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ABSTRACT

The public school superintendency in New Jersey has become a revolving door of vacancies since the state legislature removed tenure from the position in the early 1990's. Although many problems exist with the position, high stakes testing, accountability, inadequate financial resources, high stress, and the many pressure groups with special agendas, the position is no longer considered one that has high job satisfaction among those hold the position of superintendent of schools. The problem is if the job of superintendent of schools is becoming more demanding are superintendents satisfied in their present positions.

The major purpose of this study was to ascertain how satisfied superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey are in their current positions and to determine which factors, and combination of factors, are related to perceived job satisfaction in superintendents. Additionally in this study, the researcher looked at job satisfaction data from similar studies involving other New Jersey school district characteristics, a superintendent satisfaction study from South Dakota, as well as professional engineers job satisfaction who were included in the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) research.

The identification of general, intrinsic and extrinsic factors that are related to job satisfaction among superintendents is important to school boards looking for recruitment and retention strategies. The major purpose of this study was to ascertain how satisfied superintendents in two counties in New Jersey are in their current positions and to determine which factors, and combination of factors, are related to perceived job satisfaction in superintendents.

The review of the literature regarding superintendent job satisfaction revealed that superintendent satisfaction overall is good nationwide, but a concern in several states including New Jersey.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

He (the superintendent) must not lose confidence in himself, for out of confidence in himself come almost all his other powers... The world always steps aside to let a man pass who knows where he is going, but it often crushes the man who does not know whither he is bound. He must not repose too much confidence in other people. To trust subordinates and friends wisely, but not too much, is something he must learn. Sustained by the justice of this cause, and guided by an educational philosophy that gives point and direction to his administrative labors, he must not take as personal the criticisms, reverses, and even the humiliation of which he must expect and accept his full share. He must not underestimate to himself the value of his services, nor must he expect the people to appreciate fully what he is doing for them. A superintendent of schools works distinctly for the next generation, without becoming egotistical or autocratic, his own personal sense of the importance of his work must be his own greatest reward.

(Ellwood P. Cubberly, 1922)

The reality of the modern superintendency is that it is both exciting and exasperating, and school districts across New Jersey and the nation are finding it increasingly difficult to attract people to the role. While the job is fraught with external pressures, it is filled with internal possibilities. Superintendents know they can change the trajectory of children’s lives, alter the behavior of organizations, and expand the possibilities of whole communities. This creates a powerful attraction to the job. Such
ambivalence makes the superintendency an interesting subject of study. As education stands in the national spotlight, there are few roles as complex or as pivotal as that of the public school superintendent. And as we move into the future, it is inevitable that the job will continue to be one of controversy, concern, and consequence (Houston, 2001).

The Problem

The public school superintendency in New Jersey has become a revolving door of vacancies since the state legislature removed tenure from the position in the early 1990’s. Although many problems exist with the position, high stakes testing, accountability, inadequate financial resources, high stress, and the many pressure groups with special agendas, the position is no longer considered one that has high job satisfaction among those hold the position of superintendent of schools. The problem is if the job of superintendent of schools is becoming more demanding are superintendents satisfied in their present positions.

The public school superintendent has evolved for nearly two centuries from a clerk for the local schools to the most prominent educational leader in the community. The superintendent is perceived as the guardian of a sacred trust, the community’s children and promoter of a valued education for the next generation (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). The superintendency is a unique position in education. It is a job that requires dealing with daily conflictual, or potentially conflictual, situations. The role of the superintendent is very stressful (Goldstein, 1992).

The superintendency carries with it an extremely broad job description, filled with an ever-widening range of duties and responsibilities. These responsibilities have increased so much that no single person can any longer fulfill the position satisfactorily
A common perception of the school superintendency is one of an impossible job that provides little or no job security.

Expectations for superintendents are unrealistically high, and while the expectations of the job are soaring, there are fewer people who want the job (Chaddock, 1999). Reasons for the drop-off in applications include the total pressure of the job. Superintendents are expected to work actively to transform, restructure, and redefine schools, yet they hold an organizational position that is historically and traditionally committed to resisting change and maintaining stability. Consequently, superintendents are quitting, being dismissed, or retiring early because they have failed to deliver the quick educational fixes demanded of them (Sherer, 1995). Those who remain take on a determined outlook that somehow, some way, they will see their programs through and ultimately prevail.

Notwithstanding the problems and challenges facing the superintendency, however, there are positive aspects of the job. The high degree of job satisfaction that superintendents report can only be accounted for by factors, issues or challenges that are viewed as positive, not negative. The intent of this study is to investigate superintendents to determine those aspects of the job that account for job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. How superintendents react to these dimensions and how superintendents will adjust their leadership to those new challenges will determine perceived job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Hoyle, 1989).

Background of the Problem

Arguably, the study of job satisfaction may have begun with Elton Mayo’s famous Hawthorne study, conducted in the 1920’s, at the Western Electric Company,
which analyzed external variables related to job satisfaction. Researchers have used job satisfaction extensively as a tool for determining factors related to job selection, retention and productivity. In addition to Mayo's work, both Frederick Taylor and Frederick Herzberg have deep roots in this field as well. Job satisfaction remains the most common topic studied relative to work (Hopkins, 1983).

Researchers frequently include job satisfaction as one of the dimensions of effective organizational performance. Lawler and Porter (1976) asserted the presence of a low but consistent relationship between job satisfaction and effectiveness, but admitted that such a connection is highly complex. They declared intrinsic rewards (things that can only be enjoyed while at work) to a lesser extent, and extrinsic rewards (things that people take with them when they leave) as intervening variables.

The job satisfaction of school superintendents is only recently becoming an area of interest in this field of research on job satisfaction. Superintendents derive satisfaction from autonomy, achievement and service to others (Borquist, 1987; Lindstrom, 1988; Nelson, 1987; Whitsell, 1987). AASA (2000) revealed superintendents across the nation, in districts of all sizes and types, reported the superintendency to be a viable and rewarding career in public service. Past studies on New Jersey superintendents (Malanowski, 1999) addressed job satisfaction among superintendents, but only focused on urban superintendents.

The need exists to convince young administrators to aspire to higher-level administrative positions and especially the public school superintendency (Glass, 2000). The reason young professional educators are not aspiring to the superintendency may be the amount of negative literature written on the superintendency position, which may not
be an accurate representation of how those who hold the positions feel about the superintendency.

In summary, the researcher determined an investigation of job satisfaction of superintendents would be meaningful because of the lack of qualified administrators going into the position, the recent high turnover rate, and the changing work environment of superintendents.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to (a) determine the perceived job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey; (b) determine the level of general, intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction; and (c) determine the relationship of selected factors of salary, gender, and district size to job satisfaction (d) determine if there is a relationship between urban school superintendents and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey in job satisfaction (e) determine if there is a relationship between I & J Affluent school superintendents and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey in job satisfaction (f) determine if there is a relationship between South Dakota public school superintendents and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey in job satisfaction (g) determine if there is a relationship between professional engineers (from the Minneapolis and St. Paul City normative group study of the MSQ) and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey in job satisfaction.
Significance of the Study

Recruitment, selection, and retention of highly qualified public school superintendents are challenges faced by school boards across the state of New Jersey. The identification of general satisfaction, intrinsic and extrinsic factors that are related to job satisfaction among superintendents are important to school boards looking for recruitment and retention strategies.

Portrayal of the superintendency in the professional literature seems to have a focus on the negative aspects of the job. There are individuals who seek the position, individuals who derive feelings of accomplishment from the position, and individuals who, at the end of their life's work, indicate they would seek the position again if given the opportunity. Unfortunately, in a time of crisis when the applicant pool is low and the quality of the candidates is questionable, there is little in the literature that can be used as positive features to attract candidates (Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2001).

The major purpose of this study is to ascertain how satisfied superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey are in their current positions and to determine which factors, and combination of factors, are related to perceived job satisfaction in superintendents. Additionally in this study, the researcher looked at job satisfaction data from similar studies involving other New Jersey school district characteristics, a superintendent satisfaction study from South Dakota, as well as professional engineers job satisfaction who were included in the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) research.

These two counties were chosen because even though they have high socioeconomic demographics and high student achievement scores, there still seems to be
a large turnover of superintendencies in these two counties. According to the New Jersey School Boards Association, Hunterdon County had a 60% turnover in the superintendencies and Somerset County had a 50% turnover rate of change in the position. In addition, the researcher selected these two counties, because they had a broad range of district factor group (DFG) that did not include the Abbott district, which are considered the poorest 30 districts in the state. These two counties had district in all categories from DFG from B to J, which are the next level from the poorest to the wealthiest J districts.

The results of this study will be helpful to practicing superintendents in many ways. First, it will essentially answer the questions of where superintendents are the most satisfied and feel the greatest sense of satisfaction from their job. Second, it will help current and future superintendents determine what factors make them gain the most personal satisfaction and have the greatest feeling of fulfillment in their position. Third, it will help future superintendents identify the factors that will contribute to their success as a superintendent and a long and satisfying tenure. Fourth, it will assist Universities and colleges in the development of their educational leadership and superintendency programs. In addition, local school boards may use this information on job satisfaction to address change in the working conditions in their district, to attract new candidates, and provide the extrinsic incentives identified by superintendents in this study for continued employment of their chief school administrators.

Research Questions

1. What is the perceived level of job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?
2. What is the perceived level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

3. What is the perceived level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

4. What is the relationship between gender and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

5. What is the relationship between salary and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

6. What is the relationship between size of the district and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

7. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and Urban public school superintendents?

8. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and public school superintendents in affluent (I&J) districts in New Jersey?

9. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and single role superintendents in South Dakota?

10. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and professional Engineers in Minneapolis and St. Paul City?
Limitations

The following are limitations to this study:

1. The information collected in the surveys is based upon the self-perceptions of the superintendents that answered the surveys and may not be representative of superintendents who did not answer the survey.

2. The superintendents may not have answered with candor.

3. The superintendents’ level of interest in the study and their willingness to participate could have affected responses.

4. This study did not attempt to investigate job satisfaction of all superintendents in New Jersey, or a representative sample of that population.

Delimitations

The following are possible delimitations to this study:

1. This study is delimited to public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey actively employed during the 2002-2003.

2. This study is delimited to the specific factors of satisfaction, as they are included in the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Definitions of Key Terms

The following terms have precise meanings as related to this study:

1. Age of the Superintendent: Chronological age in years.

2. District Factor Group (DFG) The New Jersey Department of Education introduced the District Factor Grouping system (DFG) in 1975. This system provides a means of ranking school districts in New Jersey by their socioeconomic status (SES). The first DFG was based on data from the 1970 decennial Census. A revision was made in 1984 to take into account new data from the 1980 Census and to slightly change the theoretical model of socioeconomic status. The DFG is an index of socioeconomic status that is created using data for several "indicators" available in the decennial Census of
Population. Socioeconomic status cannot be measured directly. Rather, the literature holds that it is a function of other, measurable quantities (traditionally, the basic three are income, occupation, and education). Therefore, the DFG is a composite statistical index created using statistical procedures, a "model" of socioeconomic status, and input data for various socioeconomic traits. Seven indices were developed from the census data as follows: Percent of population with no high school diploma

1. Percent with some college
2. Occupation
3. Population density
4. Income
5. Unemployment
6. Poverty

These seven indices were utilized in a principal components analysis to produce a statistical score, which was used to rank the districts. Districts were then grouped so that each group would consist of districts having factor scores within an interval of one tenth of the distance between the highest and lowest scores (New Jersey Department of Education, http://www.state.nj.us/njded/finance/sf/dfgdesc.shtml).

3. Extrinsic Satisfaction: Satisfaction derived from factors/reinforcers in the work environment that are extraneous to the work itself (i.e., salary; Weiss, et al., 1977).

4. Intrinsic Satisfaction: Satisfaction derived from factors/reinforcers in the work environment that are inherent in the work itself (i.e., achievement; Weiss, et al., 1977).

5. Job Dissatisfaction: A present or past orientated affective state that results when educators evaluate their work roles as being negative or not enjoyable (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

6. Job Satisfaction: A present or past orientated affective state that results when educators evaluate their work roles as being positive or enjoyable (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

7. School district size: The total number of students enrolled in the school district the superintendent is employed in during the 2002-2003 school year on October 15, 2002, the date required by the New Jersey Department of Education.

8. Superintendent: The superintendent is the chief executive officer of a local public school system.
9. Years of experience: The number of years that the superintendent has served as a superintendent in a public school setting.

Outline of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of the study is organized into four chapters, references, and appendixes.

Chapter II presents a review of the related literature to job satisfaction

Chapter III presents an outline of the procedures, sample, followed by the instrument, and the method used to collect and analyze the data.

Chapter IV reports the analysis and findings of the survey of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey.

Chapter V presents a summary of the study, selected findings, conclusions and recommendations in regards to job satisfaction of the school superintendent. This study concludes with a list of references, and appendixes, which includes the survey used to collect the demographic data for the study.
Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

Job satisfaction has been a subject of interest and study for over 50 years. Most job satisfaction research has been conducted by business and industry. However, educators have developed an interest in assessing levels of satisfaction in their respective positions, be it the classroom teacher, principal, or superintendent of schools (Downs, 1979).

A review of the recent research literature reveals several studies over the past 20 years in relation to job satisfaction of school superintendents. This study focused on literature involving job satisfaction including: (1) the concept of job satisfaction, (2) theories related to job satisfaction, (3) school superintendency, (4) job satisfaction and the superintendency, (5) summary.

Theories Related to Job Satisfaction

Perhaps the most popular account of job satisfaction at present is that job satisfaction fulfills needs (Adcock, 1991). In 1943, Abraham Maslow developed his needs hierarchy with needs divided into those of the lower orders including; 1) basic physiological needs, 2) safety and security needs, 3) and social needs; and those of the higher orders including 4) esteem needs, and 5) self-actualization needs. Maslow’s theory of pre-potent needs postulates that only after lower order needs have been met can higher order needs be fulfilled.

Some organizational consequences of Maslow’s theory become
apparent when one looks at the changes in motive patterns in an affluent society like that of the United States. Extrinsic rewards such as pay, job security, and working conditions are no longer satisfactory; younger employees, especially, are demanding intrinsic rewards as well (Adcock, 1991).

No theory of job satisfaction has been studied, copied, or criticized as much as the Two Factor Theory of Frederick Herzberg. In particular, Herzberg who sees the psychological needs for individuals for achievement, recognition, responsibility, and status as the primary factors leading to job satisfaction exemplifies this study on the theory of job satisfaction. Herzberg (1959) differentiated two categories of factors involved in job satisfaction: motivators (those factors which lead to satisfaction) and hygiene factors (those that lead to dissatisfaction). The motivators correspond to Maslow’s higher order need levels and include achievement, recognition and other intrinsic interests in the work itself. The hygiene elements correspond to Maslow’s lower order need levels and include security, pay, and physical working conditions, extrinsic interests (Adcock, 1991).

Schneider and Alderfer (1973) criticized Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory citing the lack of empirical proof to support the existence of a hierarchy or even some of the needs themselves (Malanowski, 1999). Centers and Bugental’s research (1966) showed that workers in higher-level jobs appeared to have greater interest in fulfilling higher order needs. Maslow’s theory was cited as the rationale for lower level jobholders to be motivated by lower level needs (Gruneberg, 1979).

Although Maslow did not address job satisfaction specifically, those settings in education, which allow administration to satisfy each level of need, would produce job
satisfaction. On the other hand, any factors, which would not result in achieving these needs, would create an environment of job dissatisfaction (Reid, 1989).

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

Most theories of job satisfaction, including Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, are primarily weak as motivational models because they are concerned with internal states rather than with preceding conditions and consequent outcomes (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Vroom (1964) was the most outspoken of Herzberg’s critics. Vroom theorized that Herzberg’s findings could very well have been the result of the interview method and not be true indicators of satisfaction. House and Wigdor (1967) criticized Herzberg’s reliance on the biases of the interviewer and that these biases may have contaminated the data (Malinowski, 1999).
The Concept of Job Satisfaction

Thirty years ago, the study of job satisfaction was a relatively recent phenomenon (Brief, 1998). In 1976, Locke estimated the number of studies to have exceeded four thousand. Since then, thousands of studies on job satisfaction and the nature of work have been published. The study of job satisfaction began with Elton Mayo’s famous Hawthorne study, conducted in the 1920’s at the Western Electric Company. The Hawthorne study implied that satisfied workers increased productivity (Brief, 1998).

There have been considerable changes in the reasons to study job satisfaction since the Hawthorne studies. The motives for seeking the enhancement of job satisfaction have changed. It is interesting to note that the orientation of Hoppock’s *Job Satisfaction* (1935), one of the earliest job satisfaction studies, was toward improving vocational counseling (Adcock, 1991). The two-factor theory of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) hypothesized that high job satisfaction results in high job performance while Locke (1976) could find little relationship between job satisfaction and productivity.

Among the voluminous studies that examine the effects of job satisfaction, few scholars attempt its definition apart from the terms used in its measurement (Adcock, 1991). Hoppock (1935) reflects its definition through measurement by viewing job satisfaction as “any combination of physiological, psychological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person to truthfully say, “I am satisfied with my job” (p. 47). Ilgen (1971) conceives job satisfaction as resulting from the size of the difference one perceives, if any, between what he expects to receive from his work and what he believes he is receiving.
Lawler (1973) feels that job satisfaction refers to individual's affective relations to their work role and is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it is offering.

Job satisfaction remains the most common topic studied relative to work. It has been treated as both independent and dependent variables. As an independent variable, job satisfaction is seen as the cause of other phenomenon such as productivity and motivation.

Job satisfaction, as it relates to employee production and retention, has its historical roots in the work of Frederick Taylor, Frederick Herzberg, and Elton Mayo. Colquitt, Salgado, Cellar, and Barrick, among others, have done extensive work in the area of job satisfaction as it relates to personality factors, such as openness to experience, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Goffin found that personality testing was as successful as an assessment center in predicting job performance and satisfaction.

Other researchers, meanwhile, have studied the process nature of job satisfaction (Barber, 1998; Duffy, 1998, Gruenberg, 1979). Process theorists view job satisfaction as an interaction of the contextual factors of the job with the needs, values, and expectations that an individual brings to the job.

Knoop, as it related to job satisfaction, addressed commitment to the job, in 1995. Knoop examined attitudes of job satisfaction, which he defined as "...a person's general attitude toward the job and toward specific aspects of the job such as the nature of the work or relations with co-workers" (p. 379). Specifically, Knoop hypothesized that
participative decision-making was positively correlated with job satisfaction and specific aspects of it as well as commitment to the organization.

Job satisfaction literature tends to indicate that high job satisfaction is related to increased morale, decreased absenteeism and turnover, and improved employee relations. Some of the major variables that determine job satisfaction include such things as mentally challenging work, equitable rewards, good working conditions, supportive managers, and supportive colleagues (Katzell, Thompson & Guzzo, 1992).

Ducharme and Martin (2000) reported on the effects of a lack of job satisfaction to include psychological distress, anxiety, depression, powerlessness, alienation, and burnout. Stressful, unrewarding, and unpleasant working conditions, oppression, role overload, complexity, and physical discomfort all lead to decreased job satisfaction.

