

SUPERINTENDENT JOB SATISFACTION IN NEW YORK STATE

Presented to Dr. Myers
Department of Educational Administration
Sage Graduate School

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of
Educational Doctorate in Educational Leadership

Paul J. Padalino

July 2009

Superintendent Job Satisfaction in New York State

We represent to Sage Graduate School that this thesis/dissertation and abstract are the original work of the author(s) and do not infringe on the copyright or other rights of others.

Paul J. Padalino

Date of Signature

Dr. Ann Myers
Professor of Education
Dissertation Advisor

Date of Signature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	vi
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
II. Review of Literature	6
Job Satisfaction Among Superintendents	6
Changes in Stressors of the Superintendency	8
Effects on Pool of Candidates.....	10
Aspects Contributing to Increased Stress	12
Job Satisfaction in Other Roles	16
Summary	20
III. Methodology	22
Limitations	24
IV. Presentation and Data Analysis	26
Description of Sample	26
Survey Results and Findings.....	27
Summary of Data Presentation	46
V. Summary of Findings.....	49
Recommendations.....	53
Recommendations for Future Study	54
References	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: I have substantial input into the direction of the school district, to be part of the progress we make.

Table 2: I have an opportunity to build a team of educators.

Table 3: I have an opportunity to impact students

Table 4: I always have daily challenges in this job.

Table 5: I am able to utilize skills that I have.

Table 6: I can make a difference in teaching and learning.

Table 7: I can interact with a wide variety of people

Table 8: I enjoy the school culture.

Table 9: I enjoy being a CEO, making final decisions.

Table 10: I get an opportunity to work with people I like.

Table 11: I enjoy working with the Board of Education.

Table 12: I am paid well for this job.

Table 13: I can influence community decisions

Table 14: I am in control of my daily schedule.

Table 15: I enjoy the status of this job.

Table 16: I like the high visibility this job has.

Table 17: I am able to work on a 12 month job, not a separate summer job.

Table 18: The number one reason from the list 1-17 is.

Table 19: The second reason is.

Table 20: The third reason is.

Table 21: I felt I could make a positive difference in education.

Table 22: The job would enable me to provide leadership to a school district.

Table 23: The job would give me a broader span of influence than I had in a classroom or in a building level position.

Table 24: The job would allow me to help move a district forward.

Table 25: I wanted to be all that I could be (self actualization).

Table 26: The job was a logical progression in my career.

Table 27: I wanted to go beyond the building administrator level.

Table 28: I thought I could do a better job than I had seen done before

Table 29: The job would provide me financial security.

Table 30: Other superintendents I knew or worked for seemed to enjoy their work.

Table 31: I thought I would like working with the people in the office.

Table 32: The job would enable me to live in a certain area.

Table 33: I had paid my dues.

Table 34: The number one motivator from the list of 22-34 is.

Table 35: The second strongest motivator is.

Table 36: The third strongest motivator is.

Table 37: Motivating factors of ten year vs. fewer than ten years of experience.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate issues impacting the future pool of system leaders. Specifically, this study used survey materials to explore the trend of job satisfaction among superintendents with their selection of the superintendency as a culminating career choice, in the face of increased stress brought on by academic and fiscal accountability, public scrutiny and personal sacrifice inherent to the position. A survey was developed and sent to 233 New York State Superintendents to measure the aspects of the position that they liked and discover what motivated them to want to pursue the superintendency. The survey results indicated that New York State superintendents were experiencing increased job satisfaction in the face of new challenges. Superintendents indicated that the three highest motivators for pursuing the position were: making a difference in the lives of students, using skills they had acquired and having the opportunity to lead a district. Superintendents surveyed indicated the aspects of the superintendency they most enjoyed were: having substantial input in the direction of a district, being part of the progress a district makes and having the opportunity to build a team of educators. These main findings provide insight into the job of the superintendency and may inform the pool of potential future superintendents.

Suggested Keywords: superintendent, school district administration, job satisfaction, occupational stress, retention, recruitment, future pool of leaders, education reform, leadership.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

A review of literature points to an increasing trend in job satisfaction among public school superintendents. In a national survey conducted by the American Association of School Administrators in 2000, 56% of superintendents indicated that they found “considerable” fulfillment in their current position and 34% reported feeling “moderate” satisfaction in the superintendency (Glass, 2000). While this national study indicates a high rate of job satisfaction among superintendents nationally, similar results were found in New York State. Two studies conducted by the New York State Council of School Superintendents in 2004 and 2006 showed an increased trend in job satisfaction among superintendents in New York State (Volp. R., Archambault, P., Brown, C., Cattaro, G., Fale, E., O’Connell, R., Service, R., 2004, Rogers, T., Cattaro, G., Fale, E., Fiore, M., Ike, R., Rice, M., Service, R., Zseller, E., 2006). Sixty one percent of New York State superintendents surveyed in 2000 stated that they would encourage a son or daughter to pursue the superintendency (Volp et al, 2004). In 2006, 67% of New York State superintendents responded positively to the question of whether or not they would choose the superintendency again (Rogers et al, 2006). These results imply that the job satisfaction rate among superintendents is showing an upward trend. This fact is counterintuitive given that there has been a concurrent significant increase in the stress and pressures of this position. It is important to the field to determine and understand the reasons for this phenomenon.

Thomas Rogers, Executive Director of the New York State Council of School Superintendents, stated in the 2006 publication of the Snapshot on the Superintendency that there has been little research done on the reasons for reported the increase in job satisfaction and

recommends further study of this issue. This study intended to determine if there is truly an upward trend as shown in the Snapshot, as well as answer the question of why this trend is positive through the analysis of the responses from New York State superintendents as to what aspects of the position of superintendent they like the most or find the most positive. Neither the snapshot nor the AASA study answers this question. There is also a gap in the research literature on superintendent job satisfaction concerning the motivation of individuals to become and remain superintendents. This study attempted to answer this question as well.

It is believed that the formal study of job satisfaction began with the Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). The Hawthorne studies conducted from 1924 to 1933 examined the effects of lighting and other conditions on worker productivity. These studies found that the change in lighting and other conditions had less to do with workers increased productivity than did the knowledge that they were being observed. The Hawthorne findings illustrated that people work for purposes beyond pay, thus opening a door for researchers to investigate the new phenomenon of job satisfaction. By 1972, it is estimated that more than 3,350 articles on the topic of job satisfaction had been published and the number was growing significantly (Locke, 1976). The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare conducted extensive studies of job satisfaction throughout the 1970's in attempt to measure Americans general quality of working life (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973). The job satisfaction among public school superintendents has also been the subject of several studies over the years. The most recent of which have found an increasing number of superintendents claiming to have high levels of job satisfaction (Rogers et al, 2006, Volp et al, 2004).

There have been many attempts to accurately define job satisfaction. Robert Happock (1935) described and defined job satisfaction as any combination of environmental, psychological or physiological circumstances that move a person to claim he/she is happy with his/her job. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of job experiences”. Although these definitions describe some aspects of job satisfaction, a comprehensive, precise definition has been elusive (Locke, 1969). For the purposes of this research, Spector’s (1997) definition that job satisfaction is measured by an individual’s like or dislike of their job will be used.

The study of job satisfaction can be condensed to four theoretical approaches (Ashbaugh, 1976). These approaches include: factor theory, discrepancy theory, equity theory and fulfillment theory. The factor theory states that individuals may be both satisfied and dissatisfied with their job at the same time (Hertzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). This results from varying levels of happiness, or satisfaction, with specific aspects of their work life. Discrepancy theory contends that job satisfaction depends on an individual’s expectation of their job and what the job is actually offering them (Locke, 1969). Equity theory measures job satisfaction by comparing compensation for work with that being received by others doing similar work (Zalenznik, Christensen & Roethlisberger 1958). Finally, fulfillment theory contends that job satisfaction is measured by how much one feels their work is meeting personal needs (Schaffer, 1953). All subsequent work regarding the theoretical approaches to studying job satisfaction has been based on these four approaches.

The measurement of job satisfaction is most frequently accomplished using questionnaire or surveys given to employees. Literature supports the fact that job satisfaction can be measured

through the analysis of satisfaction with certain individual aspects of one's job (Wanous, 1972).

This research paper is based on this assumption.

The study of job satisfaction is important due to the perceived relationship between job performance, turnover and job satisfaction. While it might be assumed that high levels of job satisfaction equate to high levels of performance, it has been found that these factors have a low correlation (Locke, 1976). Some studies indicate a reverse of the intuitive belief that job satisfaction increases performance, showing rather good performance increases job satisfaction (Lawler & Porter, 1967).

These findings have been disputed by studies conducted in the early 1990's that indicated there is a strong correlation between job satisfaction and improved performance (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990). This study showed that a worker's job performance correlated with job satisfaction when the individual's attributes were matched to the actual job.

It can also be suggested that an individual's level of job satisfaction can increase the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization. This is most evident in areas of employee turnover and absenteeism. A 1993 study found that job satisfaction has a significant affect on worker absenteeism (Kohler & Mathieu, 1993). Wagner (1994) reported that there is a strong correlation between job satisfaction and employee turnover.

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate issues impacting the current and future pool of system leaders. In this study survey materials were used to explore the increasing trend of job satisfaction among New York State superintendents with their selection of the superintendency as a culminating career choice, in the face of increased stress, brought on by academic and fiscal accountability, public scrutiny and personal sacrifice inherent to the position

of school district leader. This study also identified the positive aspects of the job of superintendent and factors that motivated current superintendents to pursue and remain in this position. The driving research questions for this study included:

1. Given the increased stress and pressures inherent to the position, is there an upward trend in superintendent job satisfaction among New York State public school superintendents?
2. What are the aspects of the superintendency that contribute to the increased level of job satisfaction?
3. What motivated current superintendents to pursue the superintendency?
4. What motivates them to continue in this role?

