotion. Principal respondents reported a median score of 23 which fell in the ambivalent range, while both managers (16) and government workers (10) reported medians scores that indicated dissatisfaction.

Median scores on the subscale of Supervision reflected satisfaction for all three groups with principal respondents reporting a higher relative level of satisfaction (50) than managers (38) or government workers (33). Median scores on the subscale of People on your Present Job reflected a similar trend with principal respondents reporting a median score of 48, managers a median score of 38, and government workers a median score of 36. Principal respondents reported a lower median score in Pay (28) than managers (31), but a higher score than the national norm for government workers (25).

Table 10
Comparison of Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Median Scores with National Norms

Subscales	Median Scores		
	Principal	Manager	Government
Work on Present Job	49	44	40
Pay	28	31	25
Opportunities for Promotion	23	16	10
Supervision	50	38	33
People on your Present Job	48	38	36

Note. Scores range from 0-54. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54. National norms for 'manager' and 'government' were obtained from the JDI Manual (Balzer et al., 2000).

Research Question 2

What is the relationship between school grade and the five dimensions of job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI)?

School grades were obtained from the Florida Department of Education web site for each school represented by a responding principal. Table 11 presents the data for each median subscale score corresponding to the grade the schools received.

Table 11
Median Job Descriptive Index (JDI) Subscale Scores by School Grade

Subscales	A Schools			B Schools			C Schools		
	n	%	M	n	%	M	n	%	M
Work on Present Job	26	42.0	48	18	29.0	48	18	29.0	51
Pay	26	42.0	24	18	29.0	30	18	29.0	29
Opportunities for Promotion	26	42.0	21	18	29.0	17	18	29.0	29
Supervision	26	42.6	48	18	29.5	51	17	27.9	51
People on your Present Job	26	44.1	48	18	30.5	48	15	25.4	48

Note. Two schools did not receive a grade, and not all respondents that received a school grade completed every subscale. No D or F school principals in the survey population responded to the survey. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54. All respondents did not complete each subscale.

An analysis of the distribution of median scores on the JDI subscales across school grades demonstrated that median scores for Work on Present Job varied somewhat with principals from A and B schools reporting a score of 48, while principals from C rated schools reported a median score of 51. Principals from A schools reported a median score of 24 for Pay, while principals from B and C rated schools reported median scores of 30 and 29 respectively. On the subscale of Opportunities for Promotion, C rated schools reported the highest median score (29) followed by A (21) and B (17) rated

schools. Principals from C schools also scored higher on Supervision (52) when compared with principals from B (51) and C (48) schools. Reported median scores for the subscale of People on your Present Job demonstrated little difference as principals from A rated schools reported a median score of 48.5, and principals from B and C rated schools reported median scores of 48.

Utilizing Balzer's scale (Balzer et al., 2000), median scores well above 27 (32 or above) indicated satisfaction, scores in the middle range of 23 to 31 indicated ambivalence, and scores well below 27 (22 or below) indicated dissatisfaction. On the subscales of Work on Present Job, Supervision, and people on present job, median scores at grades A, B, and C fell into the satisfied range. For the Pay subscale, median scores for each grade demonstrated feelings of ambivalence. In the Opportunities for Promotion subscale, the median scores for respondents reflected dissatisfaction in schools rated A (M=21.0) and B (M=17.0), while the median score for respondents in C graded schools reflected ambivalence (M=29.0).

In order to measure the strength of any association between grade and the five JDI subscales, a Spearman rank coefficient procedure was conducted. The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 12. No significant relationship was found between the respondents' median score and Work on Present Job ($r = .13$, $p = .33$) or Pay ($r = .11$, $p = .42$). There was also no significant relationship between median scores and Opportunities for Promotion ($r = .14$, $p = .28$), Supervision ($r = .22$, $p = .09$) or People on your Present Job ($r = -.06$, $p = .68$).

Table 12
Spearman Rank Coefficients between School Grade and the JDI Subscales

Grade	Rank Coefficient	p
Work on Present Job	.13	.33
Pay	.11	.42
Opportunities for Promotion	.14	.28
Supervision	.22	.09
People on your Present Job	-.06	.68

Research Question 3

What is the overall level of job satisfaction for elementary principals in Florida?

The Job in General Scale (JIG), comprised of 18 items, provided an overall measure of job satisfaction (See Appendix G). An analysis of the distribution of median scores for the JIG demonstrated a range of scores from 19 to 54. Respondents also reported high levels of satisfaction on the JIG with scores of 45 (25th percentile), 48 (50th percentile), and 52 (75th percentile). An analysis of reliability on JIG scores utilizing Cronbach's Alpha demonstrated a reliability coefficient of .86 as compared to a reliability coefficient of .92 reported by the JDI Research Office. Table 13 demonstrates the distribution of scores for respondents on the JIG scale.

Table 13
Distribution of Scores for the Job in General (JIG) Scale

Scale	Range	Median Scores		
		25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile
Job in General (JIG)	19-54	45	48	52

Note. Lowest possible score is 0; highest possible score is 54. Range indicates the range of scores for each scale from lowest median score to highest median score. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54.

Further analysis of the JIG frequency distribution demonstrated that 60 (93.7%) of the respondents had median scores greater than 32, indicating overall satisfaction, 2 (3.1%) respondents reported median scores below 22 indicating overall dissatisfaction with the job, and 2 (3.2%) respondents fell in the ambivalent range (23-31). Table 14 presents the frequency of median scores for respondents on the JIG scale.

Table 14
 Respondents' Reported Satisfaction on the Job in General (JIG) Scale

Satisfaction Level	Range	n	%
Job in General (JIG)			
Satisfaction	32-54	60	93.7
Ambivalence	23-31	2	3.2
Dissatisfaction	0-22	2	3.1
Total		64	100.0

Note. Satisfaction levels were based on the recommendations of the JDI Research Office (Balzer et al., 2000) and reflect the median score of all respondents on each JDI subscale. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54.

Table 15 presents the data from the comparison of national norms for managers and government workers as compared to the JIG median scale scores of principal respondents. Respondents' median scores on the JIG were again compared to JIG national norms for managers and government workers. The principals surveyed reported higher overall satisfaction (48) than managers (44) or government workers (42), although all three groups reflected median scores in the satisfied range (32 and above).

Table 15
Comparison of Job in General (JIG) Median Scores with National Norms

Scale	Median Scores		
	Principal	Manager	Government
Job in General (JIG)	48.0	44.0	42.0

Note. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54.

Research Question 4

What is the relationship between the school grade and overall job satisfaction as measured by the Job in General scale (JIG)?

A comparison of relative median satisfaction on the Job in General scale (JIG) when accounting for grade demonstrated little difference between the satisfaction levels of respondents in schools graded as A schools (47), B schools (45), and C Schools (49). Median scores across different grades reported satisfaction (32-54). In order to measure the strength of any association between grade and the JIG, a Spearman rank coefficient procedure was conducted. The results of this analysis demonstrated that there was no significant relationship between the respondents' median score and JIG ($r = .13$, $p = .38$).

An analysis of variance demonstrated no significant difference ($F=1.24$, $p < .05$) and post hoc tests (Tukey and Scheffe) likewise demonstrated no significant comparisons between the three grade groups and the JIG. Table 16 represents the median scores by grade for the JIG as reported by responding participants.

Table 16
Median Job in General (JIG) Scale Scores by School Grade

Job in General Scale	A Schools			B Schools			C Schools		
	n	%	M	n	%	M	n	%	M
Total Schools (62)	26	42	47	18	28.5	45	18	28.5	49

Note. Two schools did not receive a grade and not all respondents that received a school grade completed every subscale. No D or F school principals in the survey population responded to the survey. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54. All respondents did not complete the JIG subscale. ANOVA: $F=1.24$, $p < .05$. Pearson: $r = .10$, $p = .44$

Research Question 5

Do significant differences in job satisfaction, as measured by the Job in General Scale (JIG), exist based on principal gender, principal ethnicity, and longevity in the principalship.

An independent t-test was conducted to determine the differences that existed between the JIG median scores of male and female respondents. Table 17 displays the results of the t-test.

Table 17
t-Test for Job in General (JIG) Scale by Gender of Elementary School Principals (N=64)

Gender	Range	n	%	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Male	19-54	20	31.2	42.7	11.34	2.54
Female	39-54	44	68.8	49.0	4.48	.68

Note. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54. All respondents did not complete the JIG subscale. $t = -3.19$, $df = 62$, $p > .05$.

The t-test analysis demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference ($t = -3.19$, $df = 62$, $p > .05$) between the mean JIG score of male respondents (42.7) and the mean JIG score of the female respondents (49.0). Scores did not demonstrate normal distribution for either males or females and a Levene's test for equality of variances

demonstrated significant differences in variance between the two groups ($F = 22.42, p > .05$). Median scores for female respondents ranged from 39 to 54, while the responses for male respondents ranged from 19 to 54.

Table 18 demonstrates the distribution of median scores for respondents on the JIG scale. In an analysis of the distribution of scores, male respondents reported high overall levels of satisfaction on the JIG with median scores at the 25th percentile of 35, the 50th percentile of 46.5, and the 75th percentile of 50.8. Female respondents reported even higher satisfaction with median scores of 46.3 at the 25th percentile, 49.5 at the 50th percentile, and 53.5 at the 75th percentile. A comparison of national JIG norms for males and females demonstrated a similar trend with median scores being slightly lower for men (41.0) than for women (42.0) but still falling within the range of satisfied scores.

Table 18
Distribution of Median Scores for the Job in General (JIG) Scale by Gender

Gender	Range	Median Scores		
		25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile
Male	19-54	35.0	46.5	50.8
Female	39-54	46.3	49.5	53.5

Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54. All respondents did not complete each subscale. $F=1.24, p < .05$. National norms $M = 41.0$ (male), 42.0 (female) at 50th percentile.

An analysis of frequencies of scores demonstrated that fully 80.0% of the male respondents reported overall satisfaction (median scores above 32) on the JIG. Only 10% of male respondents reported dissatisfaction (median scores of 22 and below), and only 10% reported ambivalence (median scores between 23 and 31). Virtually all (100%) of

the female respondents reported overall satisfaction with their job (median scores of 32 or higher). Table 19 presents the frequency and percentages of median scores for respondents on the JIG scale.

In order to address the difference between the ethnicity of responding principals and overall satisfaction as indicated on the JIG, descriptive statistics were analyzed.

Table 20 presents the central tendency measures for respondents on the Job In General scale by principal ethnicity.