Finkelstein, Protolipac, and Kulas (2000) further support the positive effects of social support on job satisfaction. In their study of 111 subjects, 51 men and 60 women, findings showed that greater job satisfaction was associated with social support. Research states that activities associated such as after-work happy hour or off-the-job activities with coworkers and supervisors lead to higher job satisfaction (Peter-Schinsky, 2001).

Pollock, Whitbred, and Contractor (2000) report that certain job characteristics affect job satisfaction. Skill variety, task identity and significance, autonomy, and feedback have been shown to be related to job satisfaction. Perceptions of other variables, such as over qualification, is another factor negatively related to job satisfaction (Johnson & Johnson, 2000).
Tang, Kim, and Tang (2000) reported that attitudes toward money affect intrinsic job satisfaction. Research has shown that turnover is a concern in many positions, and one of the factors involved in the phenomenon is the individuals that are positively disposed to life in general and to money but are dissatisfied with their jobs are more likely to quit. Alternatively, those with a negative disposition in general and a negative disposition toward money are less likely to quit their jobs, regardless of job dissatisfaction perceived.

There are other considerations that lead to improved job satisfaction. For example, Holland (1985) developed what he called a personality-job fit theory that he felt underlay job satisfaction. In his theory, the better the match between the individual's personality and their job, the more likely they are to be satisfied with their jobs and the less likely they are to voluntarily leave their position.

The History of the School Superintendency

The superintendent has traditionally been the chief administrator in charge of leading a school district towards a vision. The superintendency has been a position of prestige and power and yet one that few administrators aspire to today. The latest New Jersey Monthly magazine (September 2002) rated the superintendency one of the worst 15 jobs in New Jersey. How did this once high level, moral and prestigious position become such an unpopular career path.

The position of school superintendent has existed in American public education since the mid 1800s, when many school districts in larger cities appointed an individual to be responsible for the day-to-day operations of a number of schoolhouses.
The American public school superintendency has changed a great deal since its inception in the first half of the 19th century. The original role was that of a schoolmaster, with an appointed or elected lay board of education making almost all decisions of any importance. In fact, the earliest superintendents were head teachers and clerks. By the end of the 19th century, most superintendents in the cities had shed this role of clerical supervisor of students and teachers to become master teachers and educators (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). The schools managed by these superintendents reflected the transition in the late 19th and 20th centuries from an American economy and culture dominated by rural farm concerns, to one in which manufacturing would play an increasing role in shaping society and the emerging public school systems (Glass, Bjork & Brunner, 2000).

During the post war period, superintendents were viewed as important symbols in the community, and by the 1950s and 1960s, the superintendent was seen as a business executive. Moral duties of the superintendent included being not only the community educational leader, but also the minister of community values. By the end of the 1960s, the scientific management theory had taken over and brought with it changes to the position from being one of scholar-educator to that of a businessman with the superintendent at the top of a hierarchical administration. The superintendent was expected to manage growing districts with more specialized services and curricular offerings—and do it in a cost-effective manner (Grogan, 2000).

The 1970s brought increased political conflict with previous efforts to separate public education from politics no longer in effect. During this time, members who shared similar values appointed superintendents, and when the board members changed, the
superintendent was removed as the new board took its place. By the 1980s, the position demanded corporate leadership skills and political maneuvering more than educational knowledge and skill. By this time, interest and research regarding the superintendent's role in the education system began to come to the forefront. The superintendent was viewed as a statesman, with the notion of superintendent as male prevailing (Grogan, 2000).

During the 1980s and 1990s, the policy-making pendulum swung back and forth between the superintendent and school board, reflecting the disagreement between education leaders and theoreticians about what constitutes policymaking and what constitutes management. Most researchers on the superintendency favor a model of the superintendent as chief executive officer, a model borrowed from the American private sector. In many cases, what has been viewed as policy development in the world of education is seen as management prerogative in the corporate world. American public schools systems in the 1990s were on the receiving end, many times, of the same criticism as corporate America (Glass, et al., 2000).

The 1980s era of school reform, dominated by state and federal initiatives, created a backseat role for superintendents and school boards, thus putting a damper on successful results. The emergence in 1990 of "choice" movements across the country, as well as advocacy for more control at the local level by principals, parents, teachers, and students themselves, has brought additional challenges to superintendents' authority and policymaking (Glass, et al., 2000).

The job today demands the superintendent to be a change agent who is constantly adapting to a myriad of social, economic and political conditions. In the past, the job was
primarily a managerial job. Now a different approach to leadership is needed to tackle educational and political issues simultaneously. According to officials of the American Association of School Administrators, there are no shortages of people with the proper credentials to be public school superintendents. But there is a shortage of people who want the job.

**Job Satisfaction and the Superintendency**

There are a number of research studies performed on superintendents' job satisfaction. Cochran (1976) called for increased studies of job satisfaction of school superintendents in order to attract more efficient and productive individuals to the position. Defining the factors attributing to superintendent job satisfaction and dissatisfaction would result in a future with more school superintendents, not only satisfied with their jobs, but longer tenure in the position.

Cochran's (1976) study of superintendents in California identified factors, which contributed to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The factors, which contributed to job satisfaction, were relationships with staff, seeing results and progress within the school district, community relations, school committee relations, and intrinsic feeling of doing a good job. The strongest factors resulting in dissatisfaction were teacher collective bargaining and contract negotiations, financial problems, legislative restrictions, school board conflict, and community pressure.

Reisler (1977) studied 30 superintendents in three New England states to determine the effects of work on the personal life of the superintendent. He concluded that a large majority of superintendents are satisfied with their jobs, but expressed dissatisfaction with the way the job drained them of energy needed for health and non-
got for doing a good job, the pay and the amount of work they do, and the chances for advancement. Superintendents were satisfied with the chance to do things for others, the chance to do different things from time to time, and the chance to do something that makes use of their abilities. Age, district size and full-time equivalency appeared to have an insignificant relationship to superintendent job satisfaction.

Adcock (1991) studied 326 superintendents to determine the important factors that contributed to the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of superintendents in Arkansas. He concluded that variables of education, longevity in position, size of district, number of superintendencies held and type of school district don’t have significant variance on choice of job satisfiers among superintendents. Age was the only variable showing significance variance. In addition, significant differences were found in the satisfaction factors Moral Values, recognition, and technical when the factors were compared by the age of the responding superintendent.

Malanowski (1999) studied 63 urban superintendents in New Jersey to determine their perceived levels of job satisfaction utilizing the MSQ. The urban superintendents reported degrees of satisfaction from satisfied to very satisfied with all aspects of their job except tenure. All intrinsic factors of social service, ability utilization, variety, responsibility, creativity, achievement, and social status were rated in the very satisfied range of the questionnaire.

Isenberg (2004) studied 55 superintendents in Affluent (DFG I & J) districts in New Jersey to determine perceived levels of job satisfaction utilizing the short form of the MSQ. The affluent district superintendents reported high degrees of general, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction. Isenberg also addressed the issues of gender;
school size and school structure and found no statistical significance between job satisfaction and these items. In addition, Isenberg compared her research data to Malanowski (1999) and found a statistical significance in general job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction between affluent district (DFG I & J) superintendents and urban superintendents, but no difference in extrinsic job satisfaction. Isenberg also compared her data to professional engineers in Minneapolis and St. Paul (Normative Data in the MSQ) and found no statistical difference between the two groups in general, intrinsic, or extrinsic job satisfaction. The research by Isenberg provides a great basis for a comparison study to other studies utilizing the MSQ and other districts in New Jersey.

Palleria (2000) studied 141 school district superintendents in South Dakota, during the 1997-98 school year, to determine their perceived levels of job satisfaction, utilizing the short form of the MSQ. Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota scored the completed instruments. The single role superintendents reported degrees of very satisfied general job satisfaction. The areas of greatest general job satisfaction of superintendents were the chance to do things for other people and being able to keep busy all the time. The South Dakota superintendents were more satisfied with intrinsic areas of their jobs than with extrinsic areas of their jobs. The research also revealed that like in AASA (2000) study, many superintendents were retiring and many were leaving South Dakota to take positions in neighboring states that pay higher salaries.

Data Validity

As part of validating this study and its perceived responses from superintendents, the researcher consulted additional sources to determine the validity of the data using
purposive sampling. This research method was utilized to obtain similar perceptions from different investigators of the same phenomenon. In this study, the researcher looked at job satisfaction data from similar studies involving other New Jersey school district characteristics, a superintendent satisfaction study from South Dakota, as well as professional engineers job satisfaction who were included in the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire research.

This research concept applies to any means that provides additional data to reinforce a finding where the new data are independent of the original set. Further, since the data are subject to various errors, the researcher utilized this to build on the strengths of the study and minimize the weaknesses of the others. Although this method is intended to provide support for a finding, as Mathison (1988) suggests, the result is often inconsistency or contradiction (Krathwohl, 1998). As in the discussion in the AASA ten-year study, the search for an explanation of the inconsistencies frequently lead to new insights.

Each data source was used equally to obtain a complete picture of public school superintendent’s job satisfaction on a professional level in both a state and national level. Each series of data from the studies provided information from one perspective. By combining them, the researcher looked to complete a picture of job satisfaction that may not have been clear and/or an accurate complete representation of superintendent job satisfaction from various areas of one state and even a national perspective.

Gender and the Superintendency

In the first half of the 20th century, women were underrepresented in the superintendency. While Glass (1992) and others found that only about six percent of
superintendents were women in 1991, by 1999 in their stratified random sample, the percentage of female superintendents had risen to 12.2 percent, perhaps because they skewed the sample toward larger districts (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000). The male dominance of the public school superintendency is particularly striking because women comprised 70 percent of all teachers, the group from which school administrators were typically drawn (Chase & Bell, 1994).