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Job Satisfaction Among Superintendents

Sharp (2002) conducted a study of 119 school superintendents in Illinois, Indiana and Texas that measured what superintendents from these three states identified as the positive aspects of their jobs. Based on the high reporting of school superintendent job satisfaction, the researcher used a survey to determine what superintendents rated the most rewarding aspects of the position of superintendent. The study concluded that superintendents did find their jobs satisfying in the areas of team building, affect on teaching and learning, daily challenges, and utilization of skills.

In a related study, Sharp (2002) asked the question: What motivated you to become a superintendent in the first place? This study surveyed 25 current school district leaders in Illinois, Indiana and Texas to determine what aspects of the job of superintendent were most responsible for their decision to pursue this position. Sharp found that the number one motivating factor was “I thought I could make a difference”, followed by “the job would allow me to move the district forward” and “the job enables me to provide leadership”. The final two top rated responses were “the job would give me a broader span of influence than I had in a classroom situation or building level position” and “I wanted to be all that I could be”. Statements that received the lowest ratings included “I had paid my dues”, “the job would allow me to live in a certain area”, “I thought I would like working with the people in the office”,

“other superintendents I knew or worked for seemed to enjoy the work” and “I thought I could do a better job than I had seen done before” (Sharp, 2002).

A 2006 study of public school superintendents in the state of Idaho found that more than 75 percent of the 83 chief school officers surveyed stated that they had a high level of job satisfaction (Crane, 2006). The study also found that superintendents regarded intrinsic factors as more important than extrinsic factors or rewards. Although the level of satisfaction among participants was high, areas of increased stress over finance and school accountability were identified.

The Job Descriptive Index, developed by Young in 1984, was used to measure superintendent job satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index was distributed to a random sample of school superintendents in the continental United States to measure the level of job satisfaction of U.S. school superintendents as it relates to intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Young (1984) considered the following factors in this study: advancement, supervision, working conditions, level of job responsibility and interpersonal relationships. The study found little discrepancy between male and female superintendents and found that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors weighed equally in the levels of satisfaction between the sexes.

Mark Edwards, superintendent of the Mooresville Graded School District in North Carolina cited the level of action, the ability to make efficient decisions and the opportunities to make a difference in young people’s lives as the most satisfying aspects of the job of superintendent (Edwards, 2008). As a superintendent who left the field and returned, he stated that he returned because he truly loved the work. He missed the joy and fun of the superintendency (Edwards, 2008).

The literature reviewed shows that superintendents are reporting high levels of job satisfaction both nationally and in New York State. The literature also points out the aspects of this challenging position that current superintendents find to be rewarding. It can be preliminarily suggested there is a relationship between these aspects and the level of job satisfaction reported by school district leaders.

Changes In the Stressors of the Superintendency

The publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 brought the subject of school performance into the consciousness of the American public (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). This was followed in New York State by the Regents Action Plan and then in 2004 by the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act by the federal government. No Child Left Behind required states to enact accountability systems that would identify schools that were chronically underperforming. The enactment of both New York State and United States accountability systems significantly changed the role of and the stressors placed on public school superintendents forever.

Superintendents of public school districts hold one of the toughest jobs in the nation (Glass, Bjork , & Brunner, 2000). The call for reform of our schools, and an intense focus on accountability has increased the scrutiny and criticism of the people in this position. Superintendents are also faced with the complex politics of the position and unrealistic expectations in the face of scarce resources (Hess, 1999). Today the superintendent is increasingly a change agent who can fluidly adapt to the ever - changing political, social and economic conditions (Malone, 1999). Superintendents in the 21st century must deal with poor financing, educational reform initiatives brought forward by groups outside of education, charter

schools, school board relations and increased politicization of board members: increased calls for school safety, changing demographics and pressure from outside interest groups (Norton, Webb, Dlugosh, & Sybouts, 1996).

The Local School Superintendency: A Puzzling Administrative Role examined the role of the superintendent through review and analysis of data collected in the 1982 American Association of School Administrators survey (AASA). Crawson (1987) cited an increased pressure and responsibility, as well as changes in the role of superintendent as possible reasons for more superintendents stating that they would not choose the profession again if they had the chance. While Crawson did not measure overall job satisfaction, his findings are in contrast to the more recent studies done in New York State which show an increase in job satisfaction (Rogers et al, 2006, Volp et al, 2004).

The 2006 Snapshot on the Superintendency found that greater emphasis on student achievement brought on by NCLB and state mandates created the need for more school board member training beyond that of just finance. The lack of board training was seen as a factor in the ineffectiveness of school boards. This ineffectiveness created greater stress and pressure on the district leader. Greater than 75% of superintendents who identified their school board as ineffective found the position to be more stressful than expected (Rogers et al, 2006).

The review of literature shows that there have been many changes in the role of the school superintendent. These changes have increased the pressure and stresses placed on individuals in this position and are important factors in the study of job satisfaction among public school superintendents.

Effects on Pool of Candidates

The increased expectations of superintendents are unrealistically high and these expectations are growing which has led to shortages in the candidate pool and, one could assume, affecting job satisfaction (Chaddock, 1999).

The changes in working conditions and increased stress may contribute to fewer candidates being interested in entering the superintendency. Glass (2000) reported on the lack of candidates applying for vacant superintendent positions. Glass attempted to answer the question of why the superintendency has become less attractive and what can be done about it. The most compelling findings of this case study focused on school board – superintendent relations as perhaps the biggest deterrent today to attracting qualified candidates to district leadership positions. The importance of this relationship not only aids in the effective operation of the school district, but also in the recruitment and retention of qualified school district leaders. Positive superintendent – school board relationships are seen as a very attractive aspect of a given position (Cox & Malone, 2001).

The question of whether or not there is a crisis in the superintendency was studied by Fusarelli and Carella (2003). The study focused on three main questions. Is there a reduced pool of candidates? Is the quality of candidate declining? Are superintendents reporting decreasing job satisfaction? A random sample of more than 1,700 superintendents were surveyed nationally using the Superintendents' Perception Expectations and Advancement Review (SPEAR), which measured superintendent perceptions and career satisfaction. The results showed that, although respondents indicated that while there was a shortage of candidates, they felt that there was not a

decline in the quality of candidates that were applying for vacant positions. In the area of job satisfaction, participants reported significant job satisfaction, particularly in large school districts. These findings led Fusarelli and Carella to conclude that there is little evidence that the superintendency is a profession in crisis. Not all researchers agreed that the superintendency is not a profession in crises. The New York State Council of School Superintendents 2006 Snapshot presented data that show an alarmingly high rate of retirement among current superintendents (Rogers, 2006). This same study found that little progress has been made in expanding the pool of candidates through effective recruitment of women and minorities. These factors point to the superintendency as a profession that is in crisis.

A stratified random sample study of 275 public school superintendents conducted by Cunningham and Brudick (1999) explored the question of why there appears to be fewer applicants for the superintendency. The authors found that the top reasons for the shrinking of this candidate pool were school board micromanagement, time/stress demands, diminishing financial resources, relocation, insufficient pay, highly visible role, loneliness, and ambiguity of work. These factors are relevant to the study of superintendent job satisfaction in that they show some of the detractors to the position as well as further illustrate the counter intuitiveness of the upward trend reported by AASA and NYCOS. These factors also speak to motivation and retention within the superintendency.

While researchers may not agree on the primary causes of the increased stress and pressure, the literature clearly found these as factors in the decline in the number of candidates for the position of superintendent. The high rate of retirement among New York State

superintendents and the lack of interest among qualified women and minorities could also be seen as a result of the increased stress and pressure of the superintendency.

Aspects Contributing to Increased Stress

Former Texas superintendent of schools Vernon Johnson examined the differences in his life as CEO in the world of private business from that of the public school district superintendent. Johnson found that, although he enjoyed his position as superintendent, the stress of the high profile status of this job was a great detractor and part of the reason he decided to move on. Johnson stated that it is wonderful to have his life back (1998).

Kennedy (2001) identified some of the most critical issues facing school district leaders in *The Top Ten Issues Impacting School Administrators*. Kennedy found the list included: charter schools, funding, security, safety, staff training and retention, construction and facilities repair, maintenance and operations and unfunded mandates. The identification of these stressors provides insight into factors that effect job satisfaction of school leaders.

Bennett (1991), Superintendent of St. Paul Public Schools in Minnesota, used his own knowledge and experiences to provide his list of possible reasons for the shortage of candidates willing to take on large urban superintendencies. He argued that school board relations, the need for miracle workers, lack of training, better opportunities elsewhere, race, and role confusion significantly contributed to this lack of willingness among qualified candidates to take on the challenge of large, urban school districts.

Gates and Gmelch (1998) conducted a study of administrative burnout using the Administrator Work Inventory (AWI) which was administered to a random sample of school administrators including 250 elementary principals, 250 middle school principals, 250 high

school principals and 250 superintendents. The study set out to identify the most salient personal, professional and organizational characteristics to administrator burnout and determine the role of social support's impact on job satisfaction, burnout and performance. Social support was defined as the support of supervisors, colleagues and family. The analysis of data determined that there is little evidence that social support is a resource for burnout prevention. The research also found that the ambiguity of the role of administrator was the most salient characteristic to administrator burnout. This ambiguity was identified as a lack of clear job expectations and conditions. Participants indicated that they felt they had unclear goals and lacked any understanding of how much authority they did or did not have.