Table 19
Male and Female Respondents' Reported Satisfaction on the Job in General (JIG) Scale

Satisfaction Level	n	%
Male		
Satisfaction	16	80
Ambivalence	2	10
Dissatisfaction	2	10
Total	20	100
Female		
Satisfaction	44	100
Ambivalence	0	0
Dissatisfaction	0	0
Total	44	100

Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54. All respondents did not complete each subscale.

Table 20
Central Tendency Measures of Job in General (JIG) by Principal Ethnicity

Ethnicity	N	Median	Std. Error	SD	Kurtosis	Skewness
African American	8	51.0	1.69	4.78	3.97	-1.80
Caucasian	48	48.0	1.13	7.80	5.00	-2.07
Hispanic	7	48.0	4.18	11.05	2.22	-1.58
Other	1	52.0	-	-	-	-

Note. $F = .51$, $df = 3$, $p < .05$. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54

The largest number of respondents classified themselves as Caucasian (48) followed by African American respondents (8), Hispanic respondents (7), and one respondent classified himself as other. Median scores at the 50th percentile demonstrated very little difference in satisfaction between ethnic groups. While all four groups reported median scores well above the satisfaction threshold of 32, the respondent classified as other reported the highest level of satisfaction (52) followed by African American respondents (51) and Caucasian and Hispanic respondents (48).

As a further measure of the differences between median scores on the JIG and ethnicity, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of this analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the JIG median score and the ethnic background of respondents ($F = .51, df = 3, p < .05$). Less than 3% of the variance in the JIG median score was explained by the ethnic background of responding principals.

The JIG national norms provided by the JDI Research Office (Balzer et al., 2000) reported median scores of 38 for Caucasians, 35 for African Americans, and 32 for others. While these scores still fell into the satisfied range, median scores for respondents suggest a greater degree of satisfaction for respondents across ethnic groups than for the national comparison groups.

In order to address the difference between the longevity in the position of responding principals and overall satisfaction as indicated on the JIG, descriptive statistics were analyzed. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 21.

Table 21
Central Tendency Measures of Job in General (JIG) by Longevity in the Principalship

Longevity in Years	n	Median	Std. Error	SD	Kurtosis	Skewness
<1	6	49.5	1.00	2.45	-.30	.86
2-5	22	46.5	1.94	9.09	3.22	-1.74
6-10	14	48.0	2.54	9.51	2.96	-1.80
11-15	11	51.0	2.11	7.00	1.11	-1.34
15+	11	49.0	1.01	3.34	-1.17	-.02

Note. $F = 1.26$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$. Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54

Respondents in the principalship for 2-5 years comprised the largest group (22) followed by 6-10 years (14), 11-15 and 15+ years (11), and finally less than one year (6). JIG median scores at the 50th percentile demonstrated very little difference in satisfaction between respondents with differing years of experience. While all five groups reported median scores well above the satisfaction threshold of 32, respondents with 11-15 years reported the highest median satisfaction score on the JIG (51). Respondents with less than one year reported a median score of 49.5 and were followed closely by respondents with over 15 years in the principalship (49). Respondents with 8-10 years experience reported a median score of 48 while principals with 2-5 years reported a median score of 46.5.

To further analyze the differences between median scores on the JIG and length of years in the principalship, an analysis of variance was performed. The results of this analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the JIG median score and the number of years in the principalship reported by respondents ($F = 1.26$, $df =$

4, $p < .05$). Less than 2% of the variance in the JIG median score was explained by the years on the job of responding principals.

Table 22 presents data on JIG medians for principal respondents and national norms based on longevity. JIG national norms provided by the JDI Research Office (Balzer et al., 2000) reported median scores of 41 for those on the job less than one year, 41 for respondents working 2-5 years, 41 for respondents working 6-10 years, 42 for respondents working 11-15 years, and 42 for those on the job for more than 15 years. While these scores still fell into the satisfied range, median scores for principal respondents suggested a greater degree of satisfaction across groups based on years of service.

Table 22
Comparison of Job in General (JIG) Median Scores with National Norms and Longevity

Longevity in Years	Median Scores	
	Principal	National Norms
< 1	49.5	41
2-5	46.5	41
6-10	48.0	41
11-15	51.0	42
15+	49.0	42

Note. Lowest possible score is 0; highest possible score is 54. National norms were obtained from the JDI Manual (Balzer et al., 2000). Dissatisfaction = 0-22; ambivalence = 23-31; satisfaction = 32-54.

In an effort to gain further information relative to the satisfaction of elementary principals, respondents were given the opportunity to answer an open-ended question which inquired about their greatest policy challenge as a building principal and how it

might be addressed. These responses were reviewed by the researcher in an effort to identify those policy challenges that might be helpful in understanding elementary principals' level of satisfaction as determined using the JDI and JIG. The review yielded 49 issues described as policy challenges. These policy challenges were divided into the following three categories: (a) Achievement and accountability, (b) insufficient resources, and (c) building level issues. The issues are listed in their entirety in Appendix K.

Of the 49 issues, over three-fourths (37, 75.5%) were related to achievement and accountability. In the category of achievement and accountability, 11 of the expressed challenges concerned the large number of state and district initiatives schools were responsible for implementing. Four of the respondents identified the pressure on teachers and students for high achievement levels as a challenge. School grading and accountability accounted for 16 of the 37 issues identified, and challenges related to achievement and school demographics were identified by 4 respondents. High staff turnover and low staff morale resulting from accountability demands accounted for two of the identified policy challenges.

Policy challenges related to insufficient resources accounted for 7 (14.3%) of the 49 identified challenges. These challenges included insufficient funding (3), overcrowding (1), insufficient district support (2), and inadequate pay (1). Building level issues accounted for 5 (10.2%) of the 49 challenges identified. These included lack of parental support (2), lack of teacher professionalism (1), and lack of autonomy (2).

Table 23 presents the data for the policy challenges identified by respondents.

Table 23
Policy Challenges identified by Respondents (N = 49)

Policy Challenges	n	%
Achievement & Accountability		
State/District Initiatives	11	22.4
Student/Teacher Pressure	4	8.2
School Grading/Accountability	16	32.6
Demographics & Achievement	4	8.2
Staff Morale & Turnover	2	4.1
Total	37	75.5
Insufficient Resources		
Funding	3	6.1
Overcrowding	1	2.0
District Support	2	4.1
Pay	1	2.1
Total	7	14.3
Building Level Issues		
Parental Support	2	4.1
Teacher Professionalism	1	2.0
School Autonomy	2	4.1
Total	5	10.2

Of significance to this study were the comments by principals highlighting the pressures and accompanying dilemmas they experienced as a result of school accountability that could potentially lead to dissatisfaction. One principal identified the greatest challenge as “Bringing up reading scores and school morale.” Another wrote, “My greatest policy challenge is the grading of schools. Regardless of where a child is from and what prior knowledge they have, they are expected to learn at the same pace as a child who has been afforded many opportunities.” Another principal related fears that the emphasis on test scores had come at the expense of “educating the whole child.” This principal feared that this approach would end with criminals who could read well but did

not possess the skills necessary to be successfully integrated into society. Respondents also commented on the pressure to implement new programs with inadequate resources and the cost in time and effort required to complete accountability reports to the Federal Government, State, and district authorities.

Summary

An analysis of the data obtained from the respondent elementary principals to the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) assessment tools were presented in this chapter. Data analyses were performed using SPSS Graduate Pack 14.0 for Windows. Results of the analyses were presented using narrative discussion developed for each of the research questions and supported with tabular displays.

A summary and discussion of the findings of the study are presented in the Chapter 5. Chapter 5 also contains conclusions drawn from the research as well as recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Problem Statement

This study was developed to produce data about the job satisfaction of public elementary school principals in select Florida school districts. The problem of this study was to assess the job satisfaction of elementary school principals in light of the impact of Florida's A+ program of accountability and assignment of school grades utilizing the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) scales. Additionally, responses were examined to determine the impact on job satisfaction when gender, years on the job, and ethnicity were considered.

Methodology

Population and Data Collection

The survey population was comprised of 164 elementary public school principals in three different Florida Counties during the 2006-2007 school year. The first contact involved an email informing potential respondents of the purpose of the study and that a second contact with a link to the questionnaire would be arriving soon. The second contact entailed another email with an active link to the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) instruments accessed by a unique login and password. The third contact also included an active link with login and password but also provided potential respondents with an opportunity to request a hard copy of the questionnaire with a

stamped return envelope. The fourth and final contact involved a post card sent to each non-responder in the survey population with a final opportunity to access the questionnaire on-line. Email contacts yielded 65 (39.6%) completed questionnaires. Post card contacts did not yield any further completed questionnaires.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) instruments with permission of the JDI Research Office at Bowling Green State University. These instruments were supplemented with additional questions to gain data related to demographic variables. An additional open-ended question asked respondents to comment on policy challenges that might provide insight into factors impacting job satisfaction. The JDI is divided into five facets or subscales assessing job satisfaction as it relates to: (a) Work on Present Job, (b) Pay, (c) Opportunities for Promotion, (d) Supervision, and (e) People on your Present Job. The JIG was designed to provide an overall evaluation of how individuals feel about their jobs and provide a measure of overall job satisfaction.

Data Analysis

The JDI and JIG survey questionnaires were collected and scored using the JDI and JIG User's Manual provided by the JDI Research Office and the Department of Psychology at Bowling Green State University. The collected data were entered into

SPSS 14.0 for Windows, and all JDI guidelines were followed including alternate formatting and reverse scoring where appropriate.

Inherent in all survey questionnaires is the possibility of non-response error which could pose a threat to validity (Lindner & Wingenbach, 2002). According to Wiseman (2003), the size of non-response error can be attributed to two factors: (a) response rate, and (b) the extent to which respondents differ from non-respondents. The response rate for this study (40%) was slightly better than response rates reported on most email surveys (Shehan, 2001) . It is also interesting to note that response rates varied by district with district C reporting a substantially higher response rate (74%) than district A (37%) or district B (30%). The question that arises, therefore, is whether or not there is systematic difference in reasons why some principals responded while others did not. For example, are dissatisfied principals less likely to respond due to fear of disclosure, or are they more willing to respond because they want to air their grievances? Krushat and Molnar (1993) suggested that non-respondents tended toward more negative responses than respondents. Sheehan (2001) suggested that poor response rates on email surveys could be explained by ill will on the part of recipients due to over-surveying, the receipt of numerous unsolicited emails, and fear of introducing a virus to their computer. She also suggested that response rates for email surveys could be reduced due to the use of filtering software.

