2016

A Quantitative Study Of Job Satisfaction Of Assistant Principals In Alabama Public Schools

James Albert Rainey Jr
University of Alabama at Birmingham

A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS IN ALABAMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

JAMES A. RAINEY, JR.

DR. GARY PETERS, COMMITTEE CHAIR
DR. LOUCRECIA COLLINS
DR. MICHELLE JEAN SIMS
DR. BOYD ROGAN
DR. MELANIE SHORES

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the graduate faculty of The University of Alabama at Birmingham,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

2016

A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS IN ALABAMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

JAMES A. RAINEY, JR.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction levels and certain demographic characteristics among public school assistant principals in the State of Alabama. Research on assistant principals was limited but revealed assistant principals do not feel prepared for their role and responsibilities. Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory was used by combining the six facets of work on present job, supervision, people on your present job, job in general, opportunities for promotion, and pay to determine the overall level of job satisfaction for individual assistant principals. Public school assistant principals across the state of Alabama were contacted through e-mail to participate in the online survey resulting in 365 participants. Regression analysis was conducted for job satisfaction in multiple demographic areas to determine whether or not there were any significant predictors of job satisfaction for assistant principals. School setting, age, total years as an assistant principal, salary, and career assistant principal aspiration were significant predictors of job satisfaction. This study may provide evidence to school systems and college administrative preparatory programs that more support may be necessary to help assistant principals be more effective and satisfied in their role.

Keywords: assistant principal, job satisfaction, Herzberg

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to “My Beautiful” wife Stephanie and son Silas.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to everyone who has supported me throughout this entire process. First, thank you to my wife Stephanie for being with me through all the years of graduate school. I am grateful that you have been with me throughout. Thank you to my son Silas for being curious about my time at UAB and for loving the time we are together.

I am grateful for Dr. Loucrecia Collins who has been part of my administrative journey since day one many years ago. Thank you to Dr. Peters for helping me see this dissertation process through to the end. I also want to thank Dr. Shores and Dr. Rogan for your patience with me throughout this process and thank you Dr. Sims for coming on late in this journey and helping finish as well.

I also want to thank Mr. Benjie Parrish for encouraging and supporting me to become an administrator and for all the talks in the Commons Area. Thank you as well Dr. Gypsy Stovall for giving me the opportunity to become an administrator and the opportunities to learn and grow. To all the friends I've made through this journey, I thank you for your encouragement and look forward to years of working together.

Most importantly, my hope and prayer is that God uses me through this to glorify Him and spread His message.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The complexity and demands of being an assistant principal are high regardless of the school type, location, or size. These complexities and demands of the job come from being both an instructional leader and school manager while stakeholder expectations are inherent to being part of an administrative team (Colwell & Potter, 2013). As the future leaders of schools, assistant principals must face these demands (Kersten & Kersten, 2006). Whether or not an individual aspires to move up the administrative ladder from a position of assistant principal can be influenced by how satisfied they are in their current job (Yu-kwong & Walker, 2010). An assistant principal's level of job satisfaction influences their desire to move into higher leadership roles and face the changing demands of educational success. School leaders are challenged with new demands and must adapt their leadership styles to best meet these demands. According to Flanary (2009) "school change begins with changes in the principal, the assistant principals, and the leadership team members" (p. 60). One major focus of school leadership is that of developing staff members, including assistant principals, in order to influence student learning and enact change (Bartholomew, Melendez-Delaney, Orta, & White, 2005; Capelluti & Nye, 2005). This is especially true as more individuals are leaving the profession and fewer qualified applications are available to fill the vacated positions (Eadens, Bruner, & Black, 2012).

Research Problem

Research and statistics continue to reveal a shortage of qualified people to fill the growing need for quality school administrators (Shoho & Barnett, 2010). "Administrative quality has become a concern of both public and professional groups." (Norton, 2008, p. 17). A significant reason for concern is the evidence of administrative shortages from principals retiring and the high number of assistant principals who have little to no desire to become principals. Shortages may be a result not of the number of certified individuals but rather a shortage of willing and qualified candidates (Eadens, Bruner, & Black, 2012).

The focus of modern day school leadership has shifted towards a commitment to protect the learning environment (Leonard, 2008). At the same time, administrators must balance with that the responsibilities of being community builders and student advocates while managing areas such as discipline (Tredway, Brill, & Hernandez, 2007). Findings from research continually shows the important shift in "educational leadership away from management and towards education and learning" (Danzig, Zhang, & You, 2005). Assistant principals are being asked to take on responsibilities that are important to the daily work of the school but have almost become unachievable (Barnett, Shoho, & Oleszewski, 2012).

Expectations of a new principal are dependent upon their experiences as an assistant principal (Shoho & Barnett, 2010). Their experiences with work, people, and supervision are directly impacted by the types of professional development and preparation they receive. Fatima (2012) defines job satisfaction as "the extent to which one feels good about the job" (p. 260). Shifting roles of the assistant principal and a need

to receive quality professional development as well as preparation programs directly affect the assistant principal's level of job satisfaction. An assistant principal's desire to grow professionally may affect their level of job satisfaction from the people they come into contact, how they approach their responsibilities, and whether or not their professional growth will lead to opportunities for promotion (Danzig et al., 2005).

Statement of the Problem

Findings from research on education administration tend to focus more on the principalship (Barnett et al., 2012). Therefore, research studies on assistant principals are limited (Enomoto, 2012; Yu-kwong & Walker, 2010). Job satisfaction studies on education leaders have been conducted in states such as Georgia (Hall, 2008), Florida (Taylor, 2007), and Iowa (Sodoma & Else, 2009). Research involving job satisfaction of assistant principals in Alabama cannot be found at the time of this current study. Furthermore, Hall (2008) suggested comparing the level of job satisfaction for different career aspirations as well as studying more areas that can impact job satisfaction for assistant principals.

Individuals who plan to enter school administration may want to understand their level of job satisfaction prior to entering school administration. Potential administrators should also understand factors that will influence their level of job satisfaction as a school administrator (Kersten & Kersten, 2006). Prior research suggests for studies to be conducted in many states, including Alabama, to measure job satisfaction of assistant principals (Taylor, 2007). Taylor specifically suggests the use of online questionnaires due to the distance required to conduct job satisfaction research across an entire state.

This study sought to fill the gap that exists in the research relevant to job satisfaction of school assistant principals in the state of Alabama.

Purpose

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction levels and certain demographic characteristics among public school assistant principals in the State of Alabama.

Research Questions

The research question to guide this study is: To what extent are assistant principals in the state of Alabama overall satisfied with their jobs? The following null hypotheses based on the primary research question were analyzed from the survey responses:

$H_0$1: There is no difference between the elementary school, elementary/middle school, middle school, high school, or unit school types in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$2: There is no difference between rural, urban, or suburban school settings in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$3: There is no difference between gender, age, or race in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$4: There is no difference between highest education degree level, total years in education, total years' experience as an assistant principal, or salary level in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$5: There is no difference between career aspirations in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be found throughout this research and will be defined as follows:

Assistant principal: "The person who serves directly underneath the principal" in the roles of disciplinarian, manager and instructional leader (Barnett et al., 2012, p. 93).

Hygienes: Hygienes are aspects of a person's job that influence his or her level of dissatisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Examples of job hygienes are relationships inherent in the job, supervision, rules, administration, working conditions, personal life, and salary.

Job satisfaction: "The degree to which a person is satisfied with some or all aspects of their job" (Yu-kwong & Walker, 2010).

Motivators: Motivators are aspects of a person's job that influence their level of satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Examples of job motivators are work achievement, work recognition, the work itself, advancement, and work responsibilities.

Significance of the Study

"Administrative quality has become a concern of both public and professional groups" (Norton, 2008, p. 17). The reason for concern is the evidence of administrative shortages from principals retiring and the high number of assistant principals who have little to no desire to become principals. Barnett et al. (2012) suggest further research to help leadership preparation progams tailor instruction towards not only the principalship but also towards the assistant principalship. Barnett et al. imply that most entry level administrative positions in secondary and urban/suburban schools is through the assistant principalship. Also, Barnet et al. suggest the need for better professional development for

assistant principals. Specifically, they suggest ongoing support as well as professional development opportunities to prepare them for the principalship. Preparing for the factors that contribute to job satisfaction should be included in preparation programs for the assistant principalship and professional development for the principalship. Barnet et al. focus on their work on present job, people on their present job, and supervision of assistant principals may lead to higher levels of job satisfaction.

Hall (2008) suggested to study the difference in levels of job satisfaction for all years of service assistant principals. Is there a difference between those who aspire to remain assistant principals and those who wish to move higher? After the research was conducted, Hall found that gender, school level, and career aspirations had no statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction. If this is the case, then what factors do influence job satisfaction of assistant principals? Since this study was conducted in Georgia, are there any differences in the levels of job satisfaction for principals in Alabama? Taylor (2007) specifically recommended conducting job satisfaction studies among high school assistant principals in Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

Results of this current study may help principals and superintendents better understand variables that affect job satisfaction of assistant principals. These variables can be specifically addressed as school systems are searching for meaningful experiences for potential school leaders (Shoho & Barnett, 2010). By identifying areas of satisfaction, professional development specifically for assistant principals can be structured to influence their ability to build relationships and develop people (Robinson, Horan, & Nanavati, 2009). Also, understanding the factors that influence job satisfaction can help administrative preparation programs focus on the more specific needs of being an

assistant principal (Eadens et al., 2012). In addition, this current study may shed light on differences of job satisfaction factors between urban (Tredway et al., 2007), suburban, and rural (Enomoto, 2012) assistant principals in order to provide appropriate professional development for them and those who aspire for the principalship.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to assistant principals in the state of Alabama. The online survey was e-mailed to superintendents, principals, and assistant principals in the state of Alabama. Contact information was gathered from the Alabama State Department of Education website as well as local school websites. The accuracy of the contact information and school websites depends on the accuracy of the information provided to the Alabama State Department of Education. All information was self-reported by participants. The JDI/JIG survey was limited by the correlation between each of the individual areas.

Assumptions of the Study

For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that all participants were assistant principals in the state of Alabama who work in a public school. Further, all participants were practicing assistant principals at the time of the study.