A randomly selected group of school superintendents was used by Andero (2001) to describe the changing role of the superintendent as it pertains to curriculum policy and decision-making. The author found that while the superintendent is seen as an important part of this, he/she has taken a reduced role due to state and federal mandates.

Caloss (1999), a twenty three year veteran superintendent of schools, discussed the many "hidden rules" of the superintendency that are learned through years of experience in the position of superintendent of schools. Among the key findings of Caloss' reflections were the hidden rules regarding time and personal privacy. He found that the superintendent is on call 24 hours a day, every day and in this business, everyone felt their opinions and needs were worthy of the superintendent's attention and action.

Carver (2000), the creator of the Policy Governance Model, an outline for effective governance of organizations, wrote about the need for change within schools away from the traditional superintendent to a model that more closely resembles the cooperate chief executive

officer. He found that the most destructive stressor for superintendents is their relationship with the board of education.

In a case study, Patterson (2001) used prior research to outline strategies for leaders to remain resilient. Patterson defined resiliency as the ability to recover, grow stronger and learn through crisis and adversity. The author's findings resulted in multiple suggestions for remaining resilient and listed several of the resiliency reducers that exist. He stated, "Legitimate reasons exist for school system leaders to be pessimistic about today's conditions in education". Patterson also discussed the increased demands from the government dictated values as opposed to the values of the school leader/district and the effect they have on the leader's resilience. There was also discussion regarding the leader's need to remain focused on his/her beliefs when there is a constant possibility in a change in the board of education and therefore the values of the district's elected policy makers.

Ramsay (1998) used interview methodology to explore the phenomenon of school superintendents leaving education for corporate management and sales. A growing number of school superintendents are leaving the field to try their hand in the business world. Ramsay found that many leaders move their families and risk their financial stability to seek new challenges, greater input or more money in the corporate world. One subject interviewed cited the difficulties of the job of superintendent, "...The superintendency is a rough place. People get chewed up and stomped on. I have seen people departing because it's rough and tumble and they think. "Who needs it?" Another was quoted as saying, "The role of the superintendent has to be one of the hardest jobs in America" and asks "have we created a job that nobody wants anymore?" These statements are not consistent with other research found in the review of literature. More recent data

on job satisfaction among New York State superintendents found by Rogers (2006) contradicts these statements.

A quantitative study conducted by Larry Dlugosh (1994) used a survey to determine the conditions that encouraged school administrators in the state of Nebraska to move between and among school districts. Over 1,000 superintendents were surveyed and an 80% return was achieved. Findings indicated that participants moved in order to obtain higher salary, promotions or work in a larger school/district. Several other unexpected findings were also made. Through several unsolicited, write in, responses the author was able to identify that approximately 7% of respondents identified, outside of the survey, stress, poor working conditions and poor school board relations as the reason for leaving their previous posts. The study also found that 20% of superintendents surveyed indicated that they would be retiring in the next five years.

It is important to point out that while there is much evidence of the increase in stress on the position of superintendent as it pertains to job satisfaction, salary and benefits were not seen as indicators of lack of job satisfaction. Studies showed that most superintendents earn pay that is considered satisfactory. This was especially true in large urban school districts (Kowalski, 1999).

The literature presented many changes within in the superintendency that has created greater pressure and stress for the occupants of this position. Studies have cited aspects that contribute to this stress such as increased ambiguity in the role and the infusion of outside interests. The political role of the board of education and their relationship with the superintendent were also found in the literature as negative aspects of the job of school leader. It

may be the combined effects of these aspects that truly create a compounded level of stress and pressure.

Job Satisfaction in Other Roles

In an attempt to determine if job satisfaction trends in other fields were similar to those found in the superintendency, job satisfaction research on several other occupations was reviewed. This study of job satisfaction in other roles also assisted in learning how job satisfaction is assessed.

Some aspects of job satisfaction among occupations other than the superintendency were found by Perie (1997) who conducted a statistical analysis of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) 1993-94 School and Staffing Survey (SASS) report. The data analysis described the satisfaction with teaching as a career of kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers in the United States as well as identified factors associated with job satisfaction. Factors examined included characteristics of school, workplace conditions, teacher background, salary and other benefits. The SASS used a random sample stratified by state, area and school level to provide an approximate representative pool of public and private school teachers. For the purposes of this study, these teachers were surveyed and a satisfaction index was created using Item Response Theory (IRT) to measure how strongly questions correlated with teacher satisfaction. The results of this analysis demonstrated that 67 percent of teachers reported a moderate to high level of job satisfaction. It was also found that work place conditions had a correlated more strongly to job satisfaction than salary or characteristics of schools, but the of number of students receiving free and reduced lunch in a school is strongly correlated with lower job satisfaction.

Liu (2007) examined the level of teacher satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs. Data collected from the 2000 -2001 School and Staffing Survey (SASS) sponsored by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) and the Teacher Follow Up (TFU) was analyzed to measure teacher job satisfaction among teachers in the United States. This study focused on thirty- one questions within the SASS that dealt only with teacher job satisfaction. A principal component analysis (CPA) was used to summarize areas of teacher satisfaction. The results of this study demonstrated that teachers have varying degrees of satisfaction with different aspects of their jobs. Working conditions and compensation were the two highest levels of teacher dissatisfaction. It was also found that minority teachers had a higher rate of job dissatisfaction than non-minority teachers and job satisfaction increased with the number of years in the profession for all teachers.

A trend in teacher job satisfaction was further shown in a Harris Poll conducted in 2004 that indicated a significant increase in job satisfaction among American teachers (Harris 2004). This poll surveyed 1, 017 public school teachers between May and September of 2003. Harris (2004) found that the job satisfaction rate among teachers rose from a low of 33% in 1986 to 57% in 2004. The gradual increase in job satisfaction was also seen virtually each year between 1986 and 2004 (Harris, 2004).

Hewlett and Luce (2006) used 14 focus groups, 35 one on one interviews and collected from two on-line surveys to research “extreme jobs”. The survey of workers in the United States sampled the top 6% of earners in America and received responses from 844 men and 720 women full time employees. The second survey sampled 652 men and 323 women managers of global companies. The results of this study showed that 66% of participants from the United States and

76% of global company employees surveyed indicated that they loved their jobs in spite of the long hours and heavy demands placed upon them (Hewlett, Luce, 2006). This pattern of increasing job satisfaction parallels that of school superintendents.

Harris (2007) conducted a study of job satisfaction using a survey to determine demographics, the Job In General Scale to measure overall job satisfaction and the Mentoring and Communication Support Scale to measure workplace social support. These instruments were administered to 122 female and 57 male full time paid employees in two training hospitals in the southwestern part of the United States. This study, administered to multiple hospital departments, sought to identify the relative contributions of different types of social supports to job satisfaction and explored the relationship between job satisfaction and employee tenure. The results of this study demonstrated that the two types of social support that were most predictive of job satisfaction were career mentoring and task support (17% of variance). These two supports (at a lower scale: 9% of variance) were also most predictive of employee tenure.

Job satisfaction literature in occupations other than the superintendency found that these occupations were also showing an upward trend. The literature also pointed out that, much like superintendents, the people in these occupations identified their enjoyment of certain aspects of their positions as key reasons for their feelings of satisfaction. Through this literature it can be suggested that the trends in job satisfaction are similar to that of superintendents.

One of the closest comparisons to the superintendency is the position of corporate chief executive officer. The two positions mirror each other in that both positions require leadership and responsibility in every aspect of the organization.

A survey conducted by *Industry Week* in 1999 asked 78 of the CEO's of the world's 1000 largest publicly held manufacturing companies what gives them job satisfaction. The aspect of the job that CEO's rated as giving them the highest degree of job satisfaction was the ability to grow an organization with 73% of participants rating this very important (Stevens, 1998). The ability to develop people ranked second with 48% (Stevens, 1998). Other areas of satisfaction that CEO's rated highly included creating products that contribute to people's lives, establishing an organizational culture, driving financial performance, holding a position of power and public recognition, contributing to society and directing the turnaround of a company (Stevens, 1998). Once again it is notable to point out that while rated as important, financial compensation came in a distant third among the aspects rated very important by corporate leaders.

In 2000, the *Industry Week* Annual CEO Survey produced some realignment of aspects that CEO's found most satisfying. The top area of job satisfaction among participants was the sense of accomplishment when a company is successful, with over 90% rating this as the number one source of job satisfaction. Other aspects that rated highly were the ability to develop people, with 69% of respondents indicating development of others as a source of satisfaction. The ability to grow an organization fell from number one in 1998 to number three. The intellectual challenge and the need for problem solving also appeared as a top aspect of job satisfaction. Financial compensation fell to number seven in the new survey (Royal, 2000).

Another interesting result of the 2000 survey conducted by *Industry Week* found that participants rated downsizing and layoffs as the most stressful task facing a CEO (Royal, 2000). The number one source of external stress for survey participants was identified as the increasing complexity of government regulations.

In 2008 *Community Banker* interviewed four banking CEO's and asked the question: what is the most rewarding aspect of your job? William Donius, of Pulaski Bank in St. Louis Missouri stated that the ability to build a team and foster a climate of inclusiveness throughout the organization was the most satisfying aspect of his job. Peter Judkins, CEO of Franklyn Savings Bank in Farmington, Maine found that the most satisfying part of his job revolved around helping members of the community and his hometown grow and improve their lives and businesses. Barrie Christman, CEO of Principal Bank in Des Moines, Iowa agreed with both of these aspects as highly satisfying. He added overcoming challenges to his list of aspects that brought him satisfaction (Community Banker, 2008). The ability to work with the community was also the most satisfying aspect of the job for Larry Brandt, CEO of First Federal Bank in Harrison, Arkansas (Community Banker, 2008).