In this study, the likelihood that respondents' attitudes towards their jobs were representative of the population of principals was increased by survey design factors and

outcomes that reduced the possibility of systematic reasons for sample bias. These factors included (a) the brevity of the instrument (required approximately only 15 minutes to complete), (b) the ease of completion (the questionnaire was easily accessed on-line and responses required simple affective responses), (c) possible respondents were notified multiple times of the confidential nature of the study and assured complete anonymity, (d) use of the Tailored Design methodology (Dillman, 2000), (e) principals were given the opportunity to complete a paper questionnaire instead of the electronic questionnaire, (f) there was a high degree of similarity within the population in terms of job role and responsibility (all were public elementary school principals in Florida), (g) respondents reported similar median scores to prior studies of principal satisfaction using the same instrument, and (h) respondents consistently aired both positive affective responses and negative affective responses (particularly through the open response section) on the same survey.

The likelihood that respondents' attitudes reflected those of the population was also strengthened by the observation that median scores on the JDI and JIG for district C (74% response rate) were congruent with scores for district A and B which demonstrated much lower response rates. Babbie (1974) described response rates over 70% as very good. Despite these factors, however, the possibility of non-response error continued to be a factor that should not be ignored (Krushat & Molnar, 1993, and Wiseman, 2003), and the following data should be interpreted with some caution.

Summary and Discussion of the Findings

Following is a summary and discussion of the results of the study. The five research questions which guided the study have been used to focus the summary:

Research Question 1

What factors contribute to the level of job satisfaction for Florida principals?

Prior to any discussion of the findings for the reported satisfaction levels on JDI subscales, a discussion on the reliability of the JDI in this administration must first be undertaken. While the reliability coefficients for Pay (.73), Opportunities for Promotion (.91), Supervisors (.87), and Coworkers on the Job (.82) reported acceptable levels of reliability (Thorndike & Hagen, 1977 & Sax, 1997), a lower reliability coefficient for Work on Present Job (.29) necessitated caution for interpretation on this subscale. According to Sax (1997), "Correlation and reliability are possible only when there is some variability" (p. 287). The unanimous agreement for respondents on W11 (challenging), W15 (dull), W16 (uninteresting), and W18 (uses my abilities) meant that there was zero variability on these items, which were subsequently removed from the analysis, effectively reducing the items in the reliability sample by 22%. It is likely that the homogeneity of the sample had a differential impact across the subscales and that the Work on Present Job was impacted to a greater degree because the group was most homogeneous in this regard. In light of the findings in the literature review and open-ended question, it is not surprising that there would be substantial agreement that

elementary principals find their jobs very challenging, never dull or uninteresting, and a place where their abilities are utilized on a daily basis.

Using the scale of satisfaction suggested by the JDI Research Office (Balzer et al., 2000), it was determined that principals were satisfied with the work itself, their supervisors, and people with whom they work. Median scores that demonstrated satisfaction according to the JDI office ranged from 32 to 54. Feelings of ambivalence fell between median scores of 23 and 31, and median scores of 0 to 22 equated to feelings of dissatisfaction. Scores for the lowest quartile of respondents demonstrated satisfaction with Work on Present Job (45), Supervisors (43), and People on your Present Job (42). Levels of satisfaction for Pay and Opportunities for Promotion were not as high. In the bottom quartile, median scores of 18 and 12 for Pay and Opportunities for Promotion demonstrated dissatisfaction. At the 50th percentile, respondents were still largely dissatisfied with Opportunities for Promotion (23). Respondents at the 50th percentile were ambivalent (28) about Pay and barely reached the satisfied range at the 75th percentile (36).

Utilizing the national norms provided by the JDI Research Office, respondents also indicated higher levels of satisfaction than surveyed managers and government workers on the subscales of Work on Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People on your Present Job. The only scale in which principals demonstrated a lower median score was in the facet of Pay where respondents reported a slightly lower median score (28) than managers (31).

These findings were consistent with the open-ended comments made by principals on the survey instrument. Only one respondent complained about the principal pay scale and only one specifically mentioned frustrations with teacher professionalism. Two respondents identified district support as a possible source of dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction with Opportunities for Promotion was similar to that identified in earlier studies of principal satisfaction. It was likely a reflection of the reality that district-level jobs were fewer in number and so promotional opportunities were limited. Dissatisfaction or ambivalent feelings regarding pay were also common in studies of job satisfaction as most respondents believed that the work performed was deserving of higher compensation.

Research Question 2

What is the relationship between school grade and the five dimensions of job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI)?

To answer this question, principals' median scores were grouped by the grade their school received in 2006. A comparison of medians across school grades (A, B, and C) demonstrated little variation in reported scores on the five JDI subscales across the different grades. The median scores for principals in A, B, and C schools demonstrated satisfaction with Work on Present Job (48, 48, and 51), Supervision (48, 51, and 51), and People on your Present Job (48, 48, and 48). Principals in A and B schools were dissatisfied with Opportunities for Promotion (median scores of 21 and 17) while responding principals at C schools demonstrated feelings of ambivalence (29) towards

Opportunities for Promotion. The median scores for responding principals on the subscale of Pay fell into the ambivalent range across the different grades (A = 24, B = 30, C = 29). A Spearman rank coefficient demonstrated no significant relationship between grade and the five JDI facets. There were no respondents from schools classified by the State of Florida as failing (Grade D or F) resulting in a restriction of range. Weber (2001) noted that, "Through selection, restriction of range decreases the variance on one or both variables in a bivariate correlation, consequently also affecting score reliability" (p.9). Huck (1992) pointed out that a restriction in range could result in the correlation coefficient of the sample group to decrease, increase, or remain the same as the population. Another note of caution for the interpretation of this data remained due to the unreported reliability for Florida's assignment of grades and the low reported reliability for the Work on Present Job subscale.

Research Question 3

What is the overall level of job satisfaction for elementary principals in Florida?

Using the scale of satisfaction suggested by the JDI Research Office (Balzer et al., 2000), it was determined that principals on the whole were satisfied with their jobs. Utilizing the JIG scale for satisfaction, with median scores of 32 to 54 indicating overall satisfaction, even principals in the bottom quartile expressed overall satisfaction with their jobs (M = 45). Responding principals at the 50th and 75th percentiles expressed even greater feelings of satisfaction (48 and 52). In fact, of the 64 respondents that completed the JIG scale, 60 (93.7%) expressed overall satisfaction with the job with

median scores between 32 and 54. Only 2 (3.1%) of the respondents indicated overall dissatisfaction. The overall satisfaction level reported by responding principals (M = 48) was also slightly higher than those reported by managers (M = 44) or government workers (M = 42), although all reflected overall satisfaction.

Research Question 4

What is the relationship between the school grade and overall job satisfaction as measured by the Job in General scale (JIG)?

A comparison of median scores for responding principals in A, B, and C schools demonstrated very little difference in overall satisfaction. Principals in schools receiving grades of A (M = 47), B (M = 45), or C (M = 49) reported overall satisfaction with their jobs. A Spearman rank coefficient demonstrated no significant relationship between school grade and overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG. One note of caution for the interpretation of this data remained due to the unreported reliability for Florida's assignment of grades and the restriction of range resulting from a lack of respondents from D or F schools.

Research Question 5

Do significant differences in job satisfaction, as measured by the Job in General scale (JIG), exist based on principal gender, principal ethnicity, and longevity in the principalship?

To answer this question, respondents were grouped by demographic characteristics. Using SPSS version 14.0 for Windows, overall satisfaction was

investigated for each demographic characteristic based on median Job in General (JIG) scores.

The first demographic characteristic investigated involved the difference in median JIG scores for male and female respondents. Over two-thirds (68.8%) of the respondents were female, while 31.2% of the respondents identified themselves as being male. Female respondents reported a higher median score on the JIG (49.5) than did male respondents (46.5). Both median scores, however, demonstrated a high level of overall satisfaction with the job as their scores fell comfortably in the range of satisfied scores (32-54). All (100%) of the female median scores fell into the range of satisfied scores as compared to 80% of scores for male respondents. A t-test analysis demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the median scores of male and female respondents ($t = 3.19$, $df = 62$, $p > .05$). The significance of this finding, however, should be interpreted with caution despite the robust nature of the t-test as assumptions of normal distribution and equal variances between groups were not satisfied.

Very little difference in median scores on the JIG was reported by principals when grouped by ethnicity. The majority of respondents were Caucasian (48) followed by African American respondents (8), Hispanic respondents (7), and one individual who classified himself as other. The median scores on the JIG for these ethnic groups ranged from 48 for Caucasian and Hispanic respondents to 51 for African American and 52 for the respondent classified as other. This range of median scores from 48 to 52 demonstrated very little difference and a high degree of overall job satisfaction.

Respondents were also grouped by number of years in the principalship. The groupings included principals who had been in the principalship for less than one year, 2 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, and over 15 years. The median JIG scores ranged from 46.5 to 51 with the principals working from 11 to 15 years reporting the highest degree of satisfaction. Based on longevity in the principalship, all of the different groups demonstrated a high degree of overall satisfaction; and an ANOVA demonstrated no significant difference between groups. A further comparison demonstrated that principals reported a higher level of satisfaction when compared to managers and government workers as reported on the JDI national norms and demonstrated through median JIG scores.

The final section of the questionnaire included an open-ended question providing an opportunity for responding principals to identify their greatest policy challenge. Of the 49 policy issues identified, 37 (75.5%) were related to frustration with Federal, State, and district accountability policies. The remaining policy challenges were related to insufficient resources (14.3%) and building level challenges (10.2%).

Conclusions

This study sought to gain insights into the impact of accountability on the affective feelings or emotions of public elementary principals towards their work. In doing so, this study has demonstrated a clear disconnect between high satisfaction levels for Work on Present Job, Supervision, People on your Present Job, overall satisfaction and the comments of principals on the open-ended question related to policy issues and

literature review. If one were to consider the median scores on the JDI in isolation, it would be reasonable to conclude that accountability has had no major impact on the job satisfaction levels of principals. A review of the literature and district and state policies demonstrated, however, that principals were under pressure to meet accountability standards causing some to leave the profession or avoid entrance into the principalship. The literature also highlighted the enormous pressure on principals to bring up or maintain high test scores which resulted in cheating and questionable practices on the part of some administrators. It was also clear from a review of the open-ended responses provided by principals that most were very concerned about the impact of accountability on their work and schools. It has been shown (Borquist, 1987; Callarman, 1995; Miller, 1985; Peris, 1984) that a connection exists between satisfaction for principals and extrinsic and intrinsic outcomes. Peris concluded that while principals have a greater need for intrinsic rewards, both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards were valued outcomes of the work. It is reasonable to infer, therefore, that principals remained satisfied with the intrinsic satisfiers including the work itself, the people at the school, and district supervisors. It is also reasonable to infer, based on the literature reviewed and the open-ended responses, that principals were dissatisfied with the external pressures being placed on them and their schools by external accountability requirements from the State and Federal Government. In light of these two inferences, it must be concluded that the JDI and JIG provided valuable insights into certain aspects of principal satisfaction, but not all.