Glass (2000) reported that the notion women were discouraged (true or not) that an “old boy” network exists, guaranteeing men preference for the good districts. Many women do not think they will have an equal chance for an attractive superintendency when a male-owned search firm (a substantial number of partners in superintendents-search firms are male former superintendents) is conducting the search (Glass, 2000). Power is a central issue in the superintendency. As a society, we tend not to see women as powerful, and no one wants a powerless leader.

Male public school teachers in the United States are 40 times more likely to advance to the superintendency from teaching than are female teachers. Nationally, men hold about 90 percent of all superintendent jobs, yet women comprise about 75 percent of the school system workforce, figures that have changed relatively little over the past 50 years (AASA, 2000).

While the majority of superintendents are White males, gender and race gaps are slowly shrinking. In 1988, four percent of superintendents were female. By 1993, women superintendents comprised 7 percent of the total, and have risen to 12 percent today. Women superintendents are more likely to be found in suburban and urban areas rather than in rural school districts (AASA, 2000).
In a 2002 edition of Women Enews, the findings revealed that the glass ceiling keeping women from rising to the superintendent’s office is not about qualifications or interest. Today, women account for 52 percent of the people seeking advanced degrees in education administration in the United States. In addition, women hold more than half of the administrative positions in school districts’ central offices, the traditional arena from which superintendents are drawn.

Some of the AASA finding conclude that the two most widely cited reasons for the paucity of women in the superintendency are that women are discouraged from preparing for the superintendency and school boards will not hire them. Most of what exists on the subject consists of case studies that describe the individual experiences of women superintendents (AASA, 2000, p. 77-89).

Most data indicate that school boards, while claiming keen interest in the instructional program, see the management of fiscal resources to be a critical component of the superintendency. The AASA study showed that boards place a high degree of emphasis on budget and financial decisions by using skills and experiences in those areas as key hiring criteria. Yet, in that same study, nearly 82 percent of women superintendents indicated that school board members do not see them as strong managers and 76 percent felt school boards did not view them as capable of handling district finances. Nevertheless, most school boards still contain a majority of men, according to the last two 10-year studies by AASA. Women superintendents perceive some restrictive forces working against them being hired by boards (AASA, 2000, p. 77-89).
The 2000 Study of the American School Superintendency

The 2000 Study of the American School Superintendency follows similar reports issued each decade beginning in 1923, under the auspices of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. The data collection for the 2000 study was conducted through a survey mailed in 1999 to approximately 12,000 practicing superintendents across the nation. Interestingly, 1950 and 1992 Ten-Year Studies found that women superintendents constituted about 6 percent of the total superintendent group. The 2000 study, with 13.1 percent, finds significant difference (AASA, 2000).

The superintendency often is perceived as a position with rapid turnover and mobility. This study would suggest otherwise, since most of the superintendents indicate that they have spent half of their careers in only one district. The study revealed that about one-fourth have had two superintendencies, and about 11 percent had held three, with an average of 8.75 years in a single district compared to the 1992 study in which the average length of tenure was 6.47 years. In 2000, with superintendents serving on the average of 1.75 districts in 8.75 years average time in the superintendency, an approximate tenure of 5 years was estimated. Mobility in the superintendency is not substantial, and the only unusual statistic generated by the 2000 study is that a large number of superintendents are in their first three-year contract in their current districts (AASA, 2000).

Although superintendents face serious challenges, both from inside and outside their districts, they indicate that they gain a great deal of satisfaction from their jobs. Fifty-six percent of the superintendents surveyed felt a “considerable” fulfillment in their current position. This is down five percentage points from 1992. Thirty-four percent feel
moderate fulfillment or satisfaction in the superintendency. The 2000 study indicates that superintendents are receiving fulfillment from their jobs; their boards value them highly, and feel they are getting important tasks accomplished in their districts. The 2000 study data reveals that the superintendents nationally are satisfied with their jobs and the profession is not at risk (AASA, 2000).

When superintendents do leave their jobs, the most common reason is an opportunity in a larger and better paying district. Only 14 percent said they left because of conflict with their school boards. However, print and electronic media stories often portray boards and superintendents at odds with one another. This view was not supported by the data collected in the 2000 Study. What the study did reveal is that boards overwhelmingly support their superintendent, yet superintendents (30 percent) found board members "not qualified" to carry out their duties. In summary, superintendents give their boards significantly lower grades on job performance than superintendents receive from their own school boards (AASA, 2000).

Other reasons superintendents give for leaving one district for another are moving to larger districts and better-financed ones. A move to a larger district usually represents an increase in salary and benefits. Often, superintendents believe they have accomplished their goals in a district, and then seek the challenge of a new job situation in a larger district. Again, less than 15 percent indicate that they left their position because of a conflict with school boards, which was also less than the 1992 study. Board elections also accounted for about 10 percent of superintendents moving on to a new district. The 2000 data in this table do not suggest that superintendents are constantly being terminated or being asked to move on by their boards (AASA, 2000).
Measurements of Job Satisfaction

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulling in 1969 is the most utilized and researched measure of job satisfaction (Muchinsky, 1990). The JDI measures five facets of job satisfaction: work itself, supervision, pay, promotions and satisfaction with co-workers. Each facet is measured using words or short phrases to determine if the word or phrase matches the respondent's assessment of the job satisfaction of that facet. The developers of the JDI counter this charge by indicating that the main objective and accomplishment of the JDI is in measuring the satisfaction of the individual facets and not in measuring overall job satisfaction (Adcock, 1991).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Loquist (1967) to measure an individual's satisfaction with 20 different aspects of the work environment and is the second most popular measure of job satisfaction. The MSQ is based on the following rationale: a) employees have a set of expectations concerning their work environments that are derived from their histories, individual abilities, and interests; 2) employees have a set of work attitudes that emerge from the fulfillment of those expectations; c) these attitudes make up an employees' valuation of their work environment or job satisfaction.

The items on the MSQ are responded to using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (VS) very satisfied, through (S) satisfied, (N) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, (D) dissatisfied, and ending in (VD) very dissatisfied. Numerical ratings for the responses can be obtained by using values ranging from five points for "very satisfied" to one point for "very dissatisfied." A response scale such as "very satisfied," "satisfied," "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied," "dissatisfied," and "very dissatisfied" is clearly ordinal. We
often assign the values 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to these responses and compute averages; that is, we
treat them as though the attribute were being measured on an interval scale. “We have no
evidence that the distance from “very satisfied” to “very dissatisfied” equals that from the
others. Since, however, the data yield useful generalizations when interpreted that way,
we assume the underlying concept to be acceptable. Because it works, we use it.”

The short form of the MSQ contains 20 questions and usually takes 10 minutes to
complete. It measures intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and overall
satisfaction. The third most common job satisfaction measure is the Faces Scale
developed by Kunin (1955). This single item scale measures only global satisfaction. It
uses a Likert scale, which, as opposed to using words or phrases, uses scale points
consisting of drawings of a human face. The Faces scale is considered to be a good
measure of overall satisfaction and is widely applicable; especially to blue collar or other
related semi-illiterate groups (Muchinsky, 1990).

Summary

In summary, from a review of the literature, it is clear that there are a number of
contributing factors that lead superintendents to a level of job satisfaction. Some of these
satisfying job factors from the literature include the social service, social status, service to
others, longevity, advancement, and interpersonal relationships with the board.
Dissatisfiers from the literature include salary, tenure, lack of recognition, and negative
relations with boards. The role of other variables in the levels of job satisfaction has not
been addressed in recent studies such as demographics, financial resources and
compensation.
Data concerning superintendent turnover and job satisfaction supports tentative conclusions that superintendent turnover is greater and general satisfaction is less in smaller districts. The community profile and discrepancies in superintendent/board attitudes could contribute to high turnover and dissatisfaction. Finally, the literature suggests that educators attracted to the superintendency possess the personal and professional characteristics that contribute to job satisfaction.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceived levels of job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey in 2002-2003. Furthermore, this study examined the relationship of salary, gender, and district size to superintendent’s general job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction.

Population

The population of this study was comprised of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties serving in the state of New Jersey in the 2002-2003 school year. The total number of superintendents was 51. The source of the sample was a list of all New Jersey school districts by DFG on the New Jersey Department of Education website. In addition, the Hunterdon and Somerset County Offices of Education provided names and addresses for the superintendents to validate the list.

Procedure

The researcher mailed every public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey an envelope containing a cover letter explaining the study, a numbered questionnaire, a numbered demographic survey, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

The cover letter (see Appendix A) was designed to seek voluntary cooperation from the superintendents. It contained the purpose and nature of the study, identifying the university the researcher is associated with and provided instructions for the
successful completion and return of the requested information on the MSQ (see Appendix D). Further, the cover letter indicated that all responses would be kept confidential and that no superintendent would be identified in the study.

The demographic survey (see Appendix B) sought data about respondents' gender, age, salary, years of experience, and size of their school district. At the bottom of the demographic survey was a box for the respondents to check if they wish to have a copy of the study.

After a two-week period, a follow-up mailing was sent to those superintendents who did not respond to the initial mailing.

Approval of this study was granted by the Seton Hall Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct this study (see Appendix E).

Instrumentation

Several instruments, which measure job satisfaction, were investigated. In other research, particularly Malanowski (1999) investigated job satisfaction of urban superintendents in the state of New Jersey utilizing the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The researcher selected the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form to be utilized for this study to measure superintendents' overall job satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction; and extrinsic satisfaction because the MSQ has been utilized more frequently than other instrument over the last thirty years (Malanowski, 1999).

Approval to use the revised version of the MSQ was obtained from the University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology, and Vocational Psychology Research.
The MSQ is a paper-and-pencil inventory and is gender neutral. It requires approximately ten minutes to complete. The 20 items, which are used to measure intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and general job satisfaction, are as follows:

1. **Ability utilization:** The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.