The literature indicates that CEO's have indicated high levels of job satisfaction and cite certain aspects of their position as being responsible for this satisfaction. Both corporate executives and superintendents share similar job descriptions and responsibilities. The research points out that the aspects that each find most enjoyable to be similar as well.

Summary

There is evidence that there is an upward trend in job satisfaction among superintendents. The Snapshot conducted by the New York State Council of School Superintendents showed an increase in job satisfaction from 2004 to 2006. These studies also show an increase from the earlier study conducted by AASA in 2000. Both Sharp (2002) and Young (1984) found that there are multiple aspects of the job of superintendent that were identified as increasing job satisfaction. Rogers (2006) states that there is virtually no current research that explores why

superintendents are reporting increased rates of job satisfaction and recommends further study of this trend.

The many changes in the role of superintendent would seem to have a negative impact on job satisfaction in the field. Gates and Gmelch(1998) set out to determine why the rate of administrative burnout is believed to be high among school administrators and superintendents. The changes in job expectations and increased pressures of the superintendency are cited as reasons for job dissatisfaction among superintendents (Fusarelli, Cooper and Carella, 2003). These changes include increased public pressure to improve schools, and a greater personal time commitment.

In an attempt to determine if the trend of job satisfaction is a unique phenomenon in the superintendency, teacher job satisfaction and private sector employee job satisfaction were briefly examined. Perie (1997), Liu (2007) examined teacher job satisfaction. Each study found that the trend of teacher job satisfaction has increased over time, but similar to Young (1984), it was found that different aspects of the work contributed to the feeling of satisfaction and retention.

This study attempts to answer the question posed by the New York State Council of School Superintendents as to why there seems to be an increased level of job satisfaction among New York State school superintendents in the face of increased stress and pressure. The data collected contribute to the field of research through the identification of aspects of the position that current New York State school leaders find to be the most responsible for their feelings of satisfaction with the position of superintendent.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This quantitative study used survey methodology. Probability, systematic sampling was used due to the need for subjects to be currently active and employed superintendents to obtain valid data. The data were subjected to frequency analysis and independent T-testing using SPSS software.

A systematic random sample of 233 New York State public school superintendents, a membership of approximately 700 school superintendents, were asked through a initial email to complete the forty nine question Positive Aspects and Motivation Survey (Sharp, 2002). This survey was used to determine if there is an upward trend in superintendent job satisfaction. The survey also asked superintendents to identify the aspects of their position that they found most enjoyable as well as what motivated current superintendents to pursue the superintendency. Every third name on the list provided by the New York State Department of Education was selected to receive a survey. The survey took fifteen to twenty minutes to complete. A likert scale of one to five was used to measure how much subjects “like” their job, one indicated a weak reason for liking their job and five indicated a strong reason.

The survey instrument was developed, piloted and tested for reliability and validity by Dr. William Sharp and used in his research: *The School Superintendency: A Three State Study of the Positive Aspects*. This researcher received permission to use and adapt this tool by Dr. Sharp in September of 2008 via e-mail. The survey was administered via the Survey Monkey internet based survey tool. A follow up e-mail was mailed to all participants after a two week period to request participation. This study was a follow up to the 2006 Snapshot of the Superintendency

conducted by NYCROSS, a triennial survey - based study that received 75% participation among members. E-mail addresses of superintendents were obtained through the New York State Department of Education.

There are currently 700 school superintendents in the State of New York. Of the 233 current New York State Superintendents surveyed 90 completed or partially completed the Positive Aspects and Motivation Survey (Sharp, 2002). There were 60 surveys returned to the researcher as undeliverable, leaving a surveyed sample of 173. A return rate of 52 percent was achieved by the researcher.

The sample demographics ranged from eleven to forty eight years of experience in education and one to twenty eight years as superintendent. The survey showed participants ages as two under 35, nine between 36 and 40, six between 41 and 45, eleven between 46 and 50, nineteen between 51 and 55, twenty six between 56 and 60, twelve between 61 and 65 and one over 65. The most recent Snapshot study by the New York State Council of School Superintendents conducted in 2006 showed the average age of superintendents to be 54.6 years of age (Rogers, 2006). Also worth noting among respondents, there were twenty nine females, or 32 percent and fifty seven males, or 63 percent, who responded to this survey. The average number of female superintendents in the State of New York is 24.2 percent (Rogers, 2006). The number of superintendents surveyed who were currently at an age where they are eligible to retire was 38, or 44.7 percent. Superintendents surveyed who had spent their entire careers in New York State where they are now serving as district leader was 91.9 percent. Leaders served in districts with a student population range from 50 to 11,000 students with a mean of 2,208.

While the sample size was significantly smaller, it was generally representative of the New York State population of school superintendents in age, gender, district size and years of service.

Sample- Population Demographics Comparison

Sample	Population NYS
Age 50% between 51-60	54.6 Average
Male 71%	75.8%
Fem. 29%	24.2%
Pop. 2,208	2,500

Survey data collected were entered into the SPSS database, subjected to frequency and t-test analysis and reported in aggregate form. Anonymity of participants was clearly communicated prior to subject participation and further ensured by the use of the internet based survey tool.

Limitations

The size of the sample and the rate of survey return represented the major limitation of this research. The return of 60 surveys as undeliverable limited the size of the anticipated pool, while a return rate of over 50 percent was achieved, this was of the New York State superintendents who actually received the survey. One hundred and seventy three surveys were actually received and therefore the pool was reduced from the intended two hundred and thirty three. This could be seen as having a negative effect on the generalizability of the findings of this research.

A second limitation is the frequent turnover of superintendents in New York State. Due to this high rate of turnover, it is most likely that the same superintendents were not surveyed by

the two NYSCOSS Snapshots and this study. Therefore, the aspects of the job and the rate of job satisfaction data may not have measured the increase in job satisfaction, but instead measured the feelings of different individuals.

A third limitation of this study is the possibility of researcher bias based on this researcher's current role as a school superintendent in a school identified as in need of improvement by the New York State Education Department. This identification places additional stress and pressure on the superintendent and may have a negative effect on job satisfaction. This researcher's role regarding accepting the challenge of a school district under this identification could also bias the research in that increased job satisfaction may be found through meeting difficult circumstances head on, and succeeding.

A final limitation is the timing of the administration of the survey from which the data for this study was obtained. The financial downturn in the economy and the decrease in State and federal funding toward schools that has taken place since this data was collected could change the responses of superintendents to the survey questions.

CHAPTER 4

Presentation of Data and Analysis

This chapter presents the findings of this study organized around the research questions. The analysis of research question one is based on the participants' answers to two survey questions directly related to the participants' degree of satisfaction with the superintendency. Data related to research question two were used to explore the aspects of the job that current superintendents liked the most or found the most positive as related to the superintendency. Research questions three and four focused on the question of motivation to become and remain in the superintendency.

Description of Sample

The demographics of respondents ranged from one to twenty eight years of experience in administration and eleven to forty eight years in education. Two percent of participants indicated their age to be under 35, 10.5 percent were between 36 and 40, 7.0 percent between 41 and 45, 12.8 percent between 46 and 50, 22.1 percent between 51 and 55, 30.2 percent between 61 and 65 and 13.3 stated that they were over 65 years of age. Also worth noting, there were 29 females and 57 males who responded to this survey. The number of superintendents surveyed who were currently at an age where they are eligible to retire was 38, or 44.7 percent. Superintendents surveyed who had spent their entire careers in New York State where they are now serving as district leader was 91.9 percent. Surveyed school district leaders served in districts with a student population range from 50 to 11,000 students with a mean of 2,208. A

comparison of the study sample and the overall population of the New York State superintendency can be found in the Chapter 3.

Survey Results and Findings

Research Question Number 1

Initial descriptive analysis addressed the research question: given the increased stress and pressures inherent to the position, is there an upward trend in superintendent job satisfaction among New York State public school superintendents? When compared with previously reported data collected by the New York State Council of School Superintendents 2004 and 2006 Snapshot (Rogers, 2006, Volp 2004), the results of this study indicated that there is an upward trend in job satisfaction among New York State School Superintendents.

Among the superintendents participating in this study, 75.6 % stated that they have a high or very high level of job satisfaction, 54.7 % rated their satisfaction as high and 24.4% rated their satisfaction level as very high. Participants were also asked: if you had a chance to do it all over again, would you choose to become a superintendent? Approximately 84 % answered that they would still enter the superintendency.

Research Question Number 2

Also included in the initial descriptive analysis of data was the research question: what are the positive aspects of the superintendency that contribute to the increased level of job satisfaction? The following tables are presented in rank order of the aspects that received the highest mean score, in other words, reported to be the most positive aspects of the superintendency. The survey asked superintendents, "What do you like about being a

superintendent?" They rated each statement from 1 to 5, where a 1 meant a weak reason for liking the job and a 5 indicated a very strong reason for liking the job. A summary of the top five aspects can be found in Appendix B.

Table 1: I have substantial input into the direction of the school district, to be part of the progress we make.

Question 1 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	1	3	21	65	0
Percent	0	1.1	3.3	23.3	72.2	

Table 1 shows that more than 95% of respondents felt that having substantial input into the direction of the school district and the progress the district makes is an aspect that like or strongly like about their position as superintendent. This was the highest rated item with a mean score of 4.67.

Table 2: I have an opportunity to build a team of educators.