The question that remains then is: What is the root cause of dissatisfaction expressed by principals as it relates to school accountability? The present study did not provide a definitive answer to this question, and more research is needed. Certain inferences based on the literature reviewed and principals' open-ended responses, however, are possible. First, it is clear that the Federal, State, and local school boards have been exercising increasing control over what content is taught in school, how those subjects are taught, and how schools are evaluated on the effectiveness of instruction. Perhaps the findings of this study are best encapsulated in the answer of one principal to the open-ended survey question. He wrote:

The concern I have with the survey is that you may not get a true reflection: My greatest concerns come from the scope that is beyond my control. From the never ending paperwork/reports that come from the Federal, State, and local District. Everyone is pushing a program, demanding reports, and trying to control from the "tower". The pressure on our teachers is getting out of control. Where they talk of cutting the "paper demand" only creates more interestingly enough.

It seems clear in this and other responses that there has been a fundamental shift from a professional, humanistic model of governance and child-centered practice in schools to a more bureaucratic, Weberian model resulting from the political forces of accountability. Under this model, control through fidelity checks and reports, specialization, and top-down mandates are designed to produce a particular and consistent product that meets a certain standard as determined by standardized test scores. Products or processes that do not meet the standard are likely to be labeled as ineffective or failing and result in greater controls, restructuring, or abandonment. The sole

evaluation of school success has increasingly been based on a singular, standardized test of skills in mathematics, science, reading, and writing.

This apparent shift from humanistic or child-centered ideals to a more scientific or bureaucratic model has had a direct impact on principals who increasingly have found themselves in conflict with bureaucratic dictates in terms of philosophy and autonomy. Educators, unlike bureaucrats or businessmen, and schools unlike governments or factories, have typically been concerned with more than the production of a product that meets pre-set specifications. This reality is borne out in many of the principals' statements expressing concern over common expectations of all students on the same time schedules. One wrote, "Using an outcome based assessment such as the FCAT to label students as being successful is of concern. The psychological impact that this has on children seems to have been overlooked". The basic conflict between the bureaucratic/political outcomes and the basic beliefs of educators was expressed in the comment of another principal. He wrote,

The focus on test scores has decreased the focus on educating the whole child. We will soon have criminals in prisons who can read but cannot get along with others and society in general. There needs to be a focus in developing a well-rounded child and educating each child according to his/her need.

In 1951 William Heard Kilpatrick asked: "What conception of the total educative process best promises to give the personal characteristics necessary for promoting the desired American Civilization?" (p. 3). In his answer he spoke of knowledge, but also of skill in group discussion and decision making in life situations, community service, proper attitudes for citizenship duties, personal commitment to the idea of the common

good, and moral or even spiritual values. Brubaker and Nelson (1974) wrote that schools should foster the development of human beings. They described the role of the school in teaching students about the value and worth of each person, the potential that resides in each person for social, intellectual, physical, and emotional growth, and the awareness of the ability to transcend personal and social situations. The answer for the political and bureaucratic government structures are pre-established achievement levels in math, reading, writing, and science producing professional students that in turn allow competitiveness in a technological world Axtelle (1951) warned would function as a neighborhood but not a community.

Willower and Licata (1997) described the highest concern of principals as being rooted in values and outcomes based on those values. The values of most principals have been rooted in humanistic, child-centered beliefs that are fundamentally opposite to the values of those charged with setting educational policy and determining accountability. This disconnect in philosophy and resulting outcomes in terms of policy and practice have led principals to report satisfaction with their jobs, but also to express considerable concern over the future of public education.

In light of these research findings, inferences, and the body of literature on public school accountability:

1. It was concluded that despite mounting pressures, principals continued to report high levels of job satisfaction as measured by the JDI and JIG.

Callarman (1984) utilized the JDI to investigate the job satisfaction of middle

and high school principals in Florida. While she administered the test to a different level of principals (middle and high), her results demonstrated findings consistent with those of the current research. Her research demonstrated median scores of 39.2 for Work on Present Job, 25.2 for Pay, 23.5 for Opportunities for Promotion, 46.1 for Supervision, and 46.4 for coworkers or People on your Present Job. The data from the current study demonstrated median scores of 49.0 for Work on Present Job, 28.0 for Pay, 23.0 for Opportunities for Promotion, 50.0 for Supervision, and 48.0 for coworkers or People on your Present Job. The median scores are very consistent, and suggest that respondents in this study were equally or more satisfied with their jobs than earlier respondents, especially in the facet of Work on Present Job.

2. Pay and Opportunities for Promotion were the least satisfying aspects of the principalship according to respondents. Miller (1985) found that principals were more satisfied with intrinsic rather than extrinsic aspects of the job such as recognition, advancement, and compensation. While this may help to explain the high level of overall satisfaction reported by respondents on the JIG, others like Borquist (1987) and Peris (1984) found that these facets of the job remained important. Peris concluded that in educational settings the “principal’s motivation to exert effort toward a specific level of performance is to some degree based on his or her perception of associations between

actions and outcomes.” (pp. 95-96). Borquist (1987) concluded that extrinsic aspects of the job such as salary and benefits were included in the main sources of principal satisfaction.

3. It was concluded that the grade received by the school (grades A, B, and C) did not greatly impact the level of principal satisfaction as measured by the JIG. By and large, principals in schools receiving different grades from the State of Florida reported similar levels of satisfaction ranging from a median score of 45 for B schools to a median score of 49 for C schools. Respondents at schools receiving a grade of A reported an overall satisfaction median score of 47. All three scores demonstrated a high level of satisfaction within the range of satisfied scores (32-54) developed by the JDI Research Office.
4. Despite high levels of reported overall satisfaction, the literature review and principal responses to the open-ended question suggest the existence of a fundamental difference in educational philosophy and practice between the school principals and current political bureaucracy determining educational policy and practice. Principals have demonstrated remarkable resiliency in the face of bureaucratic demands and values. There is, however, some question as to whether traditional child-centered principals will choose to remain in a profession that may be changing and indeed whether principals will choose to leave the principalship as they know it rather than revert to roles as school managers for political and bureaucratic organizations.

Implications and Recommendations

The results of this study indicated that a very high majority (93.7%) of principal respondents were satisfied with their jobs as measured by the JIG. In looking at the literature related to school accountability and the open-ended policy question responses, there seemed to be a disconnect between reported satisfaction and expressed frustration with policies and practices related to accountability. Respondents highlighted the pressure of implementing Federal, State, and district programs such as classroom walkthroughs, 90 minute reading blocks, ESOL and ESE education standards, hiring requirements, new curriculums, Just Read Florida, and District Reading Plans. Part of the accountability under Federal, State, and district programs are the accompanying reports principals are required to complete for each entity.

One principal responded that in order to meet this challenge, “I am coming to my job early before school starts, staying late after school hours, taking work home, and working at school on the weekends!” Another wrote that, “Keeping up with the national, state, and local demands--paperwork, AYP, NCLB, SIP, etc.--have become unreasonable. Schools may have to hire two principals just to divide up the responsibilities”. One potential outcome to these external pressures over time may be an erosion of the satisfaction that principals feel with the work itself. Extrinsic dissatisfiers could overcome intrinsic satisfiers. Recommendations to avoid this outcome are:

1. District administrators and managers should develop intentional plans to mitigate the external impacts of accountability on school principals and avoid layering additional requirements on top of Federal and State mandates.

Coordination of district reporting requirements among different departments and automation of certain reports might also reduce the time principals spend on paperwork.

2. Target external facets of the job known to evoke feelings of dissatisfaction among principals. The results of this study demonstrated that Pay and Opportunities for Promotion led to feelings of dissatisfaction among many respondents. Addressing these facets might provide a good starting point for districts concerned with increasing principal satisfaction with extrinsic rewards.
3. Educate lawmakers and community members on issues related to child-centered humanistic pedagogy. Inform them of the risks associated with standards based education that restrict the school's freedom to pursue the education and socialization of the whole child.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research needs and recommendations were identified from the analysis of data for the present study. Future research recommendations include:

1. Repeat this study to include principals working in schools graded as "D" or "F" by the State of Florida.
2. Conduct research into the differences in educational philosophy that exist between principals and state and federal lawmakers.

3. Conduct research on the relationship of mandated initiatives from the Federal Government, State, and/or district and job satisfaction.
4. Conduct research on the level of stress reported by principals. One instrument that could be utilized is the Stress in General scale developed by the JDI Research Office with available national norms.

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEYED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Demographic Characteristics of Surveyed Counties

County	A	B	C
# Schools	116	40	24
Total # Elem. Students	77,596	27,199	19,888
Cost per FTE/Regular	\$4,940	\$4,783	\$4,318
Avg. Tchr Salary	\$36,564	\$36,458	\$34,207
Tchr. Av. Yrs. Of Experience	12.2	11.5	9.9
Suspensions %	4.3	1.8	3.7
% Absent 21+ days	4.9	6.9	7.3
% ESE	15.4	18.9	15.7
% LEP	20.9	3.1	17.4
% Free/ Reduce Lunch	49.1	52	57.1
Average School Size	669	680	829
% of elementary schools earning grades A-F	A-54.3	A-37.8	A-15.8
	B-21.9	B-35.2	B-36.8
	C-20.9	C-27.0	C-42.1
	D-1.9	D-0.0	D-5.3
	F-1.0	F-0.0	F-0.0

Note. Obtained from the *Florida School Indicators Report* for the 2003/2004 school year (FDOE, 2005). School grades reflect 2006 grades in the survey population.

APPENDIX B
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL AND INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

Project title: A Study of Florida Public Elementary School Principals' Job Satisfaction Following the Implementation of Florida's A+ System for Grading Schools.

What you will be asked to do in the study: You will be asked to complete an on-line survey.

Time required: Twenty (20) minutes

Risks/Benefits: There are no anticipated risks, compensation, or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this survey.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential. Your information will be assigned a code number. When you complete the attached questionnaire, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected to your answers in any way.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You are also free to skip any question that you do not want to answer.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study: Robert Paswaters, Doctoral Student at the UCF College of Education, (407) 343-7331 or Dr. Barbara Murray, Faculty Supervisor, College of Education at (407)-823-1474 or by email at bmurray@mail.ucf.edu.

Whom to contact about your rights in the study: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF). For information about participants' rights please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 302, Orlando, FL 32826-3252 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.

Please read over the following three statements. Please note that entering this site constitutes your agreement to the following three statements and participation in the study.

- 1) I have read the procedure described above.
- 2) I voluntarily agree to participate in the study.
- 3) I am at least 18 years of age or older.