2. **Achievement:** The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

3. **Activity:** Being able to keep busy.

4. **Advancement:** The chance for advancement on this job.

5. **Compensation:** My pay and the amount of work I do.

6. **Co-workers:** The way my co-workers get along with each other.

7. **Creativity:** The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.

8. **Independence:** The chance to work alone on the job.

9. **Moral values:** Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.

10. **Social service:** The chance to do things for other people.

11. **Social status:** The chance to be somebody in the community.

12. **Working conditions:** The working conditions.

**Extrinsic Satisfaction**

1. **Authority:** The chance to tell other people what to do.

2. **Company policies and practices:** The way company policy and practices are put into practice.

3. **Recognition:** The praise I get for doing a good job.
4. **Responsibility:** The freedom to use my own judgment.

5. **Security:** The way my job provides for steady employment.

6. **Variety:** The chance to do different things from time to time.

**General Satisfaction**

1. **Supervision-human relations:** The way my boss handles his/her employees.

2. **Supervision-technical:** The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.

3. The addition of all items from the intrinsic and extrinsic scales listed above.

These 20 job satisfaction questions have been included in numerous other studies of job satisfaction in education. Among these were the Brown (1978), Whitsell (1987) and Malinowski (1999) studies with superintendents; the Priskett (1988), Schnet (1976), Smith (1976), Hull (1974), Weiss (1968) studies with principals; and the Schaefer (1982), Parker (1974) and Bledsoe & Hayward (1981) studies with teachers.

The MSQ short form provides three sub-scores: (1) general job satisfaction (2) extrinsic job satisfaction, and (3) Intrinsic job satisfaction. The general satisfaction sub-score is a measure of the work and the environment based on the intrinsic items, extrinsic items and two general items (Weiss, et al., 1977). The intrinsic sub-score is a measure of job satisfaction with the work itself. The extrinsic sub-score is a measure of job satisfaction with the work environment.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Responses to the MSQ items were analyzed in order to determine item scores, a general satisfaction score, an intrinsic satisfaction score and an extrinsic satisfaction
score. Responses to the individual questions will range from a high of 5 to a low of 1. Mean scores and standard deviations were compiled. The data was analyzed using T-Tests to determine the relationship of gender, salary, and district size to general satisfaction, to intrinsic satisfaction and to extrinsic satisfaction. Pearson Correlation coefficients were utilized to determine the relationship between salary, gender, and district size, and general job satisfaction. In addition, T-tests were utilized to determine if there exists a statistically significant difference in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and Urban public school superintendents, public school superintendents in affluent (I&J) districts in New Jersey, single role superintendents in South Dakota, and professional Engineers that are from the normative data set for the short-form in the MSQ.

SUMMARY

This study investigated job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and the relationship of salary, gender, and district size to job satisfaction, as well as other state and national research data collected on the same subject. In addition, the data was collected from public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey during the 2002-2003 school year utilizing the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics including T-tests and Pearson correlation coefficients.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Chapter 4 represents findings from the analysis of the data obtained from this study. The following is a description of the demographic characteristics of the participants in this study. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to answer each of the research questions. The chapter begins with a presentation of the descriptive statistics on the demographic variables and proceeds to the scales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and an analysis of each research question. All results are presented in tabular and narrative form.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Somerset and Hunterdon County New Jersey public school districts and the following variables: salary, structure of the district, size of the district, age, and the gender of the superintendent.

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

2. What is the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

3. What is the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

4. What is the relationship between gender and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?
5. What is the relationship between salary and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

6. What is the relationship between size of the district and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

7. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and Urban public school superintendents?

8. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and public school superintendents in affluent (I&J) districts in New Jersey?

9. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and single role superintendents in South Dakota?

10. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and professional Engineers in Minneapolis and St. Paul City?

District Structure, Demographics and the MSQ

A total of 50 superintendents from Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey were surveyed. Responses were received from 31 for a 62% response rate. One respondent did not complete and return the demographic characteristic survey.

Respondents completed a demographic characteristic survey that included data on the respondent's gender, age, tenure, education level, salary, number of students in their
district, structure of their district, and type of district in which they are employed. Frequency distributions are presented on these variables.

**Age**

Thirty public school superintendents were participants in this study, of which 20 (66.7%) were males and 10 (33.3%) were females. A frequency distribution on their age is presented in Table 1. The respondent's ages ranged from a low range of 36-45 years old (n=1, 3.3%) to a high range of greater than 65 years old (n=2, 6.7%).

**Table 1**

*Distribution by Age of Public School Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenure Status**

Table 2 presents a frequency distribution on tenure status. Only 1 respondent (3.3%) had tenure and 29 respondents (96.7%) did not have tenure status.
Table 2

Distribution by Tenure Status of Public School Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Education Level

A frequency distribution on the respondent’s education level is presented in Table 3.

The respondents represent a highly educated professional group, with 10 (33.3%) having Master’s degrees and more than two-thirds of the superintendents, 20 (66.7%) having attained doctoral degrees.

Table 3

Distribution by Education Level of Public School Superintendent’s in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salary

A frequency distribution on the respondent’s salary is presented in Table 4.

Salary compensation as a public school superintendent in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey ranged from less than $90,000 (n=1, 3.3%) to greater than $146,000 (n=11, 36.7%). While there is a considerable range in regards to salary compensation for superintendents in these two counties, the respondents clustered in two ranges which make up for more than one-half of the respondents, with 30 %, (n=9) of the superintendents falling within the $113,000-$123,000 range and a larger percentage 36.7%, (n=11) of the superintendents falling within the greater than $146,000 range.

Table 4

Distribution by Salary Compensation of Public School Superintendent's in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$90,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$91,000-$101,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$102,000-$112,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$113,000-$123,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$124,000-$134,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$135,000-$145,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$146,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Size of District

A frequency distribution on size of the district in which the public school superintendents are employed is presented in Table 5. District size ranged from less than 1000 students to greater than 2000 students. While some respondents are employed in large districts, most (53.3%) work in districts of less than 1000 students.

Table 5

*Distribution by District Size of Public School Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure of District

A frequency distribution on the structure of the district in which the public school superintendents are employed is presented in Table 6. District structure ranged from K-6 (3.3%) to K-12 (23.3%). While there are many variations in which public schools structure their districts; most of the respondents were employed in pre-K-8 school structures (n=16, 53.3%).
Table 6

Distribution by School Structure of Public School Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Jersey has approximately 610 school districts that are structured individually by each school district by grade level. The school structure/grade configuration is not consistent among school districts and is different for each individual school district.

Type of District

A frequency distribution on the type of district in which the superintendents are employed is presented in Table 7. Type of district was representative of the two counties represented in the study, in which 73% of the respondents work in suburban types of districts.
Table 7

*Distribution by Type of District of Public School Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Urban-having characteristics of a city as distinguished from the country.*
*Suburban-a residential district, on or near the outskirts of a city.*
*Rural-of or characteristics of the country or having to do with farming.*

**Job Satisfaction Data from the Short Form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire**

The short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) contained a total of 20 questions with superintendents responding on a five-point Likert-type scale. A score of 1 meant **Very Dissatisfied** (I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job), 2 meant **Dissatisfied** (I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job), 3 meant **Not** (I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job), 4 meant **Satisfied** (I am satisfied with this aspect of my job), and 5 meant **Very Satisfied** (I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job).

Data from the respondents on the MSQ were examined to determine a general job satisfaction score, an intrinsic score, and extrinsic score.
General Job Satisfaction

The frequency distribution in Table 8 for general job satisfaction indicates that scores ranged from a low of 57 to a high of 100. In this section there were 20 questions and a possible score ranging from 20 to 100. The mean general job satisfaction score was 82.45 with a standard deviation of 10.59.

Table 8

Distribution of Perceived General Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*31 superintendents respondent to the MSQ, while one superintendent did not complete the demographic survey (n=30).
Intrinsic Satisfaction

The frequency distribution (Table 9) on intrinsic satisfaction indicates that scores ranged from a low of 40 to a high score of 60. This scale consisted of 12 questions with a possible range from 12 to 60. The mean for intrinsic satisfaction was 51.48 with a standard deviation of 5.40.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*31 superintendents respondent to the MSQ, while one superintendent did not complete the demographic survey (n=30).
Extrinsic Satisfaction

The distribution of extrinsic satisfaction scores (Table 10) ranged from a low of 10 to a high of 30. This scale consisted of 6 questions with a possible range from 6 to 30. The mean for intrinsic satisfaction was 22.80 with a standard deviation of 4.92.

Table 10

_Distribution of Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extrinsic Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*31 superintendents respondent to the MSQ, while one superintendent did not complete the demographic survey (n=30).
Research Questions

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

Each of the respondents in the study was asked to indicate a level of satisfaction on 20 items relating to general job satisfaction. Responses were indicated on a five-point scale ranging from a low of very dissatisfied to a high of very satisfied. A mean general job satisfaction score of 82.45 was calculated out of a range of 20 to 100, which concludes that the respondent’s scores fell toward the higher end of the range. By reducing the mean score to the five-point scale on which the questions were rated, an overall mean of 4.12 was found which indicates a satisfaction level (“I am satisfied with these aspects of my job”).

The areas of highest general job satisfaction expressed by the 31 superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey were the following: Item (16) Chance to try my own methods of doing job (M=4.61) and Item (9) Chance to do things for other people (M=4.58) and Item (11) Chance to do something that makes use of my abilities (M=4.58). The areas of least satisfaction expressed by the 31 superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey were the following: Item (6) Competence of my supervisor in making decisions (M=3.58) and Item (10) Chance to tell people what to do (M=3.58). As a result of these findings, we can conclude that general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey is positive.