Question 2 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	2	7	25	56	
Percent	0	2.2	7.8	27.8	62.2	

Table 2 shows that 90% of respondents saw having an opportunity to build a team of educators as an aspect of their position that they liked or highly liked. Only 10% of respondents rated this aspect a 2 or 3 and no respondents rated this aspect a 1. Building a team of educators is clearly

seen by participants as a positive aspect of the superintendency. The mean score for this question was 4.50.

Table 3: I have an opportunity to impact students.

Question 3 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	1	9	31	49	
Percent	0	1.1	10	34.4	54.4	

Having an opportunity to impact students rated highly as a positive aspect by participants. More than 85% rated this aspect as something they liked or highly liked. Table 3 shows that this aspect is seen as positive by the respondents and garnered only 11% rating this as a 2 or a 3 with no participant rating it below 2 on the likert scale. The mean rating for this item is 4.42.

Table 4: I always have daily challenges in this job.

Question 13 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	1	12	32	45	
Percent	0	1.1	13.3	35.6	50	

Table 4 shows that 85.6% of respondents felt that having daily challenges were a positive aspect of the position of superintendent. No participant rated this 1 on the likert scale and the mean score was among the highest of the survey at 4.34.

Table 5: I am able to utilize skills that I have.

Question 10 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	0	13	37	40	
Percent	0	0	14.4	41.1	44.4	

Table 5 shows that 87% of participants felt that the opportunity to use skills they possess to was an aspect of the superintendency that they liked or highly liked. There were not respondents who answered this question with a 1 or a 2. The mean was 4.30

Table 6: I can make a difference in teaching and learning.

Question 8 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	3	5	45	36	1
Percent	0	3.4	5.6	50.6	40.4	

Table 6 shows that 90% of respondents felt that making a difference in teaching and learning was an aspect of their position that they liked or highly liked. No respondents gave this aspect the lowest rating and only 10% rated this two or three. The mean score was 4.28.

Table 7: I can interact with a wide variety of people.

Question 9 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	1	17	34	38	
Percent	0	1.1	18.9	37.8	42.2	

Interacting with a wide variety of people was rated a 4 or 5 by 80% of participants with no participants giving this aspect the lowest rating of 1. The mean score for this aspect was 4.21 out of 5.

Table 8: I enjoy the school culture.

Question 4 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	1	3	15	35	36	
Percent	1.1	3.3	16.7	38.9	40	

Table 8 shows that just over 89% of respondents felt that enjoyment of the school culture was a positive aspect of their position. The percent of participants who rated this as a 1, 2 or three on the likert scale was 21.1%. This table also shows the first rating of a 1 by respondents in this questionnaire. The mean score for this question was 4.13.

Table 9: I enjoy being a CEO, making final decisions.

Question 12 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	5	21	37	27	
Percent	0	5.6	23.3	41.1	30	

Being the CEO and having the authority to make final decisions was seen as a positive aspect of the position of superintendent by 71.1% of participants. While 29% rated this 2 or a 3, no respondents felt this aspect deserved the lowest rating. The mean score of 3.96 indicates that this aspect is seen by respondents as something they like about the position but is not as important as the others already presented.

Table 10: I get an opportunity to work with people I like.

Question 7 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	1	3	18	46	21	1
Percent	1.1	3.3	20	51.1	23.3	

Table 10 shows that 74.4% of respondents found working with people that they like to be a positive aspect of the superintendency. Twenty percent of respondents rated this as a 3 on the likert scale and 4.4% gave this the lowest two ratings. The mean score for this question was 3.93.

Table 11: I enjoy working with the board of education.

Question 5 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	3	9	16	42	19	1
Percent	3.4	10.1	18	47.2	21.3	

Table 11 shows that 68.5% of participants saw working with the board of education as an enjoyable, positive aspect of their position. The number of respondents rating this as a 1,2 or three is 31.5%. A significant percentage scored this aspect low on the likert scale with just over 3% giving it the lowest possible rating. Therefore, this is not a positive aspect of the position of superintendent. The mean score of this question was 3.73.

Table 12: I am paid well for this job.

Question 17 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	7	30	38	13	2

Percent	0	8	34.1	43.2	14.8
---------	---	---	------	------	------

Table 12 shows that only 14.8% percent of respondents felt that pay was an aspect of the job that they highly liked or found positive. The majority of participants chose to rate this aspect a 4 out of five with a mean value of 3.65. Two participants did not answer this question.

Table 13: I can influence community decisions

Question 14 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	1	5	34	36	14	
Percent	1.1	5.6	37.8	40	15.6	

Table 13 shows that more than 40% of respondents did not find influencing community decisions to be a positive aspect of their position by rating it a 1, 2 or 3. While more than half of respondents did find this a positive aspect, the 40% rating it below a 4 was among the highest in the survey. The mean score of this aspect was 3.63.

Table 14: I am in control of my daily schedule.

Question 16 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	2	15	26	36	10	1
Percent	2.2	16.9	29.2	40.4	11.2	

Table 14 shows that the having control of their daily schedule did not rate very high as a positive aspect of the position of superintendent. Just over 50% of respondents rated it a 4 or 5 and just

under 50% rated in a 1, 2, or 3. The mean score for this aspect was 3.42 and one participant did not answer the question.

Table 15: I enjoy the status of this job.

Question 6 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	3	7	44	21	14	1
Percent	3.4	7.9	49.4	23.6	15.7	

The data in Table 15 show that only 39.3% of participants found the status of the position of superintendent to be a positive aspect of the position. Sixty percent of participants rated this aspect a 3 or lower, with more than 10% giving this aspect the two lowest possible rating. The mean score of this question was 3.40.

Table 16: I like the high visibility this job has.

Question 15 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	5	19	38	19	7	2
Percent	5.7	21.6	43.2	21.6	8	

Table 16 shows that only 30.5% found the high visibility of the position of superintendent to be something that they liked or highly liked. More than 25% of participants rated this 1 or 2. The mean score of this aspect was 3.05.

Table 17: I am able to work on a 12 month job, not a separate summer job.

Question 11 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	24	6	26	15	19	
Percent	26.7	6.7	28.9	16.7	21.1	

Table 17 shows that respondents 33.4 % of respondents felt that working a 12 month job, rather than a 10 month job was not an aspect of the job that they found they liked about the superintendency. Only 21.1% gave this aspect the highest rating of 5 on the likert scale and the mean score was 2.99.

Tables 18, 19 and 20 represent the aspects that participants found to be the top three most liked/positive aspects of the position of the superintendent presented in the survey.

Table 18: The number one liked/positive aspect chosen from the list 1-17 is number.

Question 18 results

Question	Frequency	Percent
3- Impact on students	30	35.7
1 -Input on dist. progress	28	33.3
8- I can make a difference	10	11.9
2 -Team builder	8	9.5
16- Control daily schedule	2	2.4

Table 18 shows the top five responses given by participants as the most liked/positive aspect of the superintendent. Just over 35.7% of participants chose the aspect measured by question three: I have an impact on the lives of students, as the aspect of the position of superintendent that they liked most. There is a significant drop between the second and third rated aspects. The third rated aspect of impacting teaching and learning garnered only 11.9%. Questions 5, 6 and 12 (not shown in table) which measured the positive aspects of board relations, status and acting as CEO

all were mentioned as the most positive aspect by 1.2% of superintendents surveyed. Six participants did not answer this question.

Table 19: The second most liked/positive aspect

Question 19 results

Question	Frequency	Percent
3-Impact students	18	21.4
8-I can make a difference	17	20.2
1-Input on dist. progress	14	16.7
2-Team builder	9	10.7
4-Enjoy school culture	6	7.1

Table 19 shows the top five ranked second choices as most positive aspects of the job of superintendent. Just over 21% of respondents felt the aspect measured by question three: I have an impact on the lives of students, was their second most liked aspect of the job of superintendent. Six participants did not answer this question.

Table 20: The third most like/positive aspect.

Question 20 results

Question	Frequency	Percent
8- I can make a difference	16	19
1-Input on dist. progress	10	11.9
3-Impact on students	7	8.3
4-Enjoy school culture	7	8.3
2-Team builder	6	7.1

Table 20 shows that 19% of participants rated the aspect measured by question 8: I can make a difference in teaching and learning, as the aspect that their third most liked aspect of the position.

Research Question Number 3

The initial data descriptive analysis included the third research question, what motivated current superintendents to pursue the superintendency? The following tables display the participants responses to questions regarding their level of motivation: 5 = Very Strong, 4=Strong, 3= Neutral, 2 = Weak and 1 = Very Weak. These tables are presented in the rank order from strongest to weakest motivating factors as measured by the mean scores.

Table 21: I felt I could make a positive difference in education.

Question 32 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	0	1	32	54	3
Percent	0	0	1.1	36.8	62.1	

Table 21 shows that a very high percentage of respondents felt that making a positive difference in education was a motivating factor in their choice of the superintendency. There were no responses in the “weak” or “somewhat weak” categories and 98.9% felt this was a “strong” or “very strong” motivating factor. The mean score was 4.61 and three participants did not answer this question.

Table 22: The job would enable me to provide leadership to a school district.

Question 25 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	0	3	44	40	4
Percent	0	0	2.3	51.2	46.5	

Table 22 shows that 46.5% of respondents felt providing leadership to a school district to be a “very strong” motivating factor in their decision to pursue the superintendency. Greater than 50% rated this as a “strong” motivating factor, for a cumulative percent of 97.7% stating that this was a “strong” or “very strong” motivator. The mean score was 4.44.

Table 23: The job would give me a broader span of influence than I had in a classroom or in a building level position.