Theoretical Framework

In studying job satisfaction, five primary theories dominate. Kwan and Walker (2012) expound on this by stating the theories evolve from paths based on past research. The five paths and the researchers behind those theories are: 1) needs fulfillment (Maslow, 1954), 2) cognitive (Vroom, 1964), 3) facet (Lawler, 1977), 4) value aspects (Locke, 1976), and 5) motivation-hygiene (Herzberg, 1959). Herzberg's Motivation-

Hygiene Theory is the basis for this study. The Two-Factor Theory was reported in 1959 by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (as cited in Norton, 2008). The major thought behind the Two-Factor Theory was as follows: "The factors leading to positive attitudes and those leading to negative attitudes are different" (Norton, 2008. p. 51). Herzberg and associates studied engineers and accountants to determine whether or not the factors that lead to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are unique from each other. They determined that indeed the factors that lead to job satisfaction are different from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction.

Hoy and Miskel (2008) explained the theory by stating that the factors influencing job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are separate factors, not opposites of each other. Factors that influence job satisfaction are called motivators while factors that influence job dissatisfaction are called hygienes. Fatima (2012) referenced Herzberg by explaining feelings of satisfaction, motivators, are different than feelings of dissatisfaction, hygienes. The opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction while the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. Because the factors that contribute to motivators and hygienes are separate and not oppositional, a low measure of satisfaction does not lead to dissatisfaction while low measures of dissatisfaction do not lead to satisfaction.

Motivators and hygienes include several factors within each group. Norton (2008) summarized the findings of Herzberg's original work with engineers and accountants that determined specific motivators contributing to job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and salary. The hygienes which influence job dissatisfaction are company policy and administration, technical supervision, salary, interpersonal relations with subordinates, and working conditions.

Later studies by Sergiovanni (1967) and Schmidt (1976) (as cited by Norton, 2008) sought to identify the motivators and hygienes of teachers and administrators. Motivators for these groups were found to include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and interpersonal relations with subordinates. Hygienes for these groups were found to be interpersonal relations with students, interpersonal relations with peers, company policy and administration, technical supervision, and interpersonal relations with supervisors. For the purpose of this study, the overall level of job satisfaction will be determined by measuring and combining both motivator and hygiene factors.

Smerek and Peterson (2007) used Herzberg's Theory to identify ways to improve job satisfaction for non-academic employees at one public university. These authors discovered work itself, a motivator, was the only indicator of job satisfaction. Using Herzberg's theory, Schroder (2008) determined that for a group of employees at a Christian University, relationships provided the most job satisfaction while salaries and policy contributed to the lowest levels of job satisfaction. In this same study, Schroder concluded that the best indicators of job satisfaction were based on demographic variables.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall level and factors that may have a relationship between job satisfaction and demographic characteristics for assistant principals in Alabama public schools. Research question and null hypotheses set forth in this study are designed to not only determine the overall level of job satisfaction, but to also understand specific demographic areas as they relate to motivators and hygienes. Upper level school administrators may be able to use these data to better serve the needs

of Alabama assistant principals and better prepare them for advancement in educational administration. This study was limited to assistant principals in the state of Alabama and assumes that all participants work in an Alabama public school. For this study, Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory is the framework.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review described prior research on job satisfaction of assistant principals. Secondly, role and responsibilities of the assistant principal was discussed. Next, research and data was provided relevant to assistant principal demographics. Lastly, prior research on preparing assistant principals for advancement shared.

Job Satisfaction of Assistant Principals

Research involving job satisfaction of assistant principals is very limited. Research that has been conducted has found for many assistant principals, job satisfaction levels may change as individuals settle into their position (Houchens, 2012). Also, assistant principals have indicated lower levels of job satisfaction due to the gap that exists between what they perceive to be the work of an instructional leader and the work actually performed regularly (Glanz, 1994 as reported in Gurley, Peters, Fifolt, Collins, & McNeese, 2015). Historically, the assistant principal position has "been poorly defined, poorly focused, unsatisfying to many in the role, and consistently under criticism from educational scholars" (p. 145).

Studies have been conducted in varying types of educational organizations such as a Christian University in which employees in general participated in a quantitative study based on Herzberg's theory (Schroder, 2008) and Catholic schools in which retention of principals was investigated (Fraser & Brock, 2006). Studies have also been

conducted with education workers such as non-tenure track University faculty members to include, manage, and recognize their contributions (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012); secondary school teachers job satisfaction levels (Fatima, 2012); to understand the attrition rates of special education teachers (Thornton, Peltier, & Medina, 2007); and administrative groups inclusive of assistant principals, principals and assistant superintendents to measure job satisfaction levels (Conrad & Rosser, 2007; Konan, 2013).

The model for this current study was from Hall (2008). Hall set out to determine the extent to which career assistant principals in Georgia were satisfied with their job. Career assistant principals were defined as assistant principals with at least seven years of experience as an assistant principal and had no plan to move out of the position. There were 519 public school assistant principals contacted for the online survey. Hall received 220 responses and 66 of these were determined to be career assistant principals. Their online survey used the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to measure job satisfaction levels and a Likert scale to measure the satisfaction participants had for performing duties that required them to be a manager or a leader.

Hall (2008) compared gender with job satisfaction, school level with job satisfaction and career aspirations with job satisfaction. Hall also sought to determine what duties and responsibilities gave career assistant principals the highest level of job satisfaction. Hall discovered that 69.99% of the career assistant principals were satisfied with their job. ANOVA's were calculated for gender, school level, and career aspirations. Hall's research revealed no statistical relationship between any of the three areas and job satisfaction. A t-test was applied to determine whether there was a difference in the level

of satisfaction for duties that required them to be a manager versus those that require them to be a leader. The t-test suggested no difference in the two forms of duties.

Another study by Taylor (2007) sought to better understand job satisfaction of assistant principals from seven different counties in Florida. Taylor used a mixed-methods approach. There were 128 respondents to the questionnaire. From there, seven volunteers from the initial survey were interviewed by telephone. This study indicated that 74% of participants were satisfied with their job. The area of greatest dissatisfaction was participant salary.

Four independent variables of school size, tenure, age, and gender showed no relationship with job satisfaction. However, the research revealed that assistant principals in lower performing schools were less satisfied than those in higher performing schools. Phone interviews indicated a lack of interest in pursuing advancement to become a principal. This was especially true as assistant principals spent more time in their positions. Recommendations were to provide mentors and training to assistant principals and encourage them to move into a principalship before they lose interest. Taylor's study by was an extension of research conducted in prior years in the state of Florida.

While Taylor's study did not compare data to a previous study, Sodoma and Else (2009) measured data over time. Researchers studied job satisfaction levels of Iowa public school principals and compared results to data from six years prior. A survey instrument was developed based on Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. The researchers found differences in overall job satisfaction, gender, service years, and type of school. Current data of that study was compared to data from six years earlier and found current participants to be more satisfied overall. Findings also revealed principals

were more involved with management than leadership. There was also more influence from hygiene factors than motivators.

Nieuwenhuizen (2011)reported that most assistant principals are generally satsisfied with their careers. Their satisfaction and motivation is found in working with students. Specifically they find satisfaction in seeing postive improvements from students and building relationships with them but they also enjoy seeing teacher growth and making their schools better. Nieuwenhuizen also found that professional satisfaction was tied to personal satisfaction. Opportunities for service, positive change, and being involved in instructional leadership aspects lead to job satisfaction. However, the frustrations of discipine and student management can accumulate over time to the point that stress, dissatisfaction, and burnout negatively impact the work of the assistant principal and may even lead to some who plan to leave the field altogether.

One by-product of the study by Nieuwenhuizen (2011) related to an area of job dissatisfaction. Nieuwenhuizen discovered that due to a lack of preparation from their leadership program, new assistant principals needed someone to talk with. Assistant principals expressed a need to converse with other people who understood what they were going through and had similar frustrations and challenges. Many times, assistant principals are faced with difficult situations that can easily cause them to be frustrated, stressed, or even experience burnout. Isolating assistant principals and not formally establishing a support network created more stress for assistant principals. In other words, the lack of a formal mentoring structure can lead to job dissatisfaction for assistant principals.

The Role of the Assistant Principal

Assistant principals have many responsibilities within the school organization. Accepting and understanding those roles is important to being an effective school leader. Jackson (2015) understood that a school leader has "responsibility for and impact on the learning of everyone in a school, from the new student to the veteran teacher to the engaged parent" (p. 67). Many assitant principals feel there is not enough time in the day to finish everything that needs to get done. At times, assistant principals feel their skills are being wasted on issues that are insignificant but necessary (Nieuwenhuizen, 2011). In fact, one participant in the study by Nieuwenhuizen stated the he felt he was "a highly educated and trained professional who has been relegated to doing menial secretarial work" (p. 180). In order to get their work done, Nieuwenhuizen revealed that assistant principals should learn to work in short bursts simply because they are not in control of their own day.

The primary role of the assistant principal varies according to school environment. Frascone (2011) also suggested the primary role of an assistant principal is to cultivate and promote the positive attributes of the school culture. To enrich school culture, public relations can be used to celebrate both collective and individual accomplishments within the school. Building trust within the staff increases morale. Maintaining an open-door policy, one in which people feel comfortable sharing, shows a genuine concern for individuals.

Continuous recognition should be displayed as a daily practice, not only as an end-of-year ceremony. Assistant principals can also show a sense of belonging through professional networking to open the school to the public. Similarly, Tredway, et al.

(Tredway et al., 2007) discovered that "new leaders view themselves as community builders, instructional leaders, enforcers, reflectors, equity promoters, and student advocates" (p. 213). In order to promote the culture, the assistant principal must build a culture of trust within the school.

Walton (2012) stated that many aspiring administrators strive to be instructional leaders. In reality the assistant principal provides support to the principal by affecting school culture through discipline and daily operations that positively impact the school and protect time so that the principal can be the instructional leader. New administrators feel they cannot be soft with discipline in order to maintain the respect of teachers and students (Tredway et al., 2007). Leonard (2008) reaffirms the need for administrators to shift their practices towards protecting instruction by minimizing external distractions. Capelluti and Nye (2005) argued that the primary role of school administrators is to be problem-solvers.

Gurley et al. (2015) discovered that assistant principals sometimes feel they have "to be all things to all people" (p. 40). Twenty-seven areas were identified by the reserchers as roles of being an assistant principal. Those roles were varied and multifacted. Five areas of athletic program manager, academic manager, conflict manager, legal expert, and technology coach were identified as frequently engaged in functions. These roles represented not only the need for assistant principals to be able to serve a wide area of domains but to also attain knowledge and apply that knoweldge in varied ways. Similarly, Stanton (2012) identified the daily tasks of assistant principals to include discipline, athletics, student activities, communication with stakeholders, staff

management, and building management as daily responsibilities where new assistant principals may have been untrained or unprepared to respond.