The mean scores in each of the 20 items related to general job satisfaction are illustrated in Table 11.
Table 11

*Perceived General Job Satisfaction Reported by Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chance to be “somebody” in the community</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Able to do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chance to do things for other people</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Chance for advancement on this job</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Chance to try my own methods of doing job</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Working conditions</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Praise for doing a good job</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feeling of accomplishment from my job</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

Each of the respondents in the study was asked to indicate a level of satisfaction on 12 items relating to intrinsic job satisfaction. Responses were indicated on a five-point scale ranging from a low of *very dissatisfied* to a high of *very satisfied*. A mean intrinsic satisfaction score of 51.48 was calculated out of a range of 12 to 60, which concludes that the respondent’s scores fell toward the higher end of the range. By
reducing the mean score to the five-point scale on which the questions were rated, an overall mean of 4.29 was found which indicates a satisfaction level ("I am satisfied with these aspects of my job"). The areas of greatest intrinsic job satisfaction expressed by the 31 superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey were the following: (Item 16) Chance to try my own methods of doing job (M=4.61) and Item (9) Chance to do things for other people (M=4.58) and Item (11) Chance to do something that makes use of my abilities (M=4.58). The areas of least satisfaction expressed by the 31 superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey were the following: Item (2) Chance to work alone on the job (M=3.94) and Item (10) Chance to tell people what to do (M=3.58).

As a result of these findings, we can conclude that intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey is high. The mean scores in each of the 12 items related to intrinsic job satisfaction are illustrated in Table 12.
Table 12

Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Reported by Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chance to be “somebody” in the community</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Able to do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chance to do things for other people</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Chance to try my own methods of doing job</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feeling of accomplishment from my job</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

Each of the respondents in the study was asked to indicate a level of satisfaction on six items relating to extrinsic job satisfaction. Responses were indicated on a five-point scale ranging from a low of very dissatisfied to a high of very satisfied. A mean extrinsic satisfaction score of 22.80 was calculated out of a range of 6 to 30, which concludes that the respondent’s scores fell toward the higher end of the range. By reducing the mean score to the five-point scale on which the questions were rated, an overall mean of 3.80 was found which indicates an N level (“I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not with these aspects of my job”). The areas of greatest extrinsic job satisfaction expressed by the 31 superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in
New Jersey were the following: Item (12) Way company policies are put into practice (M=4.13) and Item (14) Chances for advancement on this job (M=3.94). The areas of least satisfaction expressed by the 31 superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey were the following: Item (6) Competence of my supervisor in making decisions (M=3.58), Item (5) Way my boss handles his/her workers (M=3.68) and Item (19) Praise for doing a good job (M=3.68).

As a result of these findings, we can conclude that extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey is uncertain. The mean scores in each of the 6 items related to extrinsic job satisfaction are illustrated in Table 13.

Table 13

*Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Reported by Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Chance for advancement on this job</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Praise for doing a good job</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What is the relationship between gender and general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

Pearson Correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationship between gender and general job satisfaction. The results indicate that a significant relationship exists between gender and general job satisfaction ($r = -0.38$, $p = 0.03$). As a result of these findings we can conclude that job satisfaction was negatively related to gender. A low correlation exists between gender and general job satisfaction. Since females reported a mean general satisfaction score of 76.50 with a standard deviation of 10.77, and males reported a mean general satisfaction score of 85.15, with a standard deviation of 9.72, we can conclude that a negative relationship exists between females and general job satisfaction.

5. What is the relationship between salary and general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

Pearson Correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationship between salary and general job satisfaction. The results indicate that no significant relationship exists between a superintendent's salary and general job satisfaction ($r = -0.25$, $p = 0.18$). As a result of these findings we can conclude that job satisfaction was not related to a superintendent's salary.

6. What is the relationship between size of the district and general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?
Pearson Correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationship between the size of the district and general job satisfaction. The results indicate that no significant relationship exists between a district's size and general job satisfaction ($r = .27$, $p = .14$). As a result of these findings we can conclude that job satisfaction was not related to the size of the district.

7. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and Urban public school superintendents?

The mean score for the 20 items of general job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 82.45 and the mean score for urban public school superintendents in New Jersey was 70.51. An independent sample $t$ test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendents. A $t$ value of ($t=6.274$) was obtained which indicates that there exists a statistically significant difference ($p=.000$) between the two groups in general job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 14.

Table 14

* Differences in the Perceived General Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Urban Districts in New Jersey *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Districts in NJ</td>
<td>70.51</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean score for the 12 items of intrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendants in New Jersey was 51.48 and the mean score for urban public school superintendants in New Jersey was 49.92. An independent sample \( t \) test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendants. A \( t \) value of \( (t=1.612) \) was obtained which indicates that no statistically significant difference \( (p=.118) \) exists between the two groups in intrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 15.

Table 15

*Differences in the Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendants in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Urban Districts in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendants</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( t )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Districts in NJ</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for the 6 items of extrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendants in New Jersey was 22.80 and the mean score for urban public school superintendants in New Jersey was 20.59. An independent sample \( t \) test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendants. A \( t \) value of \( (t=2.504) \) was obtained which indicates that there exists a statistically significant difference \( (p=.018) \) between the two groups in extrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 16.
Table 16

*Differences in the Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Urban Districts in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Districts in NJ</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and public school superintendents in affluent (I&J) districts in New Jersey?

The mean score for the 20 items of general job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 82.45 and the mean score for affluent (I&J) public school superintendents in New Jersey was 78.58. An independent sample $t$ test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendents. A $t$ value of $(t=2.034)$ was obtained which indicates that no statistically significant difference $(p=.051)$ exists between the two groups in general job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 17.
Table 17

*Differences in the Perceived General Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Affluent I & J Districts in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent (I&amp;J) districts in NJ</td>
<td>78.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for the 12 items of intrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 51.48 and the mean score for affluent (I&J) public school superintendents in New Jersey was 57.13. An independent sample t test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendents. A t value of (t= -5.818) was obtained which indicates that there exists a statistically significant difference (p = .000) between the two groups in intrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 18.

Table 18

*Differences in the Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Affluent I & J Districts in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent (I&amp;J) districts in NJ</td>
<td>57.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-5.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean score for the six items of extrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 22.80 and the mean score for Affluent (I&J) public school superintendents in New Jersey was 21.45. An independent sample t-test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendents. A t-value of (t=1.532) was obtained which indicates that no statistically significant difference exists (p=.136) between the two groups in extrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 19.

**Table 19**

*Differences in the Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Affluent I & J Districts in New Jersey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent (I&amp;J) districts in NJ</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and single role superintendents in South Dakota?

The mean score for the 20 items of general job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 82.45 and the mean score for single role superintendents in South Dakota was 81.00. An independent sample t-test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two
groups of superintendents. A $t$ value of ($t$ = 763) was obtained which indicates that no statistically significant difference ($p$ = .452) exists between the two groups in general job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 20.

Table 20

*Differences in the Perceived General Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Single Role Superintendents in South Dakota*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Role Superintendents in South Dakota</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for the 12 items of intrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 51.48 and the mean score for single role superintendents in South Dakota was 51.12. An independent sample $t$ test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendents. A $t$ value of ($t$ = .375) was obtained which indicates that no statistically significant difference ($p$ = .710) exists between the two groups in intrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 21.
Table 21

_Differences in the Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Single Role Superintendents in South Dakota_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Role Superintendents in South Dakota</td>
<td>51.12</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for the 6 items of extrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 22.80 and the mean score for single role superintendents in South Dakota was 21.72. An independent sample t test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups of superintendents. A t value of (t=1.227) was obtained which indicates that no statistically significant difference (p=.229) exists between the two groups in extrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 22.

Table 22

_Differences in the Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Single Role Superintendents in South Dakota_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Role Superintendents in South Dakota</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and professional Engineers in St. Paul and Minneapolis?

The mean score for the 20 items of general job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 82.45 and the mean score for professional Engineers was 77.88. An independent sample t test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups. A t value of (t=2.402) was obtained which indicates that there exists a statistically significant difference (p=.023) between the two groups in general job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are illustrated in Table 23.

Table 23

*Differences in the Perceived General Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Professional Engineers in St. Paul and Minneapolis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Engineers</td>
<td>77.88</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>2.402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for the 12 items of intrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 51.48 and the mean score for professional Engineers was 48.53. An independent sample t test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups. A t value of
(t=3.044) was obtained which indicates that there exists a statistically significant
difference (p=.005) between the two groups in intrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this
analysis are illustrated in Table 24.

Table 24

Differences in the Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon
and Somerset Counties and Professional Engineers in St. Paul and Minneapolis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Engineers</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>3.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for the 6 items of extrinsic job satisfaction for Hunterdon and
Somerset County public school superintendents in New Jersey was 22.80 and the mean
score for professional Engineers was 21.32. An independent sample t test was calculated
to determine if a significant difference existed between the two. A t value of (t=1.679)
was obtained which indicates that no statistically significant difference exists (p=.104)
between the two groups in extrinsic job satisfaction. Results of this analysis are
illustrated in Table 25.
Table 25

*Differences in the Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties and Professional Engineers in St. Paul and Minneapolis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon/Somerset County, NJ</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Engineers'</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey public school districts and the following variables: salary, structure of the district, size of the district, age, and the gender of the superintendent.

To address the questions, a short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was given to 50 public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey. Thirty-one responses were received and used in the analysis representing a 62% return (one respondent did not return the demographic survey). The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Independent sample t tests were used to determine the differences in means between Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents and urban superintendents in New Jersey, Affluent (DFG I & J) district superintendents in New Jersey, Single Role South Dakota superintendents, and professional Engineers in St. Paul and Minneapolis. In addition to the questions involving job satisfaction, demographic data including gender, salary, and
size of the district were also included in the study. Results indicate superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey felt positive in regards to those aspects measured in job satisfaction.