Question 27 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	0	1	9	39	37	4
Percent	0	1.2	10.5	45.3	43	

Table 23 shows that 98.3% felt having a broader span of influence than they had as a classroom teacher or building level leader was a “strong” or “very strong” motivating factor in their choice of career path. No participants rated this factor as “weak” and 1.2% rated it as “somewhat weak”. Four participants did not answer the question and the mean score was 4.30

Table 24: The job would allow me to help move a district forward.

Question 23 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	2	0	9	41	35	3
Percent	2.3	0	10.3	47.1	40.2	

In table 24, 87.1% of respondents answered that being allowed to move the district forward was a strong or very strong motivating factor in their choice of superintendent as the next step in their career. Three participants did not respond and the mean was 4.23 out of 5.

Table 25: I wanted to be all that I could be (self actualization).

Question 31 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	2	9	17	28	31	3
Percent	2.3	10.3	19.5	32.2	35.6	

Table 25 shows that 35.6% of respondents felt self actualization was a “very strong” motivating factor in their decision to pursue the superintendency. Only 2.3% stated that this was a “weak” factor and 32.2% rated this as a “strong” motivator. Three participants did not answer this question and the mean rating was 3.89.

Table 26: The job was a logical progression in my career.

Question 29 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	5	7	15	26	33	4
Percent	5.8	8.1	17.4	30.2	38.4	

Table 26 shows that 68.6% of respondents felt the superintendency was the next logical step in their career was a “strong” or “very strong” motivating factor for their pursuit of the position. Only 13.9% of respondents rated this as a “weak” motivator. There were four participants who did not answer this question and the mean score was 3.87

Table 27: I wanted to go beyond the building administrator level.

Question 21 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	8	6	23	32	17	4
Percent	9.3	7.0	26.7	37.2	19.8	

Table 27 shows that 57% of participants felt the desire to go beyond building level administration was a very strong motivator for pursuing the position of superintendent. Also, 9.3% felt that this was a weak motivating factor. Four participants did not answer this question and the mean score was 3.51.

Table 28: I thought I could do a better job than I had seen done before

Question 28 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	6	14	24	21	21	4
Percent	7.0	16.3	27.9	24.4	24.4	

I thought I could do a better job than I had seen done before had a very evenly spread percentage within the “somewhat strong” to “very strong” range. Only 7% stated that this was a “weak” motivating factor. Four participants did not answer this survey question and the mean was 3.43

Table 29: The job would provide me financial security.

Question 22 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	10	11	32	26	8	3
Percent	11.5	12.6	36.8	29.9	9.2	

Table 29 shows the majority of participants did not feel that financial security was a strong or very strong motivating factor in their decision to pursue the superintendency. Only 39.1% rated this motivating factor as strong or very strong, with only 9.2% rating it as a very strong factor.

The mean score for this question was 3.13.

Table 30: Other superintendents I knew or worked for seemed to enjoy their work.

Question 26 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	16	12	29	25	4	4
Percent	18.6	14.0	33.7	29.1	4.7	

Table 30 shows that other superintendent enjoying the position was rated as a “weak” motivating factor in their decision to pursue this job. Only 4.7% rated this factor as a “strong” motivator.

The mean score for this factor was 2.87 and four participants did not answer this question.

Table 31: I thought I would like working with the people in the office.

Question 30 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	23	22	25	14	2	4
Percent	26.7	25.6	29.1	16.3	2.3	

I thought I would like working with the people in the office was given a “strong” motivating factor rating by only 2.3% of respondents. More than 26% of participants rated this as a “weak” motivator for pursuing the superintendency. The mean rating for this question was 2.42 and four participants did not answer this question.

Table 32: The job would enable me to live in a certain area.

Question 24 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	42	19	17	6	3	3
Percent	48.3	21.8	19.5	6.9	3.4	

Table 32 shows that very few respondents considered living in a certain area a very strong reason for pursuing the superintendency, 3.4%. Greater than 48% answered that this was a weak motivator of their decision. Three participants did not answer this question and the mean was score was 1.95.

Table 33: I had paid my dues.

Question 33 results

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Frequency	50	16	16	4	0	4
Percent	58.1	18.6	18.6	4.7	0	

Table 33 shows that 58.1% of respondents felt that paying their dues was a “weak” motivating factor in their career choice. The mean score for this factor was 1.70 and 4.7% rated this as a “very strong” motivating factor.

Tables 34, 35 and 36 represents participant answers to their rankings of the top three motivating factors offered in survey questions 21 through 33. Each table shows the top five answers submitted by participants.

Table 34: The strongest motivator.

Question 34 results

Question	Frequency	Percent
32- Self actualization	23	28.4
23-Financial Security	16	19.8
26-Provide Leadership	15	18.5
30-Logical progression	7	8.6
29- I could do a better job	6	7.4

Table 34 shows the top five motivating factors as rated by participants, Twenty eight percent of respondents felt that the factor that most motivated them to pursue the position of superintendent was: I felt I could make a difference in education.

Table 35: The second strongest motivator.

Question 35 results

Question	Frequency	Percent
26-Provide Leadership	28	34.6
23-Financial security	10	12.3
27-Influence of others	10	12.3
30-Logical progression	7	8.6
32-Self actualization	7	8.6

Table 35 shows that respondents 34.6% of respondents felt the opportunity to provide leadership was the second strongest motivating factor in their choice of career path. There were nine participants who did not answer this question.

Table 36: The third strongest motivator.

Question 36 results

Question	Frequency	Percent
27-Influence of others	22	27.2
23-Financial security	12	14.8
22-Go beyond building level	10	12.3
29-I could do a better job	10	12.3
32-Self actualization	8	9.9

Table 36 shows that 27.2% of respondents felt that other superintendents they knew or worked for enjoying their jobs was the third highest motivating factor for their decision to pursue the superintendency. There were nine participants who did not answer this question.

Research Question Number 4

The fourth research question; what motivates current superintendents to continue in this position, was analyzed using New York State Superintendents surveyed who have been in the superintendency for at least ten years and examined their responses to the survey questions

regarding what aspects of the job they “like” to determine what factors motivated them to remain superintendents as measured by the survey. This group was selected for this analysis based on the fact that, due to NYS Education Law 1711(3), which states schools may enter into contracts with their superintendents for terms of three to five years (School Law, 2006), they were most likely to have completed at least two terms as a superintendent. While there may be circumstances that make this not true, they are irrelevant for the purposes of this study question. The responses of these participants were compared with the responses of superintendent’s who had served fewer than 10 years.

There were 20 superintendents who had ten or more years of experience in the pool of study participants and 66 with fewer than ten years. The answers to ten questions regarding the aspects of the superintendency were analyzed using an independent sample t – test to compare their answers to those of the superintendents who had fewer than ten years experience.

Table 37: Motivating factors for superintendents with ten years or more of experience as compared to superintendents with fewer than ten years of experience.

Question	10 or >10 mean (S.D)	<10mean (S.D.)	T	P
1	4.7(.733)	4.65(.568)	.312	.756
2	4.7(.571)	4.44(.787)	1.373	.756
3	4.55(.686)	4.39(.742)	.838	.404
4	4.45(.686)	4.06(.943)	7.712	.091
5	3.89(1.049)	3.71(1.019)	.684	.496
6	3.35(1.089)	3.38(.930)	-.140	.899
7	4(.858)	3.88(.820)	.581	.563
8	4.3(.865)	4.26(.691)	.205	.838
9	4.2(.894)	4.2(.769)	.015	.988
10	4.1(.788)	4.35(.690)	-1.364	.176

As shown in Table 37, which displayed the mean score of ten sample questions selected from the survey, there are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the ten or more years experienced group than those with fewer than ten years in the position. The significance level was set at .05 by the researcher. Interpretation of the data will occur in Chapter Five.

Summary of Data Presentation

Among the superintendents participating in this study, 75.6 % stated that they have a high or very high level of job satisfaction with 54.7 % rating their satisfaction as high and 24.4% rating their satisfaction level as very high. Participants were also asked: if you had a chance to do

it all over again, would you choose to become a superintendent? Approximately 84% answered that they would still enter the superintendency.

The data collected show that the aspect of the job of superintendent participants “liked” most was having substantial input into the direction of the district and being part of the progress the district makes. This question had a mean score of 4.67 out of 5, with 95.5% rating this question as strong or very strong. This was followed by: I have an opportunity to build a team of educators. Ninety percent (mean of 4.50) rated this as strong or very strong on Sharp’s survey tool. The rest of the top five were: I have an opportunity to impact students, I always have challenges in this job and I am able to utilize my skills. The survey item liked least by the participating superintendents was: I like the high visibility of this position with 28.9% rating this as strong or very strong.

The number one motivator among superintendents surveyed was: I felt I could make a difference in education, with a mean of 4.61 and 95.6% rating this factor as a strong or very strong motivator. The second ranking motivator was the statement: the job would enable me to provide leadership to a district. This statement had a mean score of 4.44 and 93.3% rated it as a strong or very strong motivator for pursuing the position of superintendent. The third, fourth and fifth highest rated motivators were: the job would give me a broader span of influence than I had in the classroom or in a building level position, the job would allow me to move my district forward and I wanted to be all that I could be (self actualization) respectively. It is notable that there is significant drop off between the fourth and fifth motivating factors.

Superintendents surveyed indicated several factors that had the least effect on their motivation to become a superintendent. I had paid my dues was rated as the lowest motivator for

entering the superintendency with a mean score of 1.70 and 58.1 % of participants rating it as a weak motivating factor. The job would allow me to live in a certain area also rated very low as a motivating factor, with a mean score of 1.95 and 48.3 %.