Osabutey-Aguedje (2015) compared the role of assistant principal to a full plate of responsibilities. She recognized that the day of an administrator is a series of 15-minute segments of problem-solving situations that is continually interrupted by tragedy, humor, noise, and anger. She aspired to fulfill the school's vision, increase parent involvement, know the students, build relationshipns with the faculty, increase school acadmic performance, and protect the individuals within the school. To add to this were her reponsibilities of teacher observations, paperwork, athletic events, and civic duties. Additionally, she would have required paperwork from the central office, staying up-to-date on instructional strategies and discipline, and responding to e-mail and telephone messages.

Dansby, Jefferson-Isaac, Klipp, McMichael, and Yates (2016) echoed these same responsibilities alongside other issues in a roundtable discussion. They acknowledged collaboration, discipline, administration, and instructional leadership as being important roles. Collaborating with the principal is imperative to forging a unified front as well as being able to share your personal vision and passion. Working with parents was an ongoing responsibility across multiple areas. From discipline to instruction and generating support, efffective communication was essential. Learning to communicate through social media was a task that may have been uncomfortable or challenging for new assitant principals as their perspective changes from the classroom to the offfice. Dansby et al. realized after entering the profession that their impact on the school's climate was different as well. Their actions as a school leader had much more

influence than their words on the school climate. Their role as administrator was very much different than when they were in the classroom. They then realized that their influence on the school extended well beyond the students they taught out to all stakeholders in the school system and community.

It is important to realize that administration is more adult- than student-centered. Gale (Gale, 2010) affirms this realization by explaining that school leaders should work with teachers, parents, and the community rather that working on them. Many times assistant principals are the conduit of information between principals and faculty members (Houchens, 2012). There is a higher level of responsibility required due to the management skills needed and being able to deal with unexpected issues more frequently (Kersten & Kersten, 2006). Assistant principals must be able to manage multiple and competing priorities as well as politically motivated issues that can rapidly become personal. Time demands of the job stem from increased work hours and a longer work year. Assistant principals must also have a high level of tolerance to deal with both problems and criticisms.

Challenges Faced by Assistant Principals

Assistant principal roles are challenging and complex, yet necessary (Nieuwenhuizen, 2011). Nieuwenhuizen found that many assistant principals operated from the survival level of Maslow's hierachy. Assistant principals spend much of their time working to establish and maintain a safe learning environment. In doing so, they rarely are able to apply their skills as an instructional leader. Eighty-six percent of the participants in Nieuwenhuizen's study acknowledged they spend a majority of the day on student discipline and management. All of the assistant principals in that study expressed

dissatisfaction with the structure and responsibilities of their job but accepted those responsibilities as being part of the job.

While assistant principals are "essential to the effective functioning of schools," it is important to understand the challenge from the impact of the multitude of responsibilities inherent to the position (Gurley et al., 2015). Many times these tasks are stressful, menial, or even unrelated to the work of the assistant principal. Additionally, longer periods of time spent in managerial tasks may diminish an individual's effectiveness as an instructional leader. Therefore, time management and personal balance may be a constant struggle; especially for new assistant principals (Dansby et al., 2016) . Appreciating the ebb and flow of balancing those responsibilities may be more easity managed by focusing on the balance over the course of longer periods of time as opposed to being mired down in daily or weekly time balance.

Assistant principals face many challenges as they enter school leadership. Some new assistant principals realize after they are in their new position that they are actually powerless as the assistant principal (Nieuwenhuizen, 2011). The oftentimes feel trapped between the demands of teachers and the needs of students. Nieuwenhuizen (2011) also found that new assitant principals experience a new level of stress that affects them both physically and mentally. As individuals transition into administration they may find their role to be lonely and grueling (Houchens, 2012). New assistant principals also find they are challenged by responsibilities that administrative preparatory programs could not train them in (Gurley et al., 2015). These same responsibilities many times lead to an expectation for assistant principals to put in an intensive number of hours impacting their perception of the work they do.

As individuals enter the realm of school administration, new assistant principals often initially feel they did not belong in their new role or environment (Armstrong, 2015). Armstrongnreported that new assistant principals felt a disconnect and uncertainty as they gave up their classroom duties and relationships with other teachers changed. Assistant principals expressed an unfamiliarity with the culture of administration and discovered they had limited preparation for their new role. There was a sense of shock when they changed positions and even though they had not gained any new experiences, they were expected to have all the answers. New assitant principals experienced an increase "in the intensity, pace, and volume of their daily work which occurred mainly on the frontlines" (Armstrong, 2015, p. 114). Those new assistant principals began to question their reasoning for entering the profession when in the first six months their work was consuming and responsibilities increased. They were also challenged by their personal feelings when they disagreed with board policies but had to carry them out accordingly.

Stanton (2012) concluded that challenges faced by assistant principals may be unique to the individual. For instance, one assistant principal may find that time spent dealing with discipline took away from the rnjoyment of student achievement, staff professional development, and current issues. Whereas, another assistant principal may have relished the responsibility of disciplinarian and seen that area as a strength. Prior experience as a teacher with administrative responsibilities was also a determining factor in being able to handle responsibilities and manage the time needs of being an assistant principal. Stanton (2012) also found that having a true mentor impacted an assistant principals ability to manage the challenges of the position. New assistant principals

experienced frustration from having to immediately know the ins and outs of the position simply because of their new title.

Specifically, new assistant principals in Stanton's (2012) study experienced frustration in five areas. Those areas were the amount regular disciplinary actions they had to manage; not feeling supported by colleagues, administrators, or parents; weight management, health, and family issues; exhaustion from time requirements; and a need for a mentor or someone just to talk to who understood their struggles. Participants revealed that college prepartory programs were insufficient in preparing them to be assistant principals. Since there was a lack of preparation from college programs, assistant principals expressed the need for clearly established mentoring programs.

Instructional leadership preparation programs have shown a commitment to continualy improve their programs. However, Peters, Gurley, Fifolt, Collins, and McNeese (2016) found that assistant principals recognized a gap in the knowledge attained through preparatory programs and the actual work itself. These gaps were of substantial concern to the assistant principals. Gaps in areas such as technology, program management, and finances existed even though the assistant principals felt prepared by their preparatory program. Assistant principals in their study acknolwedged that their position "is not a role for the weak of heart" (p. 189) as they were also not prepared for the challenge presented by the interaction between work and home or personal lives. Also, the many roles of the assistant principals oftentimes enhanced the negative aspects of the AP job.

While assistant principals see their job as one of the most challenging things they have ever done, they also see is as being one of the most rewarding. Assistant principals

acknowledge that their instructional leadership program alone cannot prepare them for the challenges they will face (Gurley et al., 2016). Participants in a study by Nieuwenhuizen (2011) repeated the same sentiment.They expressed frustration and discontentment when they were faced with the reality of their new position because it was vastly different than what they thought they had been prepared to do. Assistant principals feel that leadership program training focuses mainly on the role of instructional leader than the job of assistant principal. Misssing from the prepration programs was training in managing students, diversity, and social justice. Due to the lack of preparation, assistant prinicpals stated the need for more professional development.

In order to be effective assistant principals, new assistant principals also sought assitance from other assistant principals or mentors . New assistant principals felt that it was vital to make close connections with fellow assistant principals as a ready and immediate resource. Additionally, participating in walkthroughs and having discussions with other assitant principals was a helpful way to connect and learn to manage the challenges of the position (Dansby, et al., 2016). Assistant principals intentionally and regularly seek out individuals and groups to get assistance and build professional networks in order to learn and grow in their position (Armstrong, 2015).

Mentoring programs helped assistant principals face the challenges of their position and develop into high performing leaders (Curry, 2009). Curry found as a result of building relationships and participating in hands-on activities, assistant principals were more effective in their work and profesional development. A key aspect of effective growth and development was selecting the appropriate mentor. This also helped the principal mentors to sharpen their skills as well. While barriers such as allocating time for

meetings and lack of support outisde of the program existed, it was essential to establish mentoring relationships for assistant principals to support the work they were doing and to help prepare them for advancement.

Research Related to Assistant Principal Demographic Variables

Studies on assistant principals are limited (Enomoto, 2012; Yu-kwong & Walker, 2010). Hall (2008) and Taylor (2007) are two studies of job satisfaction specifically on assistant principals. Most studies of school administration either exclude the assistant principal position or include it with the data for principals or all administrators. The Alabama State Department of Education website includes information about school system superintendents and school principals but no data for assistant principals can be obtained. Therefore, demographic information for assistant principals must be generalized from all administrators or reported from individual studies.

School type (Elementary, Elem/Middle, Middle, High, Unit) and school settings (Rural, Urban, Suburban). No universal arrangement of grade levels exists to identify schools as elementary, middle, or high school (Duke, 2010). Variations of school make-ups are common but typically 6th grade and lower is considered elementary while 9th grade and above is considered high school. Financial situations many times determine the need for certain grade level configurations. In the state of Alabama, unit schools encompassing grades kindergarten through 12th exist due to rural and/or financial reasons. Hall's (2008) research revealed no statistically significant relationship between school type and job satisfaction.

Data obtained from the Alabama State Department of Education website (www.alsde.edu) provides a guide for the number of assistant principal units a school

earns. Elementary schools must have an enrollment of at least 500 students before being funded 0.5 units for an assistant principal. Enrollment for elementary schools must be at least 750 students to earn a full state funded unit. For middle and secondary schools, an enrollment of at least 250 students will earn 0.5 assistant principal units while an enrollment of at least 500 students earns a fully funded assistant principal unit. As enrollment increases, school may earn up to 2.5 state funded assistant principal units. In all schools, the local education agency may use local funds to fill out or add assistant principal units.

Regardless of the school type or setting, the complexity and demands of being an assistant principal are high (Colwell & Potter, 2013). Much of the research involving Black administrators has been conducted in urban schools while the trend of school settings for black administrators is shifting towards suburban schools (Moore, 2013). School leaders in urban settings face challenges in attendance, poverty, resource allocation, neglected school facilities, low academic achievement, and racial/class inequity (Tredway et al., 2007). They also have to address issues of typically having larger schools and populations as well as having to spend more time on discipline (Allanach, 2002).

On the other hand, rural school leaders tend to be geographically isolated from their peers and resources (Enomoto, 2012). Prior research showed that much of what is learned about being an assistant principal was specific to the site or school in which an individual works (Peters et al., 2016). In fact, one participant in their study revealed that the experience gained and the expectiations faced were different in consecutive years in

two different urban schools. “The way things are done” (p. 192) is different at various schools. All of these factors contribute to job satisfaction.