University of Central Florida Office of Research & Commercialization

May 8, 2006

Robert Paswaters
500 W. Columbia Avenue
Kissimmee, FL 34744

Dear Mr. Paswaters:

With reference to your protocol #06-3466 entitled, "A Study of Florida Elementary School Principals' Job Satisfaction following the Implementation of Florida's A+ System for Grading Schools, I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office. This study was approved on 5/8/06. The expiration date will be 5/7/07. Should there be a need to extend this study, a Continuing Review form must be submitted to the IRB Office for review by the Chairman or full IRB at least one month prior to the expiration date. This is the responsibility of the investigator. Please notify the IRB office when you have completed this research study.

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board through use of the Addendum/Modification Request form. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 407-823-2901 .
Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,
Barbara Ward, CIM
UCF IRB Coordinator
(FWA00000351 Exp. 5/13/07. IRB00001138)
Copies: IRB File
Barbara Murray, Ph.D.
BW:jm

12201 Research Parkway • Suite 501 • Orlando, FL 32826-3246 • 407-823-3778 • Fax 407-823-3299
An Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Institution

APPENDIX C
SCHOOL DISTRICT PERMISSION

May 12, 2006

Mr. Robert Paswaters

[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Paswaters:

Attached you will find an approval of your request to conduct a research study in [REDACTED] County Schools entitled "A study of Florida principals' job satisfaction following implementation of Florida's A+ program". I will be your [REDACTED] County Administrative Contact.

When your study is complete, please forward a brief summary of your findings to the Research and Evaluation Department.

Best of luck as you pursue the subject of your research.

[REDACTED]

Sincerely,

Attachment

Submit this form and a copy of your proposal to:
Accountability, Research, and Assessment

Public Schools
RESEARCH REQUEST FORM

Your research proposal should include: Project Title; Purpose and Research Problem; Instruments; Procedures and Proposed Data Analysis

Requester's Name Robert Paswaters

Date 5/1/2006

Address: Home _____

Phone(407) _____

Business _____

Phone(407) _____

Project Director or Advisor Dr. Barbara Murray

Phone(407) 823-1473

Address UCF, PO Box 161250, Orlando, FL 32816-1250

Degree Sought
(check one)

Associate
X Doctorate

Bachelor's
None

Master's

Specialist

Project Title A study of Florida public elementary school principals' job satisfaction following the implementation of Florida's A+ Program.

ESTIMATED INVOLVEMENT

PERSONNEL/CENTERS	NUMBER	AMOUNT OF TIME (DAYS, HOURS, ETC.)	SPECIFY/DESCRIBE GRADES, SCHOOLS, SPECIAL NEEDS, ETC.
Students			
Teachers			
Administrators	116	15-20 minutes	
Schools/Centers			
Others (specify)			

Specify possible benefits to students/school system: Insight into principal job satisfaction with implications for recruitment, training, and retention.

ASSURANCE

Using the proposed procedures and instrument, I hereby agree to conduct research in accordance with the policies of the Public Schools. Deviations from the approved procedures shall be cleared through the Senior Director of Accountability, Research, and Assessment. Reports and materials shall be supplied as specified.

Requester's Signature _____

Approval Granted:

X Yes No

Date: 6-1-06

Signature of the Senior Director
for Accountability, Research, and Assessment, _____

FORM ID #GB0103/23-1/1FY REV 1/04

NOTE TO REQUESTER: When seeking approval at the school level, a copy of this form, signed by the Senior Director, Accountability, Research, and Assessment, should be shown to the school principal.

Reference School Board Policy GCS, p. 249

September 26, 2006


Robert Paswaters, Principal
Denn John Middle School 2001
Denn John Lane Kissimmee,
FL 34744

Dear Rob:

I acknowledge the receipt of your request to survey and use a questionnaire for your doctoral research through the University of Central Florida. I approve the use of the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General originally developed by Bowling Green University to be utilized to conduct your research.

I also understand that the elementary principals will be requested to voluntarily participate in the research data collection. Should you need additional information, or have additional requests, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,


Superintendent

BAM:crh

APPENDIX D
JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX (1997 REVISION) AND JOB IN GENERAL

JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the circle beside each word or phrase below, select Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does not describe it

? for "?" if you cannot decide

	Y	N	?
Fascinating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Routine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Satisfying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gives sense of Accomplishment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Respected	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Uncomfortable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pleasant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Useful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Challenging	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Simple	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Repetitive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Creative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dull	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Uninteresting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can see results	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Uses my abilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PAY

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? In the circle beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does not describe it

? for "?" if you cannot decide

Income adequate for	Y	N	?
Normal expenses	O	O	O
Fair	O	O	O
Bad	O	O	O
Income provides			
Luxuries	O	O	O
Less than I deserve	O	O	O
Well paid	O	O	O
Barely live on			
Income	O	O	O
Insecure	O	O	O
Underpaid	O	O	O

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your describe your opportunities for promotion? In the circle beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does not describe it

? for "?" if you cannot decide

	Y	N	?
Good opportunities for			
promotion	O	O	O
Opportunities somewhat			
Limited	O	O	O
Promotion on ability	O	O	O
Dead-end job	O	O	O
Good chance for			
Promotion	O	O	O
Unfair promotion policy	O	O	O
Infrequent promotions	O	O	O
Regular promotions	O	O	O
Fairly good chance for			
Promotion	O	O	O

SUPERVISION

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the circle beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does not describe it

? for "?" if you cannot decide

	Y	N	?
Ask my advice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hard to please	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Impolite	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Praises good work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tactful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Influential	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Up-to-date	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doesn't supervise enough	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Has favorites	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tells me where I stand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Annoying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stubborn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knows job well	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intelligent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poor planner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Around when needed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lazy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB

Think of the majority of people with whom you work or meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people? In the circle beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does not describe it

? for "?" if you cannot decide

	Y	N	?
Stimulating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Slow	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helpful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stupid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Responsible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fast	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intelligent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Easy to make Enemies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Talk too much	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Smart	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lazy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unpleasant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gossipy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Active	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Narrow interests	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loyal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stubborn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Job Descriptive Index

© Bowling Green State University 1997

JOB IN GENERAL

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? In the circle beside each word or phrase below, select

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does not describe it

? for "?" if you cannot decide

	Y	N	?
Pleasant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ideal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waste of time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Undesirable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Worthwhile	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Worse than most	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acceptable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Superior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better than most	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disagreeable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Makes me content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inadequate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Excellent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rotten	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enjoyable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Job in General Scale

© Bowling Green State University 1985

APPENDIX E
ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION REQUESTED

Additional Demographic Information Requested

1. What is your gender? Male Female
2. How many years have you held the position of principal?
 <1 2-5 6-10 11-15 15+
3. How would you describe your ethnic background?
 African-American Caucasian Hispanic Other
4. In the text box below, please describe your greatest policy challenge as a building principal and how it might be addressed.

APPENDIX F
PERMISSION TO USE JDI INSTRUMENT

Dear Rob,

Thank you for sending in the fax of your non-commercial agreement. Everything looks great. Attached you will find the JDI/JIG. You are currently authorized for 500 uses of the JDI. If you would like more uses, please just let me know. I have also attached your electronic printable manual. Your password is 'paswaters' no quotes and case sensitive. I'm not sure if you are aware, but we do offer the SPSS syntax for recoding your raw data into the appropriate scores and facet totals. The syntax costs \$10. If you are interested please let me know. Currently, \$40 will be charged to you for the manual. Finally, please remember to provide us with your item-level data and other information as per the agreement upon completion of your study.

Best of luck with your research!

Alison

Alison A. Broadfoot
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Voice: 419.372.8247
Fax: 419.372.6013

APPENDIX G
CONTACT 1: SURVEY PRE-NOTICE EMAIL

Dear Colleague,

In a few days you will receive an email requesting that you complete a brief questionnaire for an important research project being conducted by the University of Central Florida.

This survey concerns the job satisfaction of elementary school principals. I obtained your email address from your school web page, and am writing in advance because we have found that many people like to know ahead of time that they will be contacted. The study is an important one for all of us and will help government decision makers and school districts better understand the feelings and attitudes of principals toward their jobs.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It's only with the generous help of people like you that our research can be successful.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Paswaters
Principal, Central Avenue Elementary School

Note. Verbiage obtained from the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2000, p.157).

APPENDIX H
CONTACT 2: SURVEY REQUEST EMAIL

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to request your help in a study of Florida elementary school principals. This study is part of an effort to gain greater understanding into the factors that lead to principal job satisfaction in Florida. You were selected because you are an elementary school principal in Florida and have a unique perspective on what is satisfying or dissatisfying about being a principal in Florida today.

Results from the survey will be used to help state and local officials understand the thoughts and feelings of elementary principals towards their work. A greater understanding of the satisfaction levels of principals will help government and educational officials evaluate their own policies and procedures and how they impact principals at the building level.

Your answers are completely confidential and will be released only as summaries in which no individual answers can be identified. When you complete the attached questionnaire, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected to your answers in any way. This survey is voluntary. However, you can help us very much by taking a few minutes to share your experiences and opinions about being an elementary principal.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, I would be happy to talk with you. My number is 407-343-7331, or you can simply reply directly to this email.

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Robert Paswaters
Principal, Central Avenue Elementary School

Please click on this link and enter the following number "UNIQUE ID" to access the survey: "ACTIVE LINK"

P.S. If by some chance we made a mistake and you are not currently a public school elementary principal, please answer only the first question in the questionnaire and submit. Many thanks.

Note. Verbiage obtained from the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2000, p.162).

APPENDIX I
CONTACT 3: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL

Dear Colleague

About two weeks ago I sent a questionnaire to you that asked about your feelings towards your work as a principal. To the best of our knowledge, it's not yet been completed. The comments of principals who have already responded include valuable insights. Many have been very forthcoming in describing those things about the job that either satisfy or dissatisfy. We are confident that these results are going to be very valuable to both state and educational leaders in Florida.

We are writing again because of the importance that your questionnaire has for helping get accurate results. I truly value your opinion and realize that only by hearing from nearly everyone in the sample can I be sure that the results are truly representative. A few have responded and requested a hard copy of the questionnaire. If you would prefer to complete and mail in a hard copy rather than submit your answers via The internet, please respond to this email and I will mail it to you immediately. The hard copy will come with an addressed, postage paid envelope for return mailing to: Robert Paswaters, 500 W. Columbia Avenue, Kissimmee, FL. 34744.

A comment on our survey procedures. A questionnaire identification number is required to complete the on-line survey so that we can check your name off of the mailing list. The list of names is then destroyed so that individual names can never be connected to the results in any way. Protecting the confidentiality of people's answers is very important to us, as well as the University.