CHAPTER 5

Summary of Findings

The research data collected answered the first and paramount question of this study: given the stress and pressures inherent to the position, is there still an upward trend in job satisfaction among superintendents? The study participants indicated a job satisfaction rate of high or very high at a rate of 74.6%. This finding is consistent with the concept of an increasing level of job satisfaction when combined with the findings of the 2000 New York State Council of School Superintendents Snapshot (Volp, 2004) which showed 61% and the 2006 study by the same organization showing the increase to 67 percent (Rogers, 2006). The increase in job satisfaction by approximately seven percent between 2000 and 2006 and a similar increase of 7% between 2006 and the time of this study, while not evenly incremental, does clearly illustrate the existence of an upward trend in job satisfaction among New York State superintendents in the face of increased stress and pressure.

This trend can be shown even more dramatically when comparing the same question asked by NYSCOSS in 2006 and this research: if you had the chance to do it all over again, would you become a superintendent? The 2006 Snapshot data showed 61% answered in the affirmative while the participants of this study answered 84% that they would again choose the superintendency for their career (Rogers, 2006).

These data can be translated nationally through a comparison of the American Association of School Administrators study of 2000 (Glass, 2000), which showed a job satisfaction rate of 56%. This measured by the percentage of superintendents indicating “considerable” satisfaction in their current position. The job satisfaction of the AASA study

examined with the findings of this study, 74.6 %, indicated an upward trend at both the state and national level.

The second research question sought to uncover a greater understanding of the reasons for this upward trend, or downward trend if that had been the finding, by asking: what are the aspects of the superintendency that contribute to job satisfaction levels?

The aspects that achieved the highest rating among the participants in this study were the ability to have a positive affect on teaching and learning, team building, daily challenges and the opportunity to make use of skills acquired or possessed. These findings were consistent with those of Sharp (2002) who came to similar conclusions in his study of superintendents in three mid western states. Edwards (2008) also found making a difference in the lives of students to be one of the most rewarding aspects of the superintendency, consistent with both Sharp and this research. Crane (2006) found that intrinsic factors, such as those found in this study, played a much larger role in the job satisfaction levels of school leaders than did extrinsic factors such as pay. The study found that being paid well was not comparatively significant in this research yielding only 39% among participants when asked if the financial security was a motivating factor for entering the superintendency. Furthermore, only 14% of participants in this study indicated that being paid well for the job of superintendent rated a 5 on the “like” scale when discussing positive aspects of the job.

The review of literature found a great deal of research conducted on the changes, challenges and overall negative aspects of the superintendency. Themes consistent with this research included the negative impact, or lack of positive aspect, of high visibility. This study found that the high visibility of the position was the least positive aspect among participants

surveyed. Glass, Bjork & Brunner (2000) found that the intense accountability focus has increased public scrutiny and criticism of superintendents in the United States. Johnson (1998) also stated that increased visibility was a negative aspect of the position citing this as the reason he, and others, have left the profession. The high visibility and public scrutiny was also cited by Cunningham and Brudick (1999) as a reason for the reduced pool of applicants for the position of superintendent.

The review of literature also pointed to school board relations as a possible negative aspect of the job of superintendent. In this study, 65% of participants indicated they enjoyed working with the school board and considered it a positive aspect of the position, garnering among the lowest “likeable” ratings on the positive aspects scale. In an unexpected, finding Dlugosh (1994), found that 7 % of superintendents in his study indicated that school board relations were the reason for leaving their current position. While this is an unimpressive number, it should be noted that the question was not asked by the researcher. Carver (2000), the creator of the Policy Governance Model, found that the most destructive stress for a superintendent is their relationship with the school board. The difficulty in dealing with continuous change and change in expectations of the school board was found by Patterson (2001) to be a challenge to school leader’s ability to remain focused on educational issues. Bennett (1991) also argued that school board relations are a negative aspect of the superintendency, creating a shortage of school leaders in large urban school districts. Positive relationships with the school board are seen by Cox & Malone (2001) as a necessary, positive aspect of a given superintendency.

The data analysis for the third research question, “what motivated current superintendents to pursue this position?”, showed that the number one motivating factor was they felt could make a difference in the education of young people. This was supported by the findings of the review of literature. Edwards (2008) found that the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of young people through education to be among the most satisfying aspects of the job of superintendent. Sharp (2002) surveyed 25 superintendents in the mid-western United States and also found that the number one motivating factor in becoming a superintendent was the feeling that a difference could be made in educating students.

Data collected through this study also revealed the ability to provide leadership in a school district to be the second highest rated motivating factor. Andero (2000) found that the role in making important decisions regarding the policies and curriculum in a school district to be among the most salient factors motivating school district leaders to aspire to the job of superintendent. Edwards (2008) also indicated that the ability to make important decisions regarding education in an efficient manner to be highly motivating for potential superintendents. Sharp (2002), using the same survey instrument as this study, found the ability to provide leadership in a school district to be the second highest rated survey response in his study of superintendents in Indiana, Illinois and Texas asked when asked what motivated them to enter the superintendency.

While the data analysis revealed no clear indication that there were aspects of the position of superintendent that motivated individuals to stay in the position of superintendent as asked in research question number four, some conclusions can be drawn by reviewing the overall response to the survey questions regarding motivation. The group of superintendents with ten or

more years of experience surveyed did answer overwhelmingly that feeling they could make a difference in education was the number one motivating factor for them in pursuing the superintendency. This is supported in the literature by Sharp's(2002) findings in the mid-west and through Edwards (2008) and Crane (2006) who found that the ability to make a difference in the life of a young person and other intrinsic, rather than extrinsic, factors to be the most satisfying aspects of the job of superintendent. It could be argued that the data collected for research question three of this study indicates that the factors and aspects that motivated superintendents to pursue the position are the same factors and aspects that motivate them to stay in this role for ten years or more.

Recommendations

This study found that there is an upward trend in job satisfaction among New York State superintendents. While this is counterintuitive when looking at the increased stress and accountability that has become inherent with the position of superintendent of schools, exploring the aspects that school district leaders consider the most positive of their job does provide insight and opportunity for school district boards of education, leadership training programs and superintendent search consultants to adopt policies and practices to ensure the job satisfaction and productivity of the leader continue to maintain this upward trend.

School boards should evaluate the aspects of the job of superintendent and consider the appropriateness of the duties assigned to him/her. It is possible that the aspects that rate the highest among superintendents such as having the opportunity to be involved in team building and impacting classroom instruction and providing leadership, are those that are more in line

with the actual job of district leader and less in line with the duties of the board of education or other administrative staff, such as the business manager or building level principal.

An exploration of the aspects that superintendents find least positive (or liked least) could also yield insight into the lack of understanding of the job of superintendent. A clearly written job description of the duties and responsibilities of superintendent should be adopted by every board in New York State. This description should be concise and without ambiguous language that leave school district leaders unsure of the expectations of their role.

School leader preparation programs would also benefit from considering the findings of this study to create curriculum that encompass areas considered more and less positive, adjusting to add focus on areas that are less positive such as school board relations. These areas may be evidence of a lack of training or preparation to deal with these less positive aspects.

Lastly, superintendent search consultants should consider the increasing levels of job satisfaction as related to the aspects current superintendents in New York State find most positive when conducting school leader searches, seeking to identify if school districts provide opportunities for superintendents to engage in these activities as part of their everyday duties. A thorough investigation into board – superintendent relations and the ambiguity of the superintendents role within districts could also serve to assist search consultants in their quest for the right candidates for a given district. This may ensure there are no discrepancies between the job the expectations of the candidate and the expectations of the superintendent by board of education.

Recommendations for future study

It is clear that education today has undergone revolutionary changes. The implementation of NCLB and the overall call for accountability has changed every position within education. As the literature shows, there has been a great deal of change within the superintendency. The job now has increased stress, pressure and public scrutiny that have had an impact on the people who hold this important post.

The data collected through this study provide only a surface level view of job satisfaction among school superintendents. To further investigate the findings of this study, research using a larger population and geographic area may be helpful.

Research involving other sub-sets of school leaders such as regional, suburban, urban, rural, minority, male or female could also shed greater light on job satisfaction and the existence of an upward or downward trend.

Also, the research question for this study that went unanswered should be explored in greater depth. What motivates veteran superintendents to stay in the position despite the constant changes and increased pressure and stress? A larger population of superintendents with ten years or more experience could provide a more thorough list of positive aspects that keep them in this role. This would assist the pool of potential superintendents in their decision making process regarding ascending to the highest position in a school system.

Lastly, this research touched briefly on job satisfaction among positions other than the superintendency. It would be beneficial to the field to explore the job satisfaction trends in other leadership positions as they compare to the superintendency. The most natural comparison would be to that of corporate CEO, but the positions of Mayor, City Manager or Police Chief could be included in such a study.

REFERENCES

- Andero, A. (2000). The changing role of school superintendent with regard to curriculum policy and decision making. *Education, 121*(2), 276-286.
- Ashbaugh C. R. (1976) . What is Job Satisfaction? Planning and Changing, 195-203.
- Bennett, D. (1991, April). Big city blues: Why do so few school leaders want to take on the urban superintendency? *American School Board Journal, 178*(4), 22-24.
- Caldwell and O'Reilly (1990)
- Caloss, R. (1999, December). The hidden rules of the superintendency. *School Administrator, 56*(11), 46.
- Carver, J. (2000). Toward coherent governance: The creator of the policy governance model describes a new role in which the superintendent operates like a genuine CEO. *School Administrator, 57*(3), 6-10.
- Chaddock, G. R. (1999). In U.S. education: The buck stops here. *Christian Science Monitor, 91*(41).
- Cox, E. P. & Malone, B. G. (2001). Making the right choice: What board presidents say about hiring a superintendent. *American School Board Journal, 188* (7). 40-41.
- Crane, S. L. (2006). A study in job satisfaction of Idaho public school superintendents as compared to job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunderton and Somerset counties, New Jersey. Doctoral Dissertation. Idaho State University.