Gender, Age, and Race. Demographic makeup of a study by Conrad and Rosser (2007) found that men serve in administrative roles longer than women. Ethnic minorities were in education and as administrators longer than Caucasians but had been in their current position for less time. Their study also revealed that there were twice as many male assistant principals as female but an almost equal representation of males and females in the principalship and superintendence. A study by Yu-kwong and Walker (2010) had a similar demographic breakdown. In their study males outnumbered females more than 2 to 1 and the majority (59.5%) of the participants were between 45-54 years old. They came to the conclusion that there was no difference in the level of job satisfaction between male and female assistant principals.

Female administrators tend to be challenged more than their male counterparts in balancing life roles with job responsibilities (Shillingstad, 2011). Other studies reveal a difference in the work that females engage compared to their male counterparts (Kwan & Walker, 2012). Armstrong (2015) reported that males tended to adjust to their role as disciplinarian more easily than females. In Armstrong’s study, females reported they were sometimes fearful for their personal safety due to potential blowback from parents and students. The study by Kwan and Walker (2012) discovered age may impact job satisfaction levels for older assistant principals as opportunities for advancement decline with age (Kwan & Walker, 2012). However, age does not have a significant impact on whether or not an individual plans to enter the field of administration (Eadens et al., 2012).,

Moore (2013) reported that in 2010 the National Center for Education Statistics showed that 80% of school administrators are white, 11% are Black with the remaining 9% being of other races. The 2013 study by Moore analyzed the experiences of 22 Black women principals. This particular study discovered that most Black women administrators were perceived to be "race tokens" (p. 492) and therefore should be race experts. This notion creates tension among Black women administrators as they feel they were hired to focus on Black students rather than all students. With regard to job satisfaction, this may have an impact on their present work and the people they work with and for.

Race was also a factor in how assistant principals are expected to handle some responsibilities of the job. In Nieuwenhuizen's (2011) study, African American assistant principals were expected to handle the discipline of the children of color in their school. White assistant principals many times were reluctant to deal with certain discipine issues due to fear of possibly being labeled racist. Race and gender even affected the perspective of two assistant principals. A black female assistant principal in Nieuwenhuizen's study acknowledged a lack of cultural proficiency in the way administrators and teachers would handle situations. At times, individuals may have been racially offensive without even knowing it.

Similarly, it was revealed that the lack of cultural proficiency may have led to an open bias against administrators of color; specifically against an African American female assistant principal. In another instance, Nieuwenhuizen (2011) found where a large Black assistant principal had been rebuked for intimidating parents and students. In reality, this was not the case which led to frustration on his part as he battled being

labeled and racially discriminated against. Even through dealing with these challenges, the assistant principals in Nieuwenhuizen's study acknowledged that for them, race was not a determining factor in their ability to be promoted.

Degree level, total years in education, total years' experience as an assistant principal, and salary level. Demographics of the study by Conrad and Rossser (2007) found the level of degree shifted as the administrative position moved higher. More people with higher degrees filled higher positions. With regard to the assistant principal position, 55.8% held a master's degree, 35.4% held a specialists degree, and 7.5% held either an EdD or PhD. Similarly, demographics of the study by Kwan and Walker (2012) showed the largest number of assistant principals held lower level degrees. Also, an overwhelming number of the participants (78.3%) had been teaching for 20 or more years.

New principals, those with 3 or fewer years of service, based expectations for their current position on experiences as an assistant principal (Shoho & Barnett, 2010). The type of experiences an assistant principal has during their tenure is related to their work, supervision, and people around them which are factors that influence one's level of job satisfaction. Challenges faced by assistant principals have been found to be the same for both new and experienced assistant principals (Barnett et al., 2012). Each group was challenged by workload, task management, interpersonal conflicts with adults and students, as well as instruction and curriculum issues. All of which in some manner contribute to the factors that affect job satisfaction.

New assistant principals often experience higher levels of job satisfaction by their third year (Houchens, 2012). However, their expectations of their role and whether or not

they could better serve students had diminished during this time. Assistant principals have admitted that the experiences shared by mentors were valuable to their learning and growth (Peters et al., 2016). It was reassuring to the lesser experienced assistant principals to know that there were people who had gone through similar experiences to their own.

Salaries of education employees tend to be determined primarily by three factors (Cooke & Licciardi, 2009). Those factors are: 1) geographic location of the school system, 2) size of the district based as determined by enrollment, and 3) amount of money the school district spends per pupil. Many individuals who want to enter the field of administration cite the salary as a reason for their motivation (Eadens et al., 2012). Longitudinal data (Cooke & Licciardi, 2007, 2008, 2009; Williams, 2004, 2005, 2006) shows the median salary for classroom teachers in 2003-2004 was $46,646 while the median salary for elementary school assistant principals was $62,213, middle school assistant principals was $66,360, and high school assistant principals was $70,495. This data reflects a salary difference from $15,567 between the classroom teacher and elementary school assistant principal to $23,849 between the classroom teacher and high school assistant principal.

In 2008-2009, median salary for a classroom teacher was $52,900 while the median salary for an elementary school assistant principal was $71,893, middle school assistant principal was $77, 476, and high school assistant principal was $81, 083. The median salary gap for this reporting period was from $18,993 to $28,183. Over the time of the reported data, not only did median salary increase for each demographic but the gap between salaries for classroom teachers and assistant principals increased. With

regard to job satisfaction, research using Herzberg's theory to understand the effect of socio-economic status on job satisfaction found overall that employees were satisfied. However, satisfaction levels were higher for employees whose socio-economic status was higher (Fatima, 2012).

Career aspirations. As has been stated several times throughout, there is an anticipated shortage of leaders in education. Many school districts require experience as an assistant principal in order to be considered for a principalship (Eadens et al., 2012). Beginning principals, those in the position for 3 or fewer years, envision staying in the principalship for no more than 5-10 years (Shoho & Barnett, 2010). While moving from assistant principal to principal is one opportunity for promotion, they feel there are even more opportunities to move up; all of which are directly linked to job satisfaction factors. Kwan and Walker (2012) found a statistical difference between aspiring and career assistant principals with regard to job satisfaction. In contrast, career assistant principals, those with 7 or more years of experience and/or no desire to move higher, tend to be just as satisfied in their jobs (Hall, 2008). With time, career assistant principals may gain an understanding of how to manage factors that influence job satisfaction (Swenson, 2009).

A major influence in whether or not an individual intends to advance in administration is dependent on their individual demographic characteristics and personal preference more than satisfaction they attain from their work life (Conrad & Rosser, 2007). Assistant principals who aspire for the principalship have a propensity to be more committed to the job and experience lower levels of stress (Yu-kwong & Walker, 2010). In turn, Marshall and Hooley (as cited in Yu-kwong & Walker, 2010) claim that assistant principals who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to seek principal positions.

Research of Munoz and Barber (2011) revealed multiple challenges faced by assistant principals that may hinder them from moving up or even entering the administrative field to begin with. Even though the role of assistant principal is one pipeline to the principalship, the accountability from multiple responsibilities may be a decreasing incentive to aspire to move up. Yerkes and Guaglianone (as cited in Munoz and Barber, 2011) listed the following reasons as to why there is a declining applicant pool for adminsitrative positions: time requirements of the job, job complexity, supervision of extracurricular activities, insignificant salary differences compared to other positions, overwhelming stakeholder expectations, paperwork, social issues, negative stigma of the position, and inability to help teachers collaborate. Additionally, Munoz and Barber's research showed that potential applicants may be discouraged to apply for administrative positions because of a lack of emphasis on instructional leadership. Many assistant principals view the position of instructional leader as more appealing than that of being a disciplinarian. Job satisfaction of assistant principals may increase through greater experience and opportunities for instructional responsibilities.

Preparing Assistant Principals for Advancement

The primary means of job advancement in education is through school administration (Kersten & Kersten, 2006). Many programs which focus on preparing school leaders support "the notion that assistant principals are entry-level administrators who will become principals" (Bartholomew et al., 2005). School leaders and postsecondary training programs should invest more time to understand the actual work of the assistant principal (Houchens, 2012). Assistant principals often feel they are

inadequately prepared to advance their careers when they seek to become a principal (Nieuwenhuizen, 2011).

The position of the assistant principal is an opportunity to develop strong future leaders. Reforming and reframing the role of assistant principals has been called upon by some researchers, yet little change has taken place over time (Gurley et al., 2015). Focusing more on the instructional aspects of the position and moving away from being buried in the managerial will help individuals be better prepared for advancement. In fact, some scholars see the position of assistant principal as poor preparation of principals as instructional leaders.

Assistant principals now work more closely with principals which in turn can be an encouragement to move up the administrative ladder. Developing the leadership capacity of assistant principals should be a focus of principals (Houchens, 2012). Principals should build positive relationships that are collaborative in nature. "The ideal relationship is one built with trust as the foundation… Finding a way to communicate regularly with your principal is key" (Dansby et al., 2016, p. 33). Walton (Walton, 2012) also encouraged a strong relationship between the principal and assistant principal. At the same time, Walton stated assistant principals should be the support system for the principal. By fulfilling this role, assistant principals can move away from basic responsibilities that may hinder them to be instructional leaders.

With increased enrollment and the number of retiring administrators increasing, the education administrative market should continue to be promising as it has been for many years (Kersten & Kersten, 2006). The applicant pool has decreased as pay levels have not necessarily been commensurate with increased demands of the position. Kersten

and Kersten recommended for educators to consider several areas before entering the administrative realm of education. Researchers further advised evaluating one's personal level of career satisfaction.

Professional development for assistant principals is becoming more focused on the growth of individuals in becoming effective leaders as they move towards a principalship (Drago-Severson & Aravena, 2011). Assistant principal professional development should be pragmatic and skill based (Nieuwenhuizen, 2011). Professional development should target the demands of the rapidly changing demographics as well as the legal and political landscape of edcuation as it changes. Mentoring has also become a strategy being implemented in school systems to develop current and potential school leaders (Robinson et al., 2009). Positive experiences afforded to assistant principals have shown to help them be better problem solvers and be less emotionally exhausted when entering the principalship (Shoho & Barnett, 2010)

Assistant principals are impacted by the influence of their principal (Davis, 2008). For their growth and development in administration, assistant principals have stated that the support and mentoring by their principals is the most important aspect (Armstrong, 2015). Principals should recognize this influence and positively support the factors which impact job satisfaction levels for assistant principals. Assistant principals should pay attention and take time to learn what encompasses the principal's job (Colwell & Potter, 2013).