The number "ID NUMBER" and link for the survey is "ACTIVE LINK"

We hope that you will fill out and submit the questionnaire soon. If for any reason you prefer not to answer it, please return an email stating that fact.

Sincerely,

Robert Paswaters
Principal, Central Avenue Elementary School

P.S. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 407-343-7331 or simply respond to this email. Thanks again.

Note. Verbiage obtained from the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2000, p.182).

APPENDIX J
POST CARD REMINDER

Date

Dear Colleague,

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinions and feelings about the principalship was sent to you via email.

If you have already submitted your answers, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. I am especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your experiences that we can understand what makes the job satisfying.

Your unique number is “ID NUMBER” and the questionnaire link is “ACTIVE LINK”.

Signature

Robert Paswaters
Principal, Central Avenue Elementary School

Note. Verbiage obtained from the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2000, p.180).

APPENDIX K
PRINCIPALS' OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

PRINCIPAL'S OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES: POLICY CHALLENGES

1. (1) The demands and mandates passed from the DOE through the district without funding. (2) The pressure on teachers and students to achieve unrealistic goals, no matter what the background or length of time. (3) The number of initiatives coming from the district - they have forgotten what it is like to be on the front lines. These items might be addressed by actually listening to the people their mandates affect - teachers and school based administrators.
2. A tremendous amount of paperwork including paper and emails. Consolidate reports due. Penalize principals who don't do the minimal work and who don't get results with more paperwork and email for accountability and have the principals that do minimal paperwork and get results no added reports and accountability paperwork. Currently, I do a lot of my paperwork and email at home so I can be visible at school and make more of a difference with the adults and children.
3. The conflict of being an instructional leader when the role demands so much of your time on management issues.
4. A great challenge is maintaining continual daily classroom walkthroughs while I am dealing with budget matters, personnel issues, facility concerns, time to read and digest required paperwork from teachers (lesson plans, testing data, etc.), discipline, parent-teacher interactions, and never-ending District, State, and Federal reports! I am addressing this challenge by coming to my job very early before school starts, staying late after school hours, taking work home, and working at school on the weekends!
5. Keeping up with the national state and local demands -paperwork, AYP, NCLB, SIP, etc.-have become unreasonable. Schools may need two principals just to divide up the responsibilities.
6. Mandates from the state and federal government.
7. Altering policies in response to changes from regulatory bodies. To address: Influence policy makers to hold pedagogy superior to politics.
8. The concern I have with the survey is that you may not get a true reflection: My greatest concerns come from the scope that is beyond my control. From the never ending paperwork/reports that come from the Federal, State and local District. Everyone is pushing a program, demanding reports, and trying to control from the "tower". The pressure on our teachers is getting out of control. Where they talk of cutting the "paper demand" only creates more interestingly enough.
9. New initiatives, including but not limited to, the Just Read Florida and District Reading Plan, require teachers and administrators to complete much more paperwork than in the past. Too much emphasis is placed on written lesson plans and school plans where more emphasis and time should be given to what is going on in the classrooms. The mandates brought down by such programs also leave no room for site based management. The major challenge that I have this year concerns the States A+ Plan and its lack of consistency with the NCLB- AYP. It is interesting to see that even as our school grade has increased to a B our percentage of criteria met for AYP has lowered causing us to go into Corrective Action since we are a Title I school. This has brought about low moral to a competent and highly motivated staff, as well as additional paperwork and professional development. These are all in addition to keeping up with the reading plan.
10. Meeting the increasing demands of curricular changes--tasking teachers to examine the changes to see if the changes are congruent with state expectations. We assume they are....but may not always be congruent.
11. Having the flexibility to meet the academic needs of my students without the constraints of extra testing and paperwork from the district/state level.
12. Currently, meeting the State's mandated 90 minute reading block while maintaining high quality instruction and learning in the other subject areas. How might it be addressed? We have discussed the pros and cons of strategies such as thematic, integrated curriculum; extending the

school day; hiring reading resource teachers ; hiring education lobbyists; becoming politically active; minimizing art/music/pe times.

13. Implementation of curriculum with differentiated instruction for all children in reading, math and science.
14. Convincing people that the policy is to be implemented as it reads.
15. Grading all schools (by the state) without taking into account their differing student populations.
16. My greatest policy challenge is the grading of the schools. Regardless of where a child is from and what prior knowledge they have, they are expected to learn at the same pace as a child who has been afforded many opportunities. If schools were allowed to focus on individual needs of children and assess their growth based on where they started, then the grading of schools wouldn't be a problem.
17. State A+ Accountability Grading System--it's a moving target relative to what will be tested specifically each year and how it will apply to the state grading system ie; bar keeps getting raised. Hard to predict and focus in on the bottom 25 percent when it is really the bottom 25 percent of the current year's FCAT reading scale score that is used to calculate whether 50 percent of those students "made the cut off." Don't like the whole concept of grades for a school; point system would be better.
18. Requiring each child to achieve at the same level, in the same time frame. Provide outstanding teachers for all students, trained tutors for struggling students and time.
19. The focus on test scores has decreased the focus on educating the whole child. We will soon have criminals in prisons who can read but cannot get along with others and society in general. There needs to be a focus on developing a well-rounded child **and** educating each child according to his/her need.
20. Using an outcome based assessment such as FCAT to label students as being successful or failures is of concern. The psychological impact that this has on children seemed to have been over looked. Outcome based assessments are necessary to evaluate programs, and or state benchmarks. I would like to see the policy acknowledge the affective traits of students can be impacted.
21. The greatest challenge facing the educational profession today is the misdirected emphasis placed on testing. This could best be addressed by educating the public and politicians as to what is good education. I believe a professional public relation firm could do this best.
22. Maintaining an instructional program that meets individual needs of children and NCLB.
23. My greatest policy challenge is ensuring that we meet AYP from year to year. AYP allows for growth, yet getting our staff to see the importance of this legislation is important.
24. NCLB - Realistic goals.
25. The No Child Left Behind Law
26. The greatest policy challenge is the NCLB. I am principal of a school with nearly 1,000 students. A smaller student population would enable me to be more effective, I believe.
27. Off the top of my head, I'm thinking about meeting AYP with my subgroups. I'm not sure if this would be considered a policy challenge or not. It certainly is a challenge that I worry about quite a bit, particularly in regard to our students with disabilities subgroup. As to how to address this, that I'm trying to figure out. I think it starts with finding quality people to fill these positions. This might mean refusing to fill the position for a while. Though this might hurt a bit in the process, I hope it will pay off in the end. Once someone fills a position, it's virtually impossible to see them off if they are not working out. Therefore, I think it's vital to be as sure as possible that you've got a solid teacher candidate before making a selection for these classrooms. Next, I think ongoing support is needed for these teachers. I'm trying to really align my Title I spending with this priority: professional development, instructional assistants, instructional recourses.
28. Bringing up reading scores and school morale
29. High staff turnover and meeting AYP - need more incentives for teachers to stay at a school.

30. Motivation---Must continually keep teachers motivated to do the best job possible.
31. Getting teachers to make decisions based on data.
32. Our biggest policy change is that we are looking at more accountability from teachers in regards to their academic data. Also we are looking at the assignments of grades to be more in line with task analysis. No more "inflation" of grades.
33. My greatest challenge is our district policy which prohibits the retention, for any reason, of LEP students with less than two years in an ESOL program. This is diametrically opposed to the mandatory retention of other students who do not meet the FCAT requirements. Defending this discriminatory practice is impossible. This issue can only be addressed by a change in policy which under the current administration will not happen.
34. My greatest policy challenges deal with the realities of the job and the realities of those that make the policies. One great example is that of teaching students that speak another language. Research points to the fact that language learners need about 5 years to learn the academic language (English) yet our state requires these children to take a test after only 2 years of learning a language. That score then is used by the state to grade a school. Schools are then left with figuring a way to cram English down the students throat in an effort to get them to score better on a test. The interesting part is that some of these students come to our country with superior math skills but do poorly on the math section of the test because they still don't have the academic language down. Examples like these flood the principalship. I applaud the effort to hold educators accountable for student learning, but the accountability has to be realistic. I can respect the ability of our clientele (students) the opportunity to seek private education, but it is frustrating to know that those schools do not find themselves under the same accountability despite receiving public monies.
35. Retention policy for LEP students and ESE students specifically. Good cause for promotion needs to be expanded by each district.
36. The greatest challenge we face at my school is poverty and all of the emotional, social and academic issues associated with poverty. Our students' home environment affects their academic progress. Our students are smart and can definitely learn...we just have to work harder and longer at it! Poverty is not a policy challenge, however it impacts our academic progress which causes us to question the policies associated with school grading. I believe that schools should definitely be held accountable for student achievement and growth, however, we are compared to schools in high socioeconomic neighborhoods in which students enter kindergarten already reading. Most of our students enter kindergarten with extremely limited oral vocabularies and little exposure to print. These types of comparisons, to the general public, tend to shed a negative light on our school and community. This simply is not fair because the general public's knowledge of factors that influence education is usually quite limited. Our school was rated an "F" when the state first started grading schools. We are now in our 3rd year of maintaining a "B". This year, we were only 6 points from an "A"! How might school grading policies be addressed? I wish I had that answer. I believe that our legislators should get input from local educators (teachers, building and district administrators) and community members from all socioeconomic levels when making decisions regarding school grading. For example, for 2007, they are adding math learning gains and science into the school grade formula. Yes, these things are extremely important! However, teachers at my school are focusing the majority of the school day on getting our students reading at grade level and we still have only 58% at level 3 or above. Adding math gains and science to the mix will put further stress on teachers and students. Unfortunately, I see many dedicated, excellent teachers getting frustrated with the FCAT mandates and the challenges of our community and choosing to leave our Title I school to teach in non-Title I schools.
37. I don't know if this is a policy challenge, but I would like to have more autonomy when it comes to school management. This can range from budgeting to hiring adequate personnel to meet the