- Crawson, R. (1987). The local school superintendency: A puzzling administrative role. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23, 49 – 69.
- Crompton and Wagner (1994)
- Cunningham, W., & Burdick, G. (1999, December). Empty offices. *American School Board Journal*, 186(12), 25-30.
- Dlugosh, Larry . (1994, March). Why administrators move: Factors contributing to the turnover of school administrators in Nebraska. Lincoln, NE. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED375505)
- Fusarelli, L., Cooper, B., Carella, V. (2003). Who will serve? An analysis of superintendent occupational perceptions , career satisfaction, and mobility. *Journal of School Leadership*. 13, 304 – 327.
- Gmelch, W., Gates, G. (1998). The impact of personal, professional and organizational characteristics on administrator burnout. *The journal of educational research*. 36. 146 – 159.
- Glass, T. (2000b). The shrinking applicant pool. *Education Week*, 20(10), 68, 50-51.
- Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., Brunner, C. Cryss (2000). The study of the school superintendency, 2000: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium. Arlington, Va. America Association of School Administrators.
- Harris Poll International (2004). *Teacher job Satisfaction Survey*.

- Harris, I., Winskowski, A. M., Engdahl, B.E. (2007). Types of workplace social support in the prediction of job satisfaction. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 56, 150 -156.
- Hertzberg, F. , Mauser, B. & Snyderman, B. B. (1959) . The motivation to work. NY: Wiley
- Hewlett, S., Luce, C.B. (2006). Extreme jobs: the dangerous allure of the 70 hour work week. *Harvard Business Review*. 49-59.
- Johnson, V. (1998, February). My life as CEO. *School Administrator*.
- Katz, S. (2008). Just Do It: Women Superintendents Speak to Aspiring Women. *Advancing Women in Leadership Online Journal*. Retrieved August 12, 2008 from <http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/winter2008/index.htm>
- Kennedy, M. (2001). The top ten issues impacting school administrators. *American School and University*, 23(5), 18-22.
- Kohler, S.S., & Mathieu, J.E. (1993). Individual characteristics, work perceptions, and affective reactions influences on differentiated absence criteria. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 515 – 530.
- Kowalski, T. J. (1999). *The School Superintendency: Theory, Practice and Cases*. Upper Saddle River, NJ. Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Lawler, E.E. , & Porter, L. W. (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations*, 7 (1) , 20-28.
- Liu, X. S., & Ramsey, J. (2007). Teacher's job satisfaction: Analysis of the Teacher Follow up Survey in the United States for 2000 – 2001. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, (2007), doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.010

- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office).
- New York State Education Department. (2003). *Just the facts for NY parents: The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001—An overview*. Retrieved November 20, 2004 from <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/nclb/parents/facts/eng/eng-overview.pdf>
- New York State Education Department. (2004). *New York State learning standards*. Retrieved December 12, 2004 from <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/ciai/describe.html>
- Norton, M. S., Webb, L.D., Dlugosh, L.L. & Sbouts, W. (1996). *The school superintendency: New responsibilities, new leadership*. Needham Heights, MA.
- Malone, B. G. (1999). Barriers to Entering the Superintendency. Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, Indianapolis, In.
- Patterson, J. (2001, June). Resilience in the face of adversity. *School Administrator*, 58(6), 18-21.
- Perie, M., Baker, D. (1997). Job satisfaction among America's teachers: effects of work place conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation. Washington, D.C. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington D.C.
- Ramsey, K. (1998, February). The private sector beckons: Former superintendents describe their shift from public education to corporate management and sales. *School Administrator*, 55, 41.
- Rogers, T., Cattaro, G., Fale, E., Fiore, M., Ike, R., Rice, M., Service, R., Zsellar, E. (2006). *Snapshot 2006: The 6th Triennial Study of the Superintendency in New York*. Albany, NY: New York State Council of School Superintendents.

Shaffer, R. H. (1953). Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work. *Psychological Monographs*, 14, 3-12.

Sharp, W. , Malone, B. G., James, W. (2002). The school superintendency: a three state study of the positive aspects. *Illinois Association of School Business Officials*. v 33 – 37.

Sharp W., Malone, B., James, W. (2002). What motivates someone to become a superintendent? Paper presented at the annual meeting for the mid western educational research association. Columbus OH.

Volp. R., Archambault, P., Brown, C., Cattaro, G., Fale, E., O'Connell, R., Service, R., & Terranova, M. (2004). *Snapshot V: The Fifth Triennial Study of School Superintendents in New York State*. Albany, NY: New York State Council of School Superintendents.

Young, P. (1984). An examination of job satisfaction for female and male public school superintendents. *Planning and Changing*. 15, 114 – 124.

Locke, E.A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309-306.

Locke, Edwin A. "The Nature and Cause of Job Satisfaction" *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 1976.

Roethlisberger, F.G. , & Dickson, W.J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. *Work in America, Report of a Special Task Force*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1973.

Wanous, J.P., Lawler, E.E. (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Zelenkik, A. , Christensen, C. R. , & Roethlisberger, F. J. (1958). *The motivation, productivity and satisfaction of workers*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Appendix A

What Do You Like About Being A Superintendent?

For each item below, please indicate how much you LIKE that aspect of your job. A "1" means a WEAK reason to like your job; a "5" means a very STRONG reason to like your job. Please circle a number from 1 to 5.

1. I have substantial input into the direction of the school district;
to be part of the progress we make. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I have an opportunity to build a team of educators. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I have an opportunity to impact students. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I enjoy the school culture. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I enjoy working with the Board of Education. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I enjoy the status of the job. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I get the opportunity to work with people I like. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I can make a difference in teaching and learning. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I can interact with a wide variety of people. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I am able to utilize the skills that I have. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I am able to work on a 12-month job, not a
separate summer job. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I enjoy being a CEO, making final decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I always have daily challenges in this job. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I can influence community decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I like the high visibility that this job has. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I am in control of my daily schedule. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I am paid well for this job. 1 2 3 4 5

18. Other: _____

While you may feel that several of the above items are reasons why you like your job as superintendent, please **select the top three** and put the item number (1-17) of each reason below:

19. The number one reason from the list 1-17 is number _____.

20. The second reason is number _____.

21. The third reason is number _____.

What Motivated You To Become a Superintendent In The First Place?

The second part of this survey deals with why you became a superintendent in the first place. While some reasons may be the same as those just discussed, there are some other reasons listed below, too. For each item below, circle 1-5 where "1" means that the item was a WEAK motivator for you to seek the superintendency and "5" was a very STRONG motivator for you to become a superintendent.

22. I wanted to go beyond the building administrator level. 1 2 3 4 5

23. The job would provide me financial security. 1 2 3 4 5

24. The job would allow me to help move a district forward. 1 2 3 4 5

25. The job would enable me to live in a certain area. 1 2 3 4 5

26. The job would enable me to provide leadership. 1 2 3 4 5

27. Other superintendents I knew or worked for seemed to enjoy their work. 1 2 3 4 5

28. The job would give me a broader span of influence than I had in a classroom or in a building level position. 1 2 3 4 5

29. I thought I could do a better job than I had seen done before. 1 2 3 4 5

30. The job was a logical progression in my career. 1 2 3 4 5

31. I thought I would like working with the people in the office. 1 2 3 4 5
32. I wanted to be all that I could be (self-actualization). 1 2 3 4 5
33. I thought I could make a difference. 1 2 3 4 5
34. I had "paid my dues." 1 2 3 4 5
35. Other: _____
-

Again, please look back through items 22-34 and list the **top three reasons** that motivated you to become a superintendent.

36. The number one motivator from the list (22-34) is number _____.
37. The second strongest motivator is number _____.
38. The third motivator is number _____.

38 a. Please identify the number one reason for remaining in the superintendency. _____

Demographics: Please give us the following information so that we can compare responses with different factors.

39. The number of years I have been a superintendent is _____.
40. The total number of years I have been in education is _____.
41. I am Male _____ Female _____
42. I would rate my overall job satisfaction as a superintendent as
 _____ Very Low _____ Low _____ Average _____ High _____ Very High
43. If you had it all over to do again, would you become a superintendent?
 _____ Yes _____ No
44. The number of students in my school district is: _____ under 500 _____ 500-999
 _____ 1000-2499 _____ 2500-3999 _____ 4000-6000 _____ over 6000
45. Currently, I am eligible to retire with full benefits.
 _____ Yes _____ No
46. My age is: _____ under 35 _____ 36-40 _____ 41-45 _____ 46-50

_____ 51-55 _____ 56-60 _____ 61-65 _____ over 65

47. All of my teaching experience has been in the state where I live now.

_____ Yes _____ No

48. All of my administrative experience has been in the state where I live now.

_____ Yes _____ No

49. This superintendency is my _____ (1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc.) superintendency.

APPENDIX B

Top Five Rated Aspect of the Superintendency

Rank	Question	Mean Score
1.	Having substantial input into the direction and progress of a school district	4.67
2.	Having an opportunity to build a team of educators	4.50
3.	Having an opportunity to impact student learning	4.42
4.	Having daily challenges	4.34
5.	Being able to utilize skills possessed	4.30

APPENDIX C

Research Question	Survey Question
1	42
2	1,2,3,13,10,8,9,4,12,7,5,17,14,16,6,15,11,18,19,20
3	32,25,27,23,31,29,21,28,29,26,30,24,33,34,35,36
4	22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31