Chapter five includes a summary of this study, conclusions drawn from the study, recommendations made as a result of this study, and recommendations for future studies that were encouraged by this study.

Table 26

*Summary of Means for Job Satisfaction on the MSQ for Superintendents in Urban, Affluent (I&J) Districts in New Jersey, South Dakota Superintendents, and Professional Engineers Compared to Hunterdon and Somerset County Superintendents in New Jersey.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon &amp; Somerset County Superintendents in New Jersey</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Superintendents</td>
<td>70.51*</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>20.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluent (I&amp;J) Superintendents</td>
<td>78.58</td>
<td>57.13*</td>
<td>21.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Superintendents</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>51.12</td>
<td>21.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Engineers</td>
<td>77.88*</td>
<td>48.53*</td>
<td>21.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistical significance, p < .05*
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the purpose of the study, summaries of the procedures and findings as well as a discussion of the significance of the findings are presented in Chapter V. Conclusions and recommendations based on an analysis of the data collected are also presented.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to investigate the perceived relationship between job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Somerset and Hunterdon Counties in New Jersey public school districts in 2002-2003. It was also to determine the relationship to perceived job satisfaction to the following variables: salary, size of the district, and the gender of the superintendent.

In summary, the researcher determined an investigation of job satisfaction of superintendents would be meaningful because of the lack of qualified administrators, administrators unwilling to take on superintendency responsibilities because they are satisfied with staying as deputy/assistant superintendents, principals, or other district-level administrative positions, the recent high turnover rate, and the changing work environment of superintendents.

The following questions were used to guide the course of this study:

1. What is the perceived level of job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?
2. What is the perceived level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

3. What is the perceived level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

4. What is the relationship between gender and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

5. What is the relationship between salary and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

6. What is the relationship between size of the district and job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

7. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and Urban public school superintendents?

8. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and public school superintendents in affluent (I&J) districts in New Jersey?

9. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and single role superintendents in South Dakota?

10. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey and professional Engineers in Minneapolis and St. Paul?
Methodology

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (1977) short form was used to survey public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey. The MSQ is a self-administered, pencil-and-paper inventory, which consists of 20 questions that are designed to measure general job satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, and extrinsic satisfaction. The MSQ is a well-regarded measure of job satisfaction (Muchinsky, 1990) and was updated in 1977 to leave out any sex bias terminology.

A total of 50 superintendents from Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey were surveyed. Responses were received from 31 for a 62% response rate. One respondent did not complete and return the demographic characteristic survey.

Respondents completed a demographic characteristic survey that included data on the respondent’s gender, age, tenure, education level, salary, number of students in their district, structure of their district, and type of district in which they are employed. Frequency distributions are presented on these variables.

The data from the MSQ was analyzed in order to determine individual item scores, a general satisfaction score, an intrinsic satisfaction score, and an extrinsic satisfaction score. Responses were indicated on a five-point scale ranging from a low of very dissatisfied to a high of very satisfied.

Findings

Demographic Data

1. The majority, 53% (n=16) of responding Hunterdon and Somerset County Superintendents in New Jersey fell between the age ranges of 56-65. While the range in ages was from 36 years old to greater than 65 years old; it was also noted that 36.7%
(n=11) of the responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents were between the ages of 46-55, and 6.7% (n=2) fell into the range of greater than 65 years old, and only 3.3% (n=1) were between the ages of 36-45. It is interesting to note that there were zero superintendents less than 35 years of age.

2. While the minimum requirement in New Jersey for the position of superintendent is a master's degree, more than three-quarters of the respondents (66.7% possessed doctoral degrees, far exceeding the minimum requirement for the position of superintendent.

3. An overwhelming majority of responding superintendents was without tenure, 96.7% (n=29). This percentage indicates that since the New Jersey State Regulations in 1991, only those who have held the position for 12, abolished tenure for superintendents, or more years maintain tenure status 3.3% (n=1) as the position has been effected through enormous turnover over the years.

4. More than half of the responding superintendents 53.3% (n=16) work in districts with less than 1,000 pupils. Only 23.3% (n=7) work in districts with 2,000 or more pupils, which indicates that most districts in Hunterdon and Somerset County are much smaller in size.

5. Almost three-fourths 73.3% (n=22) of the responding superintendents work in suburban districts.

6. Most of the districts, being smaller in size, are structured in a K-8 configuration 53.3% (n=16), with only 23.3% (n=7) have a K-12 configuration, and with those being the largest districts.
7. With salaries having a large range in variation, many Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents 36.7% (n=11) make more than $146,000 a year. Only 9.9% (n=3) make less than $112,000. The salary range between $113,000-$123,000 was the second largest total with 30% (n=9).

The demographic data portray the typical Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendent in New Jersey is likely to be a male in his fifties, possessing a doctorate, making over $123,000 a year, in a suburban K-8 district, with fewer than 1,000 pupils.

Job Satisfaction Findings

1. Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents are generally satisfied with their jobs as indicated by a mean general satisfaction score of 82.45 given a possible score range from 20 to 80 and a median score of 84 (Table 8, p. 57). When reduced to the 5-point Likert scale, this conclusion is also supported by the mean score of 4.12, which indicates a satisfaction level.

2. With possible scores ranging from 12 to 60 (Table 9, p.58), the mean score of 51.48 indicates that Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents’ intrinsic job satisfaction is high. When broken down to the 5-point Likert scale, this conclusion is also supported by the mean score of 4.29 or falling between the satisfied and very satisfied level.

3. Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents are less satisfied with the extrinsic job aspect of their position than the other two areas. With a mean score of 22.80 on a scale of scores and breaking down score to a 5-point Likert-type scale, a mean of 3.80 emerges indicating an extrinsic satisfaction level of falling between neutral and satisfied.
4. Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents were most satisfied with the chance to try my own methods of doing the job, the chance to do things for other people, the chance to do different things from time to time, and the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities (table 11, p.61). This level of response indicates an orientation toward intrinsic motivating factors. Such an orientation would lend itself to being a good principle-centered leader within a school district. The presence of these intrinsic motivators results in satisfaction with the job, but their absence does not necessarily lead to job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). The two-factor theory of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) hypothesized that high job satisfaction results in high job performance, relating specifically to those superintendents that expressed high intrinsic satisfaction motivators would be more satisfied, better quality work ethic, and higher performance.

5. Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey were satisfied with the intrinsic factors of the chance to try my own methods of doing the job, the chance to do things for other people and the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities (Table 12, p.63). Ilgen (1971) conceives job satisfaction as resulting from the size of the difference one perceives, if any, between what he expects to receive from his work and what he believes he is receiving. Most superintendents experience satisfaction in their jobs because of these higher intrinsic levels of satisfaction within their responsibilities in their position.

6. Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey were less satisfied with extrinsic factors of the way policies are put into practice, chances for
advancement, pay and the amount of work they do, and the way my boss handles his/her workers (Table 13, p. 65).

7. The job satisfaction reported by responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was statistically significant related to gender of the superintendent. Male superintendents indicated a statistically significant higher level of job satisfaction than did females on general job satisfaction.

8. The job satisfaction of responding superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant related to the salary of the superintendent.

9. The job satisfaction of responding superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant related to the size of the district the superintendent worked in the 2002-2003 school year.

10. The general job satisfaction difference of responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was statistically significant compared to urban public school superintendents (p=. 000).

11. The intrinsic job satisfaction difference of responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant compared to urban public school superintendents (p=. 118).

12. The extrinsic job satisfaction difference of responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was statistically significant compared to urban public school superintendents (p=. 018).

13. The general job satisfaction difference of responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant compared to public school superintendents in affluent (I & J) districts (p=. 051).
14. The intrinsic job satisfaction difference of responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was statistically significant compared to public school superintendents in affluent (I & J) districts (p=. 000).

15. The extrinsic job satisfaction difference of Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant compared to public school superintendents in affluent (I & J) districts (p=. 136).

16. The general job satisfaction difference of Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant compared to single role superintendents in South Dakota (p=. 452).

17. The intrinsic job satisfaction difference of Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant compared to single role superintendents in South Dakota (p=. 710).

18. The extrinsic job satisfaction difference of Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant compared to single role superintendents in South Dakota (p=. 229).

19. The general job satisfaction difference of Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was statistically significant compared to professional white-collar workers (Engineers) (p=. 023).

20. The intrinsic job satisfaction difference of Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was statistically significant compared to professional white-collar workers (Engineers) (p=. 005).
21. The extrinsic job satisfaction difference of responding Hunterdon and Somerset County superintendents in New Jersey was not statistically significant compared to one other group of professional white-collar workers (Engineers) (p=. 104).

22. Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey are generally satisfied with their jobs and when using Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory as a theoretical framework, the hygiene factors or extrinsic job satisfaction (security, pay, physical working conditions) were revealed in this study to lead to dissatisfaction among superintendents.

Discussion

Although superintendents in New Jersey face enormous challenges, both academically and financially, they maintain that they gain a great deal of satisfaction from their jobs. Superintendents are feeling fulfillment from their jobs and are playing a pivotal role in shaping the structure and content of education for the next generation. Yet despite this level of satisfaction, the superintendent’s position is facing an enormous turnover rate across the state, including Hunterdon and Somerset Counties. According to New Jersey School Boards Association, during the past five years, Hunterdon County has faced a 60% turnover rate, while Somerset faced a 50% rate of change.

If there is a high level of job satisfaction among superintendents, then why is there such a large percentage of them leaving? The data from the NJSBA suggests that approximately 50% of the superintendents in New Jersey who leave their positions retire, (compared to 49% in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties) but approximately 30% move to other districts (compared to 34% in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties). The areas of job satisfaction that scored the lowest on the MSQ was the competence of my supervisor in
making decisions, the way my boss handles his/her workers, and praise for doing my job. These extrinsic factors are the main reason this study suggest why superintendents are leaving their districts, whether they retire or leave for another district.