- ever changing needs of a school.
38. Not really having the power to get rid of ineffective teachers. The teacher union makes our lives very difficult. I feel the teachers who don't do their jobs have more rights than I do and definitely more job security. How can it be addressed? I'm not really sure it will ever be effectively addressed. As long as there is a union, there will be protection for these teachers. If we had more time as leaders to really be in the classrooms and document ineffectiveness and be able to 'release' a professional contract teacher who does not fit my school needs--that would help.
 39. The biggest challenge is getting teachers/staff to follow professional policies on a consistent basis. As long as the union takes a mediocre stand on professionalism with regards to record keeping, standards and dress code, this policy challenge will continue to be both time consuming and frustrating for school administrators.
 40. I am not sure if you mean district policy or state policy or even "official" policy. One of my greatest frustrations is fighting the "that is the way it has always been done" mentality. Our district is so large that trying to make an initiative happen while dealing with lots of departments is nearly impossible. There is not a lot of "big picture" vision so it discourages proactive thinkers.
 41. Usually the greatest challenge is shielding teachers from bureaucratic, ineffective district policy. Also, it is virtually impossible to get any support whatsoever from the district level - from curriculum to human resources - highly ineffective. You must constantly work "around" the district logjam.
 42. Having to learn the county's new hiring system . . . challenging, but making progress :-). I think, in relation to all of your questions, that I am too new at being a principal -- I am still on Cloud 9 . . .
 43. Lack of funding to maintain quality academic and social development funding and having to spend dollars on district or state mandates that do not effect student achieve or enhance our school culture.
 44. Funding is an issue. Policies related to funding should change to reduce the disparities between schools. It is difficult to meet state and district mandates with limited funding. Every school should have a consistent core team to provide services and adequate teachers to keep classes small enough to be effective.
 45. Budget! Inadequate funds! The demographics are not varied enough. Building too old.
 46. The school enrollment number far exceeds the capacity this school was build to accommodate. The challenge is keeping up with the growth and scheduling all the programs for a school that is 1100 plus students. Mobility rate is 68% which creates an even more challenge with the growth we experience. Thanks for listening. I love my job. I will quit when I don't like it any more.
 47. Parents must sign-in at the admin office. Parents are not allowed to roam and visit classrooms throughout the day (walking students to class or to the morning gathering area). Provide a positive list of safety tips for parents (newsletter, poster or sign), which include visitors on campus, and state statue relating to student "drop-off".
 48. Dealing with parents and guardians that are emotionally unstable. I would like to see a parent guideline policy in place.
 49. Paying all principals the same regardless of their effectiveness.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abernathy, M. (2005). *Teachers, administrators may see pay hike*. Kingston Free Press. Retrieved August 23, 2006, from <http://www.kinston.com/SiteProcessor.cfm?Template=/GlobalTemplates/Details.cfm&StoryID=29866&Section=local>
- Adelman, C. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Retrieved May 10, 2005, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html>
- Allen, R. (2003, November). Building school culture in an age of accountability. *Education Update*, 45(7). Retrieved August 24, 2006, from http://www.ascd.org/affiliates/articles/eu200311_allen.html
- Anderson, J. E., Guido-DiBrito, F. & Morrell, J. S. (2000). Factors that influence satisfaction for student affairs administrators. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 99-110.
- Arizona School Board Association. (2003). Superintendents and principals survey. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.azsba.org/pasaptsurvey.htm>
- Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk-taking behaviors. *Psychological Review*, 64, 359-372.
- Autovino, A., Baker, B., Loucks, D., & Wolf, C. (1998). *The new 3 R's--roadblocks, responses and roles: A snapshot of current practices among Finger Lakes area building principals*. Retrieved June 28, 2005, from <http://oswego.edu/~edadmin/New3Rs.html>
- Ave, M. & Tobin, T. C. (2006, May). Teachers troubled with job, poll says. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from http://sptimes.com/2006/05/14/Tampabay/Teachers_troubled_wit.shtml
- Axtelle, G. (1951). Philosophic consensus, world order, and education. *Educational Theory*, 1(2), 251-268.
- Babbie, E. R. (1979). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., Sinar, E. F., & Parra, L. F. (2000). Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 version) and the Job in General scales. In J. M. Stanton and C. D. Crossley

- (Eds.), *Electronic resources for the JDI and JIG*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Bandura, Albert. 1986. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 125-139
- Bauman, K. E., & Fisher, L. A. (1985). Subjective expected utility, locus of control, and behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 606-621.
- Bavendam Research Incorporated. (2000). Managing Job Satisfaction. *Special reports (6)*. Retrieved October 30, 2005, from <http://www.employeesatisfactions.com>
- Behling, O., & Starke, F. A. (1973). The postulates of expectancy theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16, 373-388.
- Billman, J. C. (2002, October). Cash for grades. *Orlando Weekly*. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.orlandoweekly.com/features/story.asp?id=2856>
- Booher-Jennings, J. (2006). Rationing education in an era of accountability. Phi Delta Kappan. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k_v87/k0606boo.htm
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Bonstingl, J. J. (2001). Are the stakes too high? *Principal Leadership* (High School ed.), 1(5), 8-14.
- Borquist, L. C. (1987). Job satisfaction of administrators in a public suburban school district. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (UMI No. 8711931)
- Bouchard, E. D., Cervone, L., Hayden, H., Riggins-Newby, C. G. & Zarlengo, P. (2002). Addressing the leadership challenges faced by principals. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/pln/chrncl_pln.pdf
- Brazer, S. D. (2004). Principal choice and teacher participation in site-based management: Four schools implement one policy. In J. Chrispeels (Ed.), *Learning to lead together: The promise and challenge of shared leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Brubaker, D. & Nelson Jr., R. (1974). *Creative survival in educational bureaucracies*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing.
- Bryson, A. Cappellari, L. & Lucifora, C. (2005). Why so unhappy? The effects of unionization on job satisfaction. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://www.psi.org.uk/research/project.asp?project_id=38
- Burney, M., Kummer, F. & Ott, D. (2006, May). Camden principal fired, says he'll sue. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.topix.net/content/kri/0491993399191245644810256040773827472603>
- Bushweller, K. (1997). Teaching to the test: Increasingly, schools are finding it just makes sense to align curriculum and assessment. Retrieved August 22, 2006 from <http://www.asbj.com/achievement/aa/aa4.html>
- Bushweller, K. (1999, August). Eyes on the prize: Performance pay for principals and teachers who produce results. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.asbj.com/199908/0899coverstory.html>
- Callarman, M. H. (1984). Levels of satisfaction among principals in selected Florida school districts. *Dissertation Abstracts International*.
- Carson, K. P., Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., and Schriesheim, C. A. (2002, February). Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 14-32.
- Charles. (2005). *Principal Office: Reviewing the Goings-on in Education and Other Topics from the Perspective of a Principal. Did NCLB Kill the Spelling Bee?* Retrieved September 3, 2006, from http://reviewingtheweek.blogspot.com/2005_02_01_reviewingtheweek_archive.html
- Cherin, S. V. (2006). Broward schools reshuffling black principals and administrators. *Westside Gazette*, originally posted 6/23/2006. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.Thewestsidegazette.com/News/article/article.asp?NewsID=70561&SID=4>
- Cooley, V.E. & Shen, J. (2003, March). School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87, 10-25.

- Consortium For Policy Research in Education (2006). Motivational Theory. Retrieved September 2, 2006, from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/tcomp/research/motivational.php>
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and application. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 478-494.
- Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical & modern test theory*. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Darboe, K. (2003). *An empirical study of the social correlates of job satisfaction among plant science graduates of a midwestern university: A test of Victor H. Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory*. New York: University Press of America.
- DeMeuse, K. P. (1985). A compendium of frequently used measures in industrial/organizational psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 23, 53-59.
- Denardo, C. (2006). District struggles to come up with teacher-bonus plan. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from <http://www.trumpetamerica.org/twiki/bin/view/FloridaTopics/TeacherBonusPlan>
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- DiPaola, M. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87, 43-65.
- Donaldson, G. A. (2001). *Cultivating leadership in the schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dorn, S. (1998). The political legacy of school accountability systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 6(1), 1-30. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v6n1.html>

- Doud, J. L. & Keller, E. P. (1998). The K-8 principal in 1998. *Principal*, 78(1), 5-6, 8, 10-12.
- DuFour, R. (2002, May). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 12-15.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). *Development of achievement motivation*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ediger, M. (2002). Assessing the school principal. *Education*, 123(1), 90-95.
- Educational Research Service. (1999). Study of the principalship. *ERS Bulletin*, 26(6), 1-2.
- Educational Research Service; National Association of Elementary School Principals; & National Association of Secondary School Principals, (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need*. Arlington: Authors
- Edwards, W. (1961). Behavioral decision theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 12, 472-498.
- Emerson, T. R. (1995). An analysis of factors that determine the level of job/life satisfaction for principals in the department of defense dependent schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*.
- Erez, A. & Isen, A. M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1055-1067.
- Evers, W. M. & Walberg, H. J. (2002). *School accountability: An assessment by the Koret task force on k-12 education*. CA: Hoover Press.
- Fair Test Examiner (2006, August). Cheating. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.fairtest.org/examarts/August%202006/cheating806.html>
- Figlio, D. N. & Getzler, L. S. (1996). Accountability, ability and disability: Gaming the system. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://bear.cba.ufl.edu/figlio/w9307.pdf>
- Fishbein, M. (1967). Attitude and prediction of behavior. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), *Readings in attitude theory and measurement*. New York: Wiley.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1981). Acceptance, yielding, and impact: Cognitive processes in persuasion. In R. E. Petty, T. M. Ostrom, & T. C. Brock (Eds.), *Cognitive responses in persuasion* (p. 339-359). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Florida Department of Education (2005). *Assessment & accountability briefing book*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from <http://www.fldoe.org>
- Florida Department of Education (2005). *Florida School Indicators Report*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from <http://www.fldoe.org>
- Florida Department of Education (2005). *2006 Guide to Calculating School Grades: Technical assistance paper 2005-06*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from <http://www.fldoe.org>
- Florida Department of Education (2006). *Proposals for: District corrective action and school restructuring*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from <http://www.fldoe.org>
- Florida Department of Education (2005). *Supplemental educational services in Florida under NCLB*. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from <http://www.fldoe.org>
- Forest, V. (2006). Work motivation and performance-related pay in the French Civil Service. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/egpa/HRM/milan/Forest2006.PDF>
- Francis, D. R. (2006, August). *How school administrators cheat the accountability rules*. National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved August 12, 2006, from <http://www.nber.org/digest/jun03/w9307.html>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P. & Borg, W. R., (2007). *Educational research: an introduction*. (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Gappa, J. M. (2000, Spring). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 77-86.
- Gawel, J. E. (1997). Herzberg's theory of motivation and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Retrieved November 23, 2002, from <http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=5&n=11>
- Gay, L., Mills, G., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- George, P. S. (2001). Principals under pressure: School leaders and standards-based accountability programs. Retrieved June 28, 2005, from <http://www.coe.ufl.edu/faculty/george/A+.htm>