Johnson-Taylor and Martin (2007) identified several areas to help school leaders intentionally develop assistant principals for the complex job of principal. They suggested inquiring about specific career goals and select individuals who are strong in

instruction. It is important for school leaders to quickly be on the same page and involve assistant principals in all aspects of the school. At times, the principal needs to get out of the way and let the assistant principal lead also have conversations about difficult topics regarding the principalship. Last, principals should provide appropriate professional development and support their assistant principals when they are ready to move on.

Summary

There is a great future need for school level administrators. Research on assistant principal job satisfaction is limited. Understanding the role, responsibilities, and factors which influence job satisfaction for assistant principals is important. The challenges faced by assistant principals may not be fully understood or appreciated and in some instances may negatively impact not only job satisfaction but also the effectiveness as an instructional leader. Research has shown some factors that influence job satisfaction for assistant principals are unique to some demographics while other factors show no difference. Being an assistant principal is considered the first step in career advancement in education so it is important to properly prepare assistant principals for new jobs. Understanding factors that influence job satisfaction for assistant principals may help preparation programs and professional development plans to be tailored to fit the needs of individuals who intend to advance their careers in education.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used for this study will be discussed in this chapter. First, population and study sample will be discussed. Next, data collection tools as well as collection procedures will be explained. Analysis procedures will then be covered. Reliability and validity of the survey instrument will be explained. The last section will address human subject's protection.

Population and Study Sample

The population for this quantitative study will be assistant principals in the 136 Alabama public school systems. According to the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE), there are 1,192.59 full time equivalent assistant principal units representing 1,269 actual people in the State of Alabama. There are more people included in the count than the full time equivalency due to the number of part time assistant principals. The number of funded assistant principals in schools in the state of Alabama range from 0.0 to 2.5 per school based on school student enrollment. School systems may combine a partial unit with another position or fund the remainder of the unit with local funds. Schools may also employ assistant principals through local funds. In order to be statistically significant with a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of less than 5 the sample size needs to include at least 300 participants. (http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm#two)

Data Collection Tools

The survey instruments used for this study will be the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) ("Purpose - Job Descriptive Index - BGSU,"). Bowling Green State University has the rights to these scales and allows researchers to use them at no cost through their website, www.bgsu.edu/departments/psych/io/jdi/index.html (Appendix A). These scales measure job satisfaction as a part of employee attitudes. The website states that combined into one instrument, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) are a series of questions with Likert-type responses that measure the job facets of "satisfaction with: coworkers, the work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, and supervision" as well as "how satisfied they are with their job in a broad, overall sense." Areas of work on present job, supervision, people on your present job, and job in general have 18 items while pay and opportunities for promotion have 9 items. For the purpose of this study, facets of work on present job, opportunities for promotion, and job in general will be motivators as defined by Herzberg's theory. Facets of pay, supervision, and people on your present job will be hygienes.

Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com), an online survey software program, will be used for data collection. Qualtrics is free to use for researchers at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). The electronic survey (Appendix E) will include the Informed Consent, demographics, and questions from the JDI and JIG. Demographic variables will be asked through multiple choice responses. Participants will not be asked information specific enough to identify them or their school location. The JDI and JIG information will be collected in the second part of the Qualtrics survey. Each area will list the items associated with that variable and for the participant to rate their response. Once all data

has been collected, Qualtrics will be used to compile the data into a file that can be directly uploaded into SPSS v. 23 at UAB.

Data Collection Procedures

An e-mail (Appendix C) was sent to superintendents and principals at each of the 136 school systems in the State of Alabama. Contact information for superintendents and principals was made public through the Alabama State Department of Education website. An initial e-mail was sent the first week of February 2016. This e-mail asked for their help in contacting assistant principals to participate in this study. The e-mail contained an explanation of the study and a link to the survey. Finally, an assistant principal whose contact information may be listed on individual school websites was sent an email as well.

Upon receiving the e-mail, assistant principals were asked to participate in the study by clicking the available link. The link directed them to the web-based survey. They first received an explanation of the study and their rights as a survey participant in the initial e-mail. Information regarding participant rights and IRB approval was fully explained in the e-mail. Continuation of the survey implied consent on behalf of the participant. After agreeing to participate, individuals were directed to answer demographic questions and questions related to their job satisfaction. Follow-up e-mails (Appendix D) were sent the third week in February and a final e-mail reminder was sent the first week in March. The survey closed the third week in March.

Data Analysis Procedures

Survey results will be downloaded directly from Qualtrics into SPSS v. 23. Independent variables for this study are school type (Elementary, Elem/Middle, Middle,

High, Unit, or other); school setting (rural, urban, or suburban); gender; age (under 30, 30-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, 51-55, 56-60, or over 60); race/ethnicity (African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American or Alaska Native, White, or Other); highest level of education (Masters, Educational Specialist, or Doctorate); years in education (Less than 5, 5-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 36-30, More than 30); years as an assistant principal (3 or less, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12, 13-15, 16-18, 19-21, More than 21); salary range (Less than $40,000, $40,001-$50,000, $50,001-$60,000, $60,001-$70,000, $70,001-$80,000, More than $80,000; Prefer not to answer); and career aspirations (Return to the classroom, Career Assistant Principal, Principal (Any Level), Central Office Position (not Superintendent), Superintendent, State Department of Education, Other).

The dependent variable was overall job satisfaction to include the subcategories of work on present job, opportunities for promotion, pay, supervision, people on your present job, and job in general. Statistical analysis used for this study will be regression. Regression is defined by Gravetter and Wallnau (2009) as "the statistical technique for finding the best-fitting straight line for a set of data" (p. 566). More specifically, a regression is a type of correlational analysis used to make a prediction. A multiple regression analysis will be conducted in this study because multiple predictor variables are associated with the null hypotheses. Therefore, the regression analysis will be used to predict any correlation between the demographic areas of participants and their level of job satisfaction. The Bonferroni post hoc test will be conducted on any predictor values determined to be statistically significant.

Validity and Reliability

The Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Quick Reference Guide (Brodke et al., 2009) report the validity and reliability of the JDI and JIG. The guide reports Pearson correlations for selected outcome measures. All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level. Cronbach's coefficient alpha is used to report the level of reliability. An alpha level of .80 or higher is considered to be a high level of reliability. For the six areas used with this instrument, the lowest alpha level is .88; meaning each area has a high level of reliability. The specific Cronbach's coefficient alpha levels are as follows: work = .90; pay = .88; promotion = .91; supervision = .92; co-workers = .92; and job in general = .92. The correlation between each of the areas for the original JDI/JIG is well below .80. The correlation between work and job in general is .69 while all other correlations are below .50.

Human Subjects Protection

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was secured prior to conducting any research. Results from the online survey will remain confidential. Survey results will be downloaded to a personal laptop and remain in the personal possession of the researcher. Data will be backed up to a portable hard drive that will be stored in a locked drawer. E-mails will be sent directly to superintendents, principals, and assistant principals using bcc: (blind carbon copy). However, Data collected through Qualtrics will not be identifiable to the researcher.

Summary

Population and study sample for this study were public school assistant principals in the state of Alabama. The Job Descriptive Index and Job in General surveys were

distributed through the Qualtrics program. An e-mail providing the link to participants was sent to superintendents, principals, and assistant principals throughout the State of Alabama. Multiple regression analysis was used to analyze data acquired through the online surveys by using SPSS v. 23. Validity and reliability of the survey instrument was established. Demographic information did not identify participants and all data was safely stored.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Findings of the study will be reported in this chapter. First, the research question and null hypotheses will be reviewed. Next, the research design will be discussed. The population for this study will then be introduced. Last, the findings will be revealed.

Research Questions

The research question to guide this study was: To what extent are assistant principals in the state of Alabama overall satisfied with their jobs? The following null hypotheses based on the primary research question will be analyzed from the survey responses:

$H_0$1: There is no difference between the elementary school, elementary/middle school, middle school, high school, or unit school types in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$2: There is no difference between rural, urban, or suburban school settings in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$3: There is no difference between gender, age, or race in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$4: There is no difference between highest education degree level, total years in education, total years' experience as an assistant principal, or salary level in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$5: There is no difference between career aspirations in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

Research Design

Survey structure consisted of two sections that were split into multiple pages each as it was entered on www.qualtrics.com. Respondents completed the survey by going to https://uab.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yX5wjL7uRvDZOd. E-mails were sent to 1106 assistant principal e-mail addresses as listed on school websites, 1466 principal e-mails from ALSDE information, and 137 superintendent e-mails from ALSDE information. Principals and superintendents were asked to forward the survey information to assistant principals in their school system. Assistant principals who were currently working in an Alabama public school were asked to participate in the study.

First, participants were asked to respond to demographic questions. Demographic information was not identifiable to the researcher. Participants were asked for their school type, school setting, gender, age, race/ethnicity, highest education degree, total years in education, total years as an assistant principal, salary, and career aspirations. Next came the JDI/JIG which consisted of 6 factors that included either 9 or 18 individual responses depending on the factor. Participants were asked to respond either ‘Yes’, ‘No’, or ‘?’. The data was collected through Qualtrics then downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to begin analyzing.

Cleaning the data was the first step in the process of analysis. The JDI/JIG Quick Reference Guide provided a step-by-step process to clean the data. First, responses which had 4 or more missing values in any of the Work, Supervision, Coworker, or JIG individual factors or 3 or more missing values in the Pay or Promotion factors were

removed from the data set due to being incomplete. In the data file that resulted from the survey, the JDI/JIG instructed the researcher to assign 'Yes' a value of 3, 'No' a value of 0, and '?' a value of 1 in order to determine the level of satisfaction. The remaining missing responses were assigned a value of 1 according the survey instructions. Next, the values were added together within each factor. If the total for the 18 item factors equaled 54 or 0 or if the total for the 9 item factors equaled 27 or 0, this represented a "straight line" response. "Straight line" responses, according to the guide, are unusable as the responses include both positive and negative items and this may represent a participant who may have been inattentive or did not read the items correctly. Participant data that included "straight line" responses were removed from the data set.