Some organizational consequences of Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs Theory become apparent when one looks at the changes in motive patterns in an affluent society like that of the United States. Extrinsic rewards such as pay, job security, and working conditions are no longer satisfactory; younger employees, especially, are demanding intrinsic rewards as well (Adcock, 1991). Some of the major variables that determine job satisfaction include such things as mentally challenging work, equitable rewards, good working conditions, supportive managers, and supportive colleagues (Katzell et al., 1992). School boards across the state need to be mindful of the data from this study that would suggest that superintendents are leaving their jobs because school boards of education have lost their focus, become more micromanagers of school districts, and have not been rewarding and supporting superintendents for the job they are doing.

Superintendents exhibit a high level of satisfaction because as the study suggests, they have the chance to try their own methods and the chance to do something that makes use of their abilities. When school boards interfere with these satisfiers, superintendents feel less satisfied with their job and more likely to be motivated to leave. Interesting to note, that in the 2000 Study of the American School Superintendents, superintendents across the nation rated their boards “not qualified” 30% of the time in the study. However, the superintendents gave their school boards lower grades than the superintendents themselves received from their boards. Although superintendents feel
that their board is "unqualified" or "lacking competence" to fulfill their positions, most boards appear to have more confidence in their superintendent than vice versa. If school boards are to promote job satisfaction with superintendents and create harmony, they need to ensure that superintendents feel satisfied with those intrinsic satisfiers, such as praise for a job well done, a chance to try new ideas, and the freedom to exercise one's own judgment, as well as nurture and support their leaders. These factors included in the MSQ that lead to superintendent job satisfaction will not add an additional financial burden to a district.

The study also suggests that the demographic variables, analyzed separately, appeared to have an insignificant relationship to superintendent job satisfaction in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties.

This study did not look at the correlation of tenure and job satisfaction because almost all but one of the superintendents who participated in this study did not have tenure. The researcher chose to compare the level of job satisfaction with South Dakota Superintendents because superintendents in South Dakota do not have tenure and are given one, two, and three year contracts, which is similar to superintendents in New Jersey.

Nevertheless, when superintendents in New Jersey lost tenure status in the early 1990's, the effect on the superintendency has been tremendous. Although many superintendents in New Jersey today serve under contracts, the analogy between tenure and turnover is a factor that needs to be looked at closely by the state legislature, especially in the case in New Jersey, where the three counties (Cape May, Gloucester, and Salem) with the highest number of tenured superintendents have the lowest rates of
turnover. In this educational reform, standards-based, accountability driven era of education, school districts demand continuity and stability in their leadership. With superintendents lacking tenure and turnover rates at their highest, how can school boards afford not to look at job satisfaction to keep their current leaders at home?

Recommendations for Practice

The following recommendations for practice emerged from study findings and conclusions:

1. The State Legislature should revisit the policy/law in respect to the removal of tenure from superintendents and recommend restating the law.

2. To achieve a better working relationship between boards and education and the superintendent, the state school boards association should conduct training sessions to address this issue. School boards must find a way to nurture and support their leaders.

3. The state legislature should look to regulate the scope of local school boards authority and limit them to only hiring the superintendent of schools.

4. School boards should utilize the results of this study to help ensure superintendents are satisfied with their jobs by adding those satisfiers (be free to try new ideas, etc.) to their job description, which will not be a financial burden to the school district.

5. The results of this study should be utilized by professional search firms and boards of education when seeking to hire a new superintendent in order to look into the positive and negative job satisfaction characteristics that appear to accompany the position.
6. The education departments of universities should use the results of this study to explain to prospective superintendent candidates the areas of highest and lowest levels of job satisfaction, and utilize this advance knowledge when developing their course work for perspective administrators and doctoral candidates in this field.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations are made to encourage further studies in the job satisfaction field for superintendents:

1. Future research should be conducted utilizing an instrument other than the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ).

2. Future research involving qualitative measures should be conducted to determine the factors associated with positive and negative aspects of job satisfaction of superintendents.

3. Future research should be conducted again in five to ten years to determine whether changing conditions, or federal legislation (NCLB), or lapse of time have changed the results significantly.

4. Future research should be conducted to investigate if there is a difference in job satisfaction levels between superintendents in a single role or dual role (superintendent/principal).

5. Future research should be conducted to further investigate if there exist a difference in job satisfaction between male and female superintendents in New Jersey.

6. Future research should be conducted to investigate the factors that either entice or deter teachers and/or school administrators from pursuing the position of superintendent.
7. Future research should be conducted to examine the positive factors that are associated with positive school boards/superintendent relationships.

The reality of the modern superintendency is that it is both exciting and exasperating, and school districts across New Jersey and the nation are finding it increasingly difficult to attract people to the role. While the job is fraught with external pressures, it is filled with internal possibilities. This study sought to explain that although the job presents many challenges, it still offers job satisfaction to those who aspire to this tremendous leadership position.
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Appendix A

Cover Letter
Letter of Solicitation and Informed Consent
June 1, 2003

Superintendent
School District
Address

Dear Superintendent,

I am a graduate student at Seton Hall University in the College of Education and Human Services. I am currently writing a doctoral dissertation entitled “A Study of Job Satisfaction Among Superintendents in Somerset and Hunterdon Counties in New Jersey.” This study will investigate the job satisfaction of superintendents of school in these two counties.

I am writing to ask that you participate in this study, which will consist of answering the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short form and completing a brief demographic survey. They should take about 15 minutes to complete. For the purpose of this study, “disclosure on the questionnaire refers to the board of education.”

This study guarantees confidentiality and anonymity. Participation is voluntary and all the material you complete will remain confidential with this author. Under no circumstance will data be published which identifies the participants. All replies will be coded and will be kept in a locked box. The code list will be in a safety deposit box. Results will be discussed with my dissertation mentor, but will not be seen by any unauthorized individual. All results will be in an aggregate form. There are no risks and no direct benefit for the participants.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) believes that the procedures adequately safeguard the subjects’ privacy, welfare, civil liberties and rights. The chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.

By returning the completed survey, it will be assumed that you are thoroughly informed about the research and have voluntarily consented to participate in this study. A copy of the Informed Consent form will be given to all participants. Please keep this letter for your records. After reading the material above, it will be assumed that all your questions about the study are answered satisfactorily. If you would like to participate and do have questions, you can contact me by calling my dissertation mentor, Dr. John Collins, at Seton Hall University at (973) 275-2974.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the addressed stamped envelope provided by June 15. The data provided by you is greatly need to assist research on the job satisfaction of superintendents. Your participation is greatly appreciated and all data will be destroyed after 3 years.

I realize that time is very precious, and easily consumed fulfilling essential obligations but the time invested in my research will be useful in guiding police and practice. Your participation in this study can hopefully improve the job satisfaction of superintendents. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support

Sincerely,

Richard O'Malley
C/o Dr. John Collins/ Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
Appendix B

Demographic Survey
"A STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION AMONG SUPERINTENDENTS IN SOMERSET AND HUNTERDON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN NEW JERSEY"

SUPERINTENDENT DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
(Please return with the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire)

CODE: _____

1. Number of students in the district:
   <1000 _____  1000-1500 _____  1501-2000 _____  >2000 _____

2. Structure of district:
   K-6 _____  K-8 _____  K-12 _____  7-12 _____  other _____

3. Type of district:
   Urban _____  suburban _____  rural _____

4. Annual Salary:
   <$90,000 _____  $91,000-101,000 _____  $102-112,000 _____  $113-123,000 _____
   $124,000-$134,000 _____  $135,000-$145,000 _____  >$146,000 _____

5. Gender:  M _____  F _____

6. Age:<35 _____  36-45 _____  46-55 _____  56-65 _____  >65 _____

7. Number of years in this position: _____  Tenure:  Yes _____  No _____

8. Number of other superintendent jobs/Years in each position: _____

9. Doctorate: Yes _____  No _____

* I would like to receive a copy of this study: Yes _____  No _____

APPROVED
MAY 13 2003
IRB
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
Appendix C

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form
minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

(short-form)

Vocational Psychology Research
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Copyright 1977
The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

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

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

• Read each statement carefully.

• Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

—If you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under “Very Sat.” (Very Satisfied);

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

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

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

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

• Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.

• Do this for all statements. Please answer every item.

Be frank and honest: Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.
Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Check one:  □ Male  □ Female

2. When were you born?_____________________________ 19

3. Circle the number of years of schooling you completed:

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
Grade School  High School  College  Graduate or Professional School

4. What is your present job called? __________________________

5. What do you do on your present job? __________________________

6. How long have you been on your present job?__________years__________months

7. What would you call your occupation, your usual line of work? __________________________

8. How long have you been in this line of work?__________years__________months
Appendix D

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form Approval Letter
Dec. 3, 2002

Richard J. O'Malley  
15 Deerpond Court  
Flemington, NJ 08822

Dear Richard J. O'Malley:

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director  
Vocational Psychology Research
Appendix E

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter
May 13, 2003

Richard O'Malley
15 Deerpond Court
Flemington, NJ 08822

Dear Mr O'Malley:

The Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board has reviewed the information you have submitted addressing the concerns for your proposal entitled "A Study of Job Satisfaction Among Superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey". Your research protocol is hereby approved as amended through expedited review. The IRB reserves the right to recall the proposal at anytime for full review.

Enclosed for your records are the signed Request for Approval form and the stamped original Consent Form. Make copies only of this stamped Consent Form.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

According to federal regulations, continuing review of already approved research is mandated to take place at least 12 months after this initial approval. You will receive communication from the IRB Office for this several months before the anniversary date of your initial approval.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Giuliana Mazzoni, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Director, Institutional Review Board

cc: John Collins, Ph.D.