- Groff, F. (2001, October/November). Who will lead? The principal shortage. *State Legislatures Magazine*. Retrieved June 28, 2005, from <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/pubs/1101prin.htm>
- Harmel, K. (1999). UF researcher studies changes in elementary school principalship. Abstract retrieved November, 2002, from www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1999/02/99021110470.htm University of Florida
- Harrington-Lueker, D. (2000). The uneasy coexistence of high stakes and developmental practice – accountability in primary education. *School Administrator*, 57(10). Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saissuedetail.cfm?ItemNumber=3808&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951>
- Hertling, E. (1999, June). *Performance contracts for administrators*. ERIC Digest 127. Retrieved August 23, 2006, from <http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest127.html>
- Hertling, E. (2001, April). Retaining principals. ERIC Digest. (147). Retrieved November 24, 2005, from [Http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest147.html](http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest147.html)
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. B. (1993). *The motivation to work*. Somerset, NJ: Somerset Publishers.
- Hirokawa, R. Y. & Scheerhorn, D. R. (1986). Communication in faulty group decision-making. In R. Y. Hirokawa & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *Communication and group decision-making*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hopkins, K., Hopkins, B., & Glass, G. (1996). *Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences*. (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hopkins, G. (1998). Help wanted: Qualified principals. Abstract retrieved November, 2002, from www.education-world.com/admin/admin067.shtml
- House, R. (1997). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (1997). *Educational administration: Theory, research, & practice*. (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hu, J. & Liu, H. (2004). Job satisfaction among nurses in China. *Home Health Care Management & Practice* 17(1), 9-13

- Huck, S. W. (1992). Group heterogeneity and Pearson's r . *Education and Psychological Measurement* 52, 253-260.
- Jaquiss, N. (1999). A matter of principals: A WW study shows that Portland's new merit pay for public-school principals is creating disparities based on race, poverty, and geography. Retrieved August 23, 2006, from <http://www.wweek.com/html/education111099.html>
- Jones, K. (2003, December). A learner-centered school accountability model: An alternative to high stakes testing. Retrieved October 30, 2005, from http://www.fairtest.org/k12/Jones_Account.html
- Keen, C. (2006, June). Schools suspend poor students to raise test scores, study shows. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://news.ufl.edu/2066/06/12/discipline>
- Kilpatrick, W. (1951). Critical issues in current educational theory. *Educational Theory*, 1(2), 1-8.
- Kohn, A. (2001). Fighting the tests: A practical guide to rescuing our schools. Phi Delta Kappan. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.alfiekohn.org/teaching/fit.htm>
- Konkol, M. J. (2001, March). Schools face matter of principals: Shortage has city looking to pilot program for help. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.cpef.org/n-principal-shortage.htm>
- Krushat, W. M., & Molnar, J. I. (1993). The effect of nonrespondents on a self-administered mail survey. *Evaluation Practice*, 14(1), 25-32.
- Lashway, L. (2001). Leadership for accountability. Retrieved August 12, 2006, from http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/roundup/Spring_2001.html
- Lawler III, E. E. (1994). *Motivation in work organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Lewis, K. (2006). Collier teachers slam bonus plan based on FCAT. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from http://www.naplesnews.com/news/2006/feb/11/cteachers_could_get_bonus_under_state_plan/?print

- Lindner, J. R., & Wingenbach, G. J. (2002). Communicating the handling of nonresponse error in research in brief articles. Retrieved November 21, 2006, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2002december/rb1.shtml>
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Lovely, S. (2004). Leadership forecasting: the development and selection of school leaders starts with the end in mind by considering future vacancies, both known and unknown. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0HUL/is_1_34/ai_n6358519/
- Lovely, S. (2004). *Staffing the principalship: Finding, coaching, and mentoring school leaders*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Marsh, D. (2000). Educational leadership for the twenty-first century: Integrating three essential perspectives. *The Jossey Bass Reader on Educational Leadership* (pp. 126-146). San Francisco: Jossey Bass
- Marsden, D. & Richardson, R. (1994). Performing for Pay? The effects of merit pay on motivation in a public service. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 32, 243-261.
- Marsland, D. W., Syptak, J. M. & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.aafp.org/fpm/991000fm/26.html>
- Matus, R. (2006, February). Survey highlights principals' doubts about FCAT. St. Petersburg Times. Retrieved August 12, 2006, from http://www.sptimes.com/2006/02/03/news_pf/State/Survey_highlights_pri.shtml
- Maxwell, T. W. (1994). Accountability and the principal: Focus on improvement. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://fehps.une.edu.au/f/s/edu/tMaxwell/Account_Princ_F.pdf
- Mayo Clinic. (2005). *Research instruments in cumulative index to nursing & allied health*. Retrieved October 30, 2005, from <http://www.mayo.edu/education/nursing-research/research-cinahl.html>
- Mayo, E. (1986). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. Salem, NH: Ayer Company Publishers.

- McCall, R. (1951). The autonomy of education: A Thomistic view. *Educational Theory*, 1(2), 246-250.
- McGregor, D. (1966). *Leadership and motivation*. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.
- Miller, N. J. (1985). A description of secondary school principals in Minnesota and their job satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (UMI No. 8602134)
- Million, J. (2000, September). When a principal cheats. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.naesp.org/ContentLoad.do?contentId=231>
- Noguera, P. A. (2005, October). It takes more than pressure to improve failing high schools. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://www.inmotionmagazine.com/er/pn_pressure.html
- Olson, L. (1999). Demand for principals growing, but candidates aren't applying. *Education Week*, 18(25), 1, 20-22.
- Osborn, H. (2004, August). Principal shortage hits valley schools. Retrieved June 28, 2005, from <http://www.napanews.com>
- Packer, J. (2006). More schools are failing NCLB law's 'adequate yearly progress' requirements. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from <http://www.nea.org/esea/ayptrends0106.html>
- Patterson, J. L. (1993). *Leadership for tomorrow's schools*. Alexandria: Association for supervision and curriculum development.
- People for the American Way (2004, February). Dereliction of duty: Florida's failed education policy. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from <http://www.pfaw.org/pfaw/general/default.aspx?oid=13555>
- Peris, H. J. (1984). Predictors of job satisfaction and performance of principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*.
- Peterson, K. D. (2001, Winter). The roar of complexity. *Journal of Staff Development*, 22(1), 18-21.
- Pierce, M. (2000, October). Portrait of the 'super principal'. *Harvard Education Letter*. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from <http://www.edletter.org/past/issues/2000-so/principal.shtml>

- Pierce, M. (2001, May). Support systems for instructional leaders. *Leadership Magazine*, 30(1), 1-3. Abstract retrieved May 1, 2005, from www.acsa.org/publications/pub_detail.cfm?leadershipPubID-1026 Association of California School Administrators
- Pierce, M. (2002). The 21st-Century principal: Current issues in leadership and policy. Retrieved August 19, 2006, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~hepg/principalintro.html>
- Planner-Hardy, M. M. (1983). Decision involvement and job satisfaction of elementary school principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*.
- Pounder, D. G. & Merrill, R. (2001, November). Lost luster: Redesigning the principalship could have a positive impact on the pipeline supply. Retrieved June 28, 2005, from http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2001_11/pounder.htm
- Riad, A. (1994). Job satisfaction among public employees in Jordan. *Department of Public Administration*. Retrieved October 30, 2005, from http://www.metu.edu.tr/home/wwwsbe/thabs/1994/adm_abs_94.html
- Rogers, R. W. (1975). A protection motivation theory of fear appeals and attitude change. *The Journal of Psychology*, 91, 93-114.
- Savage, L. E. (1954). *Foundations of statistics*. New York: Wiley
- Sax, G. (1997). *Principles of educational and psychological measurement and evaluation*. (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Scholl, R. W. (2002, October). Motivational processes--expectancy theory. Retrieved November 11, 2005, from http://www.cba.uri.edu/Scholl/Notes/Motivation_Expectancy.html
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2006). *The Principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. (5th ed.). San Antonio: Pearson Education Inc.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., Kelleher, P., McCarthy, M. M. & Wirt, F. M. (2004). *Educational Governance and Administration*. (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc. (Original work published 1980).
- Sheehan, K. (2001). E-mail response rates: A review. Retrieved November 21, 2006, from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue2/sheehan.html>

- Spatz, C. (2001). *Basic statistics: Tales of distributions*. (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stevenson, H. & Stigler, J. (1992). *Learning gap: Why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education*. Touchstone, NY: Summit Books.
- Stewart, M. (2006, February). FCAT pressure coming to a head. Retrieved August 12, 2006, from <http://www.pensacolanejournal.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060205/NEWS01/60>
- Stockman, K. J. (2005, April). School demands stress principals. Retrieved June 28, 2005, from <http://www.fortwayne.com/mld/journalgazette/news/local/11301667.htm>
- Sweeney, J. (2000, April). Accountability can drive student achievement. Retrieved August 19, 2006, from http://www.acsa.org/publications/pub_detail.cfm?leadershipPubID=1326
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper.
- Taylor, R. T. & Williams, R. D. (2001, June). Accountability: Threat or target? Retrieved June 28, 2005, from http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2001_06/Taylor.htm
- Thorndike, R. L. & Hagen, E. P. (1977). *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education*. (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tucker, M. S. & Coddling, J. B. (2002). *The principal challenge: Leading and managing schools in an era of accountability*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Urban Educator, (2003, May). *Palm Beach principals to be paid more for taking on bigger challenges*. Urban Educator 12(4). Retrieved August 23, 2006, from http://www.cgcs.org/urbaneducator/2003/may_vol_12_no_4_6/may_vol_12_no_4_6.html
- Usdan, M. (2000). Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from

<http://www.iel.org/programs/21st/reports/principal.pdf#search=%22leadership%20for%20student%20learning%3A%20reinventing%22>

- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Weber, D. A. (2001). Restriction of range: The truth about consequences and correlations. *Education Resources Information Center*. (ERIC No. ED449213)
- Weber, M. (1921/1968). *Max Weber on law in economy and society*. Max Rheinstein (ed.). Translated by Edward Shils and Max Rheinstein. New York: Simon and Schuster
- Weber, M. (1946/1958). *From Max Weber*. Translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Galaxy.
- Willower, D, & Licata, J. (1997). *Values and Valuation in the Practice of Educational Administration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Winchester, D. (2006, February). FCAT bonus plan for teachers wins approval. Retrieved August 24, 2006, from http://www.sptimes.com/2006/02/22/State/FCAT_bonus_plan_for_t.shtml
- Wiseman, F. (2003). On the reporting of response rates in extension research. Retrieved November 21, 2006, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2003june/comm1.shtml>
- Woody, E. L. (2005). Voices from the field: Educators respond to accountability. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://pace.berkeley.edu/pace_accountability.html
- Zedek, S. (1987, October). *Satisfaction in union members and their spouses*. Paper presented at the Job Satisfaction: Advances in Research and Practice Conference, Bowling Green, Ohio.