Once the data set was cleaned, the data could be scored. The first step in scoring the data was to reverse score the negative items of the JDI/JIG factors. This was done so that a high score will represent a high level of job satisfaction. The guide specifically identified the items to be reverse scored. Therefore 3 became 0 and 0 became 3 for the specific negative items. The score for the individual factors was then computed by adding the individual item scores. For the factors that included only 9 items, the scores were added together then multiplied by 2. The range of possible scores for each individual factor is 0 to 54. A score of 54 represented the maximum level of job satisfaction while a score of 0 represented the lowest level of job satisfaction. To determine the overall level of job satisfaction for each participant, the 6 individual factors were averaged together. The data from the excel spreadsheet was then entered into SPSS v. 23 to be analyzed. A regression analysis was conducted for each null hypothesis.

Population

For this study, the survey population consisted of assistant principals in Alabama public schools. As a result, 412 assistant principals in Alabama public schools participated in this study. Once the survey was closed the data was cleaned and recoded as specified in the instructions for the JDI/JIG. As a result, there were a total of 370 participants for this study. For each participant, the level of satisfaction for each of the six factors was computed then each factor was averaged together to determine the level of overall job satisfaction. Mean level of overall job satisfaction for all participants was 41.011, representing a high level of overall job satisfaction. This level of overall job satisfaction was the dependent variable for the regression analysis. After examination of the data set for outliers, five cases were removed. Individual demographics for each null hypothesis will be appropriately reported along with the analysis of the results.

Findings

There were 5 null hypotheses to be tested in this study. $H_0 1$ stated there is no difference between the elementary school, elementary/middle school, middle school, high school, or unit school types in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama. Participants were asked to select the type of school in which they worked. The data was coded where 1 = Elementary school, 2 = Elem/Middle school, 3 = Middle school, 4 = High school, 5 = Unit school, or 6 = other.

Table 1

Participants by School Type

School Type	N	Percent
Elementary school	102	27.9
Elem/Middle school	20	5.5
Middle school	78	21.4
High school	149	40.8
Unit school	11	3.0
[a]Other	5	1.4
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants
[a]*Other represents schools not listed including vocational or alternative.*

Table 1 shows the demographic breakdown of the participants. High school assistant principals represent the largest group at 149 (40.8%) participants with elementary school assistant principals being the next largest group at 102 (27.9%). The smallest representation was in other schools (5, 1.4%) and unit schools (11, 3.0%).

A linear regression was calculated to predict overall job satisfaction based on school type. The results of the regression indicated that school type explained only 0.4% of the variance (R^2=.004, $F(1,363) = 1.640$, $p = .201$) (see Table 2). The F value of 1.640 is lower than the critical value of 3.867 for $F(1,363)$. Also, the p value of .201 is greater than .05. Therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Participant's predicted overall job satisfaction is equal to 42.267 - .434 School Type, where School Type is coded as 1 = Elementary school, 2 = Elem/Middle school, 3 = Middle school, 4 = High school, 5 = Unit school, or 6 = other. Participant's overall level of job satisfaction decreased by .434 for each type of school. School type was not a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction therefore we fail to find evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 2

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by School Type

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	1	124.633	124.633	1.640	.201
Within groups	363	27592.434	76.012		
Total	364	27717.067			

$H_0$2 stated that there is no difference between rural, urban, or suburban school settings in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama. Participants were asked to select the setting of school in which they currently work. Responses were coded as 1 = Rural, 2 = urban, and 3 = suburban. Participant's school setting in Table 3 was represented by being predominately 51.0% Rural (186 participants).

Table 3

Participants by School Setting

School Setting	n	Percent
Rural	186	51.0
Urban	69	18.9
Suburban	110	30.1
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants

A linear regression was calculated to predict overall job satisfaction based on school setting. The results of the regression indicated that school setting explained 1.4% of the variance (R^2=.014, $F(1,363) = 5.237$, $p = .023$). The F value of 5.237 is higher than the critical value of 3.867 for $F(1,363)$. Also, the p value of .023 is less than .05. School

setting is a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction therefore we reject the null hypothesis. A Bonferroni post hoc test found a Mean difference of -2.200 between Rural and Urban and -2.262 between Rural and Suburban School Setting. Participant's predicted overall job satisfaction is equal to 38.886 + 1.186 (School Setting), where school setting is coded as 1 = Rural, 2 = Urban, and 3 = Suburban. Participant's overall job satisfaction increased 1.186 for each school setting.

Table 4

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by School Setting

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	1	394.200	394.200	5.237	.023
Within groups	363	27322.867	75.270		
Total	364	27717.067			

The next null hypothesis, $H_0$3, stated that there is no difference between gender, age, or race in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama. Three demographics are analyzed here. Male participants 199 (54.5 %), Table 5, comprised the larger number of participants.

Table 5

Participants by Gender

Gender	N	Percent
Male	199	54.5
Female	166	45.5
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants

Age, Table 6, is represented by the largest group being age 41-45 (81 participants, 22.2%) and the smallest groups being under 30 (7 participants, 1.9%, and over 60 (8 participants, 2.2%). The age ranges of 30-35 (75 participants, 20.5%), 36-40 (68 participants, 18.6 %, and 46-50 (67 participants, 18.4%) represented an equal distribution of participant ages.

Table 6

Participants by Age

Age	N	Percent
under 30	7	1.9
30-35	75	20.5
36-40	68	18.6
41-45	81	22.2
46-50	67	18.4
51-55	31	8.5
56-60	28	7.7
over 60	8	2.2
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants

Race/ethnicity, Table 7, was represented by 5 different groups. However, white participants (276, 75.6%) significantly outnumbered all other participants. African American participants were the second largest group at 74 (20.3%). Seven participants chose to not select a race/ethnicity. Those participants will not be included in the analysis of this null hypothesis.

Table 7

Participants by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	N	Percent
African American	74	20.3
Asian	0	0
Hispanic	2	.5
Native American or Alaska Native	2	.5
White	276	75.6
Other	4	1.1
Total	358	98.1
[a]Missing System	7	1.9
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants
[a]Missing System indicates the demographic was left blank therefore the participants' response was not included in the analysis.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict overall job satisfaction based on gender, age, and race/ethnicity The results (Table 8) of the regression indicated the three predictors explained 5.6% of the variance (R^2=.056, $F(3,354) = 7.007$ $p = .000$). The F value of 7.007 is higher than the critical value of 2.630 for $F(3,354)$. Also, the p value of .000 is less than .05. Age was a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction while gender and race/ethnicity were not. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. A Bonferroni post hoc test on Age found a significant Mean difference of 4.725 between the age groups of 30-35 and 46-50.

Table 8

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by Race/Ethnicity, Age, and Gender

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	3	1527.740	509.247	7.007	.000*
Within groups	354	25725.979	72.672		
Total	357	27253.719			

**Significant at the p <.05 level.*

Participant's predicted overall job satisfaction is equal to 39.851 +.725 race/ethnicity -1.055 age + 1.668 gender. Gender is coded as 1 = male, 2 female, age is coded as 1 = under 30, 2 = 30-35, 3 = 36-40, 4 = 41-45, 5 = 46-50, 6 = 51-55, 7 = 56-60, 8 = over 60 and race/ethnicity is coded as 1 = African American, 2 = Asian, 3 = Hispanic, 4 = Native American or Alaska Native, 5 = White, 6 = Other. Overall job satisfaction increased 1.668 for gender and .725 for race/ethnicity and decreased 1.055 for age.

The fourth null hypothesis, $H_0$4, stated that there is no difference between highest education degree level, total years in education, total years' experience as an assistant principal, or salary level in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama. With regard to the highest degree level for the participants (Table 9), the Master's degree had the most participants at 183 (50.1%). As the degree level increased, the number of participants decreased. Two participants did not indicate their highest degree level so their response was not included in this analysis.

Table 9

Participants by Highest Education Degree Level

Highest Degree	N	Percent
Masters	183	50.1
Educational Specialist	153	41.9
Doctorate	27	7.4
Total	363	99.5
[a]Missing System	2	.5
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants
[a]Missing System indicates the demographic was left blank therefore the participants' response was not included in the analysis.

Total number of years in education (Table 10) was the next demographic area represented. For the participants, the largest number (103, 28.2%) were in education between 11-15 years. The smallest participant group (19, 5.2%) had more than 30 total years in education. None of the participants had less than 5 total years' experience in education. One participant did not indicate their total number of years in education so their response will not be included in this analysis.

Table 10

Participants by Total Years in Education

Total Years in Education	N	Percent
Less than 5	0	0.0
5-10	50	13.7
11-15	103	28.2
16-20	94	25.8
21-25	70	19.2
26-30	28	7.7
More than 30	19	5.2
Total	364	99.7
[a]Missing System	1	.3
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants
[a]Missing System indicates the demographic was left blank therefore the participants' response was not included in the analysis.

The total years' experience (Table 11) as an assistant principal was greatest at 3 years or less (195 participants, 53.4%). As the total number of years of experience as an assistant principal increased, the number of participants decreased. The smallest group of participants was 2 (0.5%) with more than 21 years' experience as an assistant principal. Seven participants did not indicate their years of experience as an assistant principal so their responses will not be included in this analysis.

Table 11

Participants by Total Years Experience as an Assistant Principal

Total Years Assistant Principal	N	Percent
3 or less	195	53.4
4-6	76	20.8
7-9	33	9.0
10-12	24	6.6
13-15	17	4.7
16-18	8	2.2
19-21	3	.8
More than 21	2	.5
Total	358	98.1
[a]Missing System	7	1.9
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants
[a]Missing System indicates the demographic was left blank therefore the participants' response was not included in the analysis.

With regard to salary (Table 12) 140 participants (38.4%) held a salary from $60,001-$70,000, representing the largest participant group. The two smallest groups each had 8 (2.2%) participants which were those who made $40,001-$50,000 and those who preferred not to answer. Each group was represented with participants except for 1 = Less than $40,000 which had no participants.

Table 12

Participants by Salary Level

Salary	n	Percent
Less than $40,000	0	0.0
$40,001-$50,000	8	2.2
$50,001-$60,000	87	23.8
$60,001-$70,000	140	38.4
$70,001-$80,000	76	20.8
More than $80,000	46	12.6
Prefer not to answer	8	2.2
Total	365	100.0

Note: n=number of participants

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict overall job satisfaction based on highest level of education, total years in education, total years as an assistant principal, and salary. The results of the regression indicated the 4 predictors explained 11.4% of the variance (R^2=.114, $F(4,350) = 11.237$, $p = .000$). The F value of 11.237 is higher than the critical value of 2.397 for $F(4,350)$. Also, the p value of .000 is less than .05. Both total years as an assistant principal and salary level were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction while highest level of education and total years of education were not therefore we reject the null hypothesis. A Bonferroni post hoc test on Total Years Assistant Principal found a significant mean difference of 11.869 between 3 or less and 16-18. A Bonferroni post hoc test on salary found significant mean differences of 6.925 between More than $80,000 and $50,001-$60,000, 5.383 between More than $80,000 and $60,001-$70,000, and 5.035 between More than $80,000 and $70,001-$80,000.

Table 13

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by Highest Education Degree Level, Total Years in Education, Total Years' Experience as an Assistant Principal, and Salary Level

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	4	3093.186	773.296	11.237	.000*
Within groups	350	24086.495	68.819		
Total	354	27179.680			

**Significant at the p <.05 level.*

Participant's predicted overall job satisfaction is equal to 37.958 + 2.398 salary - 1.593 total years as assistant principal -.656 total years in education -.954 highest level of education. Highest level of education is coded 1 = Masters, 2 = Educational Specialist, 3 = Doctorate. Years in education is coded 1 = Less than 5, 2 = 5-10, 3 = 11-15, 4 = 16-20, 5 = 21-25, 6 = 26-30, 7 = More than 30. Years as an assistant principal is coded 1 = 3 or less, 2 = 4-6, 3 = 7-9, 4 = 10-12, 5 = 13-15, 6 = 16-18, 7 = 19-21, 8 = More than 21 Salary range is coded 1 = Less than $40,000, 2 = $40,001-$50,000, 3 = $50,001-$60,000, 4 = $60,001-$70,000, 5 = $70,001-$80,000, 6 = More than $80,000, 7 = Prefer not to answer. Overall job satisfaction decreased .954 for highest level of education, decreased .656 for total years in education, decreased 1.593 for total years as an assistant principal and increased 2.398 for salary level.

The last null hypothesis, $H_0$5, states there is no difference between career aspirations in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama. Participants were asked to select their career aspirations from a given list. Selecting an

area as a career aspiration was coded as 1 while not selecting an area was coded as a 0. Participants were able to select as many areas as they felt compelled. The following table (Table 14) represents the career aspirations of the participants.

Table 14

Participants by Career Aspirations

Career Aspirations	n	Percent
Return to the classroom	10	2.7
Career Assistant Principal	46	12.6
Principal (any level)	214	58.6
Central office (not superintendent)	192	52.6
Superintendent	80	21.9
State Department	73	20.0
Other	51	14.0

Note: n=number of participants

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict overall job satisfaction based on the career aspirations of return to the classroom, career assistant principal, principal (any level), central office position (not superintendent), superintendent, state department of education, and other. The results (Table 15) of the regression indicated the predictors explained 3.4% of the variance (R^2=.034, $F(7,357) = 1.800$, $p = .086$). The F value of 1.800 is lower than the critical value of 2.035 for $F(7,357)$. Also, the p value of .086 is greater than .05. Only career assistant principal (p=.020) was a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction while the other aspirations were not, therefore we failed to find evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 15

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by Career Aspirations

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between groups	7	944.984	134.998	1.800	.086
Within groups	357	26772.083	74.992		
Total	364	27717.067			

Overall job satisfaction decreased 5.135 for return to the classroom, increased 3.523 for career assistant principal, increased .205 for principal, increased 1.447 for central office, increased 1.227 for superintendent, decreased 1.646 for state department of education, and decreased 1.464 for other. Each independent variable is coded as 0 = not a selected career aspiration or 1 = selected as a career aspiration. Therefore, a participant's predicted overall job satisfaction could be determined by starting with a score of 40.091 and increasing that score by -1.464 for other, -1.646 for state department, + 1.227 for superintendent, + 1.447 for central office, + .205 for principal, + 3.523 for career assistant principal, or – 5.135 return to the classroom if the participant selected that area as a career aspiration.

Summary

An e-mail inviting assistant principals to participate in this study was sent to assistant principals throughout the state of Alabama. As a result, 412 public school assistant principals from the state of Alabama participated in this study. After the data set was cleaned, recoded, and outliers removed, 365 participant responses were used for the analysis. A regression analysis was conducted for each of the five null hypotheses.

For $H_0$1 the F value of 1.640 is lower than the critical value of 3.867 for $F(1,363)$ and the p value of .201 is greater than .05 so the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. School type was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. $H_0$2 had an F value of 5.237 which was higher than the critical value of 3.867 for $F(1,363)$ and the p value of .023 was less than .05. School setting is a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction therefore we reject the null hypothesis. A post hoc test found a Mean difference of -2.200 between Rural and Urban and -2.262 between Rural and Suburban School Setting. The F value of 7.007 for $H_0$3 was higher than the critical value of 2.630 for $F(3,354)$. Also, the p value of .000 was less than .05. Age was a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction while gender and race/ethnicity were not. The null hypothesis was rejected. A post hoc test on Age found a significant Mean difference of 4.725 between the age groups of 30-35 and 46-50.

For $H_0$4, the F value of 11.237 was higher than the critical value of 2.397 for $F(4,350)$. Also, the p value of .000 was less than .05. Both total years as an assistant principal and salary level were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction so the null hypothesis was rejected. A post hoc test on Total Years Assistant Principal found a significant mean difference of 11.869 between 3 or less and 16-18. Another post hoc test on salary found significant mean differences of 6.925 between More than $80,000 and $50,001-$60,000, 5.383 between More than $80,000 and $60,001-$70,000, and 5.035 between More than $80,000 and $70,001-$80,000. Lastly, $H_0$5 had an F value of 1.800 that was lower than the critical value of 2.035 for $F(7,357)$. The p value of .086 was greater than .05. Only career assistant principal (p=.020) was a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction so we failed to find evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The focus of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction levels and certain demographic characteristics among public school assistant principals in the State of Alabama. The following null hypotheses based on the primary research question were analyzed from the survey responses:

$H_0$1: There is no difference between the elementary school, elementary/middle school, middle school, high school, or unit school types in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$2: There is no difference between rural, urban, or suburban school settings in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$3: There is no difference between gender, age, or race in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$4: There is no difference between highest education degree level, total years in education, total years' experience as an assistant principal, or salary level in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

$H_0$5: There is no difference between career aspirations in terms of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama.

Invitations to participate in this study were sent to Alabama public school assistant principals through e-mail. As a result, 412 assistant principals participated in

this study. After cleaning and recoding data then analyzing the data set for outliers, 365 participant responses were used in this study. Included in the e-mail invitation was a link to the survey for the participants to respond. Qualtrics was used to administer the survey online. First, the survey asked participants to indicate their demographic characteristics of school type, school setting, age, gender, race, ethnicity, highest degree level, total years in education, total years as an assistant principal, salary level, and career aspirations. Next, participants were asked to respond to certain factors that determine their level of job satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) questionnaire was used to determine the participants overall level of job satisfaction.

The six factors to measure job satisfaction used by the JDI/JIG are 1) Work on Present Job, 2) Pay, 3) Opportunities for Promotion, 4) Supervision, 5) People on Your Present Job, and 6) Job in General. Scores for each factor were calculated using an Excel spreadsheet then the six factors were averaged together to determine the overall level of job satisfaction. Data was then uploaded in SPSS v. 23 for analysis. For each of the 5 null hypotheses a regression analysis was conducted to determine if a significant relationship exists between any of the demographic characteristics and the level of overall job satisfaction.

Analysis and Discussion of Research Findings

For this study, the range of overall job satisfaction was 0 to 54. Mean level of overall job satisfaction for all participants was 41.011. This represents a high level of overall job satisfaction. A regression analysis was then conducted for each null hypothesis. $H_0$1 compared demographic of school type (Elementary, Elem/Middle, Middle, High, Unit, or other) in terms of overall job satisfaction. A significant

relationship was not found for school type and overall job satisfaction. A low percentage of variance for $H_0$1 (0.4%) meant that participant responses were widely dispersed. No direct correlation existed in this study based on school type. This finding supports the research of Hall (2008) which showed no statistically significant relationship between school type and job satisfaction. Predicting the level of job satisfaction based on school type decreased by .434 as the level of school increased. No direct correlation exists nor is school type a significant predictor of job satisfaction for assistant principals.

School type may bring fewer challenges as other demographics. For instance, one main reason may have been that school types are consistent regardless of other demographics. For example, all elementary, elem/middle, and unit schools would more than likely include 2nd grade. However, to differentiate between 2nd grades at various schools would require another stipulation such as whether or not the school is rural, urban, or suburban. Also, the level of job satisfaction would depend less on whether or not the participant was over a 2nd grade than the age, experience, or salary level of the individual assistant principal.

The analysis for $H_0$2 did show a significant relationship between school setting (rural, urban, or suburban) and the level of overall job satisfaction. This is consistent with the research of Sodoma and Else (2009) as they also found a relationship with school setting and job satisfaction. A variance of 1.4% meant participants were widely dispersed in their responses. Predicted overall job satisfaction for rural assistant principals was 38.886. Participants predicted overall level of job satisfaction increased by 1.186 to 40.072 for urban assistant principals and 41.258 for suburban assistant principals.

Predicted level of job satisfaction did not indicate a direct correlation of the overall level of job satisfaction for assistant principals but can be generalized.

Post hoc analysis showed that rural school assistant principals overall level of job satisfaction was 2.200 lower than urban assistant principals and 2.262 lower than suburban assistant principals. Previous research has showed that assistant principal responsibilities and challenges were different based on school settings. Rural school leaders tend to be geographically isolated from their peers and resources (Enomoto, 2012). In contrast, school leaders in urban settings faced challenges in attendance, poverty, resource allocation, neglected school facilities, low academic achievement, and racial/class inequity (Tredway et al., 2007).

With Alabama being a predominately rural state, rural school assistant principals may face challenges bigger than originally perceived. Rural schools tend to be smaller with less funding. Rural school assistant principals may be asked to carry out more responsibilities than their peers in urban and suburban settings. For instance, some rural schools earned only .5 assistant principal units. Assistant principals in these settings may be asked to teach in the classroom one-half of their day due to a lack of local funding. While in the classroom, assistant principal responsibilities continue without the ability to manage them in a timely manner. Many of the specific roles and job responsibilities faced by assistant principals everywhere are similar, however, the findings of this study that overall job satisfaction of rural school assistant principals is lower than those of urban and suburban assistant principals should be considered by school leaders and future research to determine what exactly the differences are and how to address those challenges.

A significant relationship was found for $H_0$3 between gender, age (under 30, 30-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, 51-55, 56-60, or over 60), and race/ethnicity (African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American or Alaska Native, White, or Other). Participant responses were again widely dispersed with a variance of 5.6%. Of the 3 independent variables here, only age was a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction. Predicted overall job satisfaction levels for females were 1.668 higher than males. No direct correlation exists for gender as it was not a significant predictor. Yu-kwong and Walker (2010) also came to the conclusion that there was no difference in the level of job satisfaction between male and female assistant principals.

While race has not been widely studied as a predictor of overall job satisfaction levels for assistant principals, Moore (2013) found that race may have an impact on the overall level of job satisfaction. However, no conclusive evidence was found to support race as a predictor of job satisfaction. In the current study, race/ethnicity was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction either. There were six subgroups to select from in this study. Overwhelmingly, the two predominant subgroups were African American (20.3%) and White (75.6%). Predicted overall level of job satisfaction increased by .725 for each subgroup of race/ethnicity. For this study, African American was coded as 1 and White as 5. Therefore, the predicted overall level of job satisfaction would be 2.900 higher for White assistant principals. Due to the wide variance of responses and because race/ethnicity was not a significant predictor, it cannot be established that White assistant principals were more satisfied than African American assistant principals.

Age was the only significant predictor for this null hypothesis. As age increased overall job satisfaction levels decreased by 1.055 for each subgroup. Findings from the

current study supported the research of Kwan and Walker (2012) that age is a significant predictor of job satisfaction levels. Post Hoc analysis found a significant Mean difference of 4.725 higher for the 30-35 age group than the 46-50 age group. The 30-35 age group represented the second largest participant group for this study. This group, along with the under 30 age group, was new to the assistant principal profession. For many people seeking to enter school leadership, the assistant principalship was the entry level position. It was natural to be excited, eager and grateful to be in the new position.

The 46-50 age group represented an almost equal number of participants (18.4%). Since no participant information was identifiable, the level or years' experience could not be assumed for the 46-50 group. Therefore, it was entirely possible that participants in the 46-50 age group may be new to the profession. Difference motivations for participants in the older group may be that they are considering retirement or moving up the administrative ladder. It may also be possible they felt stuck or overlooked in their current position not being able to move into something new. Age cannot be a consideration when hiring into the assistant principal position, but school leaders should consider the experiences and motivating factors for older assistant principals as they consider professional development and growth of their assistant principals.

Regression analysis of $H_0$4 showed a significant relationship between highest level of education (Masters, Educational Specialist, or Doctorate), years in education (Less than 5, 5-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 36-30, More than 30), years as an assistant principal (3 or less, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12, 13-15, 16-18, 19-21, More than 21), and salary range (Less than $40,000, $40,001-$50,000, $50,001-$60,000, $60,001-$70,000, $70,001-$80,000, More than $80,000; Prefer not to answer). Participants who selected 'Prefer not

to answer' did not want to indicate their salary level but were included in the data analysis. Of the five null hypotheses for this study, $H_0$4 had the highest percentage of variance at 11.4% but this still represents a wide dispersion of responses. Specifically, total years as an assistant principal and salary level were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction while highest level of education and total years in education were not.

Findings from this study paralleled the research of Conrad and Rossser (2007) that showed that the largest number of assistant principals held lower level degrees. A significant relationship was not established between degree level and overall level of job satisfaction. For participants as the level of degree increased the predicted overall level of job satisfaction decreased by .954. Similarly, as total years in education increased the predicted overall level of job satisfaction decreased by .656. In both demographics, a correlation could not be established but only generalized.

Barnett et al. (2012) found that the challenges faced by new versus experienced assistant principals are similar but research on the impact of experience as an assistant principal is limited. For the current study, the relationship between total years as an assistant principal and overall job satisfaction was significant and may need to be studied further due to the limited research in this area. Predicted overall level of job satisfaction decreased by 1.593 for each subgroup of total years as an assistant principal. Post hoc analysis revealed a significant Mean difference 11.869 lower for the 16-18 years group than the 3 or less group. Similar to age being a significant predictor, participants who are first entering administration may have a deeper appreciation for being an assistant principal. Their limited experience may have prevented them from anticipating troubling

or difficult issues. They may also be more satisfied with their salary level as they earn an increase from transitioning from the classroom to administration.

In contrast, participants in the 16-18 group may have been at the point where they desire to move into a different position but their opportunity for promotion has not happened yet. Those who fall into this category may not see themselves as a career assistant principal even though their years leads one to believe these people are career assistant principals. Their experience may have also led them to anticipate issues that cause them to view their work differently. A parallel may exist between total years' experience as an assistant principal and age. If further research confirmed this parallel, significant attention should be paid to assistant principals who are older and/or experienced to help them be more satisfied and be more effective school leaders.

With regard to salary, the findings of the current study supported the prior research of Eadens et al. (2012) that cited salary as a motivator for people to enter the field of administration. This study also supported the research of Fatima (2012) that satisfaction levels were higher for employees whose socio-economic status was higher. Current findings discovered as salary level increased the predicted level of overall job satisfaction increased by 2.398. Post hoc analysis found a significant Mean difference between those in the highest salary group who make $80,000 or more and three other groups. Those in the highest group were 6.925 higher than participants in the $50,001-$60,000 group, 5.383 higher than those in the $60,001-$70,000, and 5.035 higher than those in the $70,001-$80,000 group. An assistant principal's roles and responsibilities are numerous. Some may have felt they have as many responsibilities as the principal yet do not make the same salary. As salary itself is a factor that may lead to job dissatisfaction,

it stood to reason that assistant principals who feel their responsibilities are immense but receive a lower pay than they deserve may be dissatisfied.

For $H_0$5 a relationship was not established for the variables of the career aspirations Return to the classroom, Career Assistant Principal, Principal (Any Level), Central Office Position (not Superintendent), Superintendent, State Department of Education, or Other but Career Assistant Principal was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Again, a low level of variance (3.4%) represents a wide dispersion of responses. Predicted overall job satisfaction levels increased by 1.447 for those who aspire to work in a central office, increased by 1.227 for superintendent, decreased 1.646 for state department of education, and decreased 1.464 for other. Other represented those who aspired to teach at the post-secondary level, retire, or possibly leave the education field altogether. Because none of these aspirations were significant predictors, a correlation cannot be established.

Participants overall job satisfaction level increased .205 for participants who aspired to be a principal. A connection between aspiring to be a principal and job satisfaction was established by Yu-kwong and Walker (2010). Results of the current study do not confirm those findings for the participants even though the predicted overall job satisfaction for participants in this study did increase for principal aspirations. Predicted overall job satisfaction decreased for those who selected return to classroom by 5.135. Even though this area was not found to be a significant predictor during analysis, it is important to note the high level of decrease as compared to all other demographics. Participants who aspire to return to the classroom may exhibit high levels of

dissatisfaction for multiple reasons. This dissatisfaction may lead to poor job performance which may have a negative impact on the school environment.

Data analysis revealed that the aspiration of being a career assistant principal was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. This result supports the prior research of Kwan and Walker (2012) and Hall (2008) that aspiring to be a career assistant principal is a predictor of job satisfaction. Career assistant principals predicted overall job satisfaction increase by 3.523 for this study. Participants with this aspiration may have a firm grasp on what was required of them and knew their roles and responsibilities. Those individuals could have found satisfaction in the work they do and understand the people with whom they worked.

Implications

1. Results suggest that the level of overall job satisfaction cannot be predicted by school type (elementary, middle, elem/middle, high, unit, or other). As such, school leaders who wish to improve the job satisfaction levels of assistant principals in their schools should consider other demographic factors with regard to job satisfaction.
2. Results imply that school setting (rural, urban, or suburban) did impact the level of job satisfaction for assistant principals. The responsibilities and challenges of assistant principals can be different based on school setting (Tredway et al., 2007; Enomoto, 2012). Specifically, assistant principals in rural schools had lower predicted levels of job satisfaction than both urban and suburban assistant principals. Since Alabama is a rural state consisting of many rural schools, school leaders may want to work with assistant principals to identify the specific

challenges their school setting presents. In addition, professional organizations for school leaders and education employees may want to tailor professional development to specifically address the challenges assistant principals face in their setting. Administrative preparation programs, even though limited by state department requirements, may want to find ways to address individual school challenges or create dialogue to better prepare future school leaders for the challenges they may face.

3. Results imply that age does impact the level of job satisfaction for assistant principals. While age cannot be a consideration in hiring and employment, school leaders may want to consider age in providing support for assistant principals. This study does not identify the specific correlation between age and job satisfaction but one does exist. Specifically, there is a significant difference between those who are relatively new to school leadership and those who may be nearing the end of their career. Further research needs to be conducted to understand the specific differences. The impact of age could be experience or motivation. Job satisfaction changes due to age may also be impacted by the individuals own life experiences and how they saw their personal work. Another impact may be the realization that opportunities for promotion could be diminishing or already faded. School leaders may want to compare the experiences of assistant principals to see what factors may positively influence job satisfaction on younger versus older assistant principals.
4. The demographic of total years as an assistant principal was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. A large significant gap existed between

total years of experience as an assistant principal for those who had 3 years or less and those with 16-18. Those new to the profession may have a level of excitement for their new adventure or be pleased with their raise in pay. Assistant principals with many years' experience in the position may have reached a point in their career when opportunities for promotion have passed. It may also be the case that their experiences have taught them how to navigate their position as assistant principal and be more prepared to anticipate issues they may face. Research is extremely limited in this area. School leaders may want to work with more experienced assistant principals to determine the areas and types of support for new or less experienced assistant principals. Proper support and training of new and less experienced assistant principals may increase their job satisfaction and help them to be stronger school leaders.

5. Results imply that salary is a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Assistant principals who made less than they feel they deserve may feel resentment if they start comparing their own work load with others. They may see the work load of their job as significantly higher than someone with a similar salary. They may also see their salary as lower than someone else with an equal or even lesser work load. School leaders may want to consider the type of responsibilities and amount of work assistant principals regularly complete. Salary increases for assistant principals may be limited by funding. However, this is an area that may need to be considered on a case-by-case situation according to job responsibilities.
6. Results suggest that the level of overall job satisfaction cannot be predicted by career aspirations. Aspiring to be a career assistant principal was a predictor of

job satisfaction, but this is only one of many possible aspirations. Assistant principals who aspire to be career assistants may have accepted the work they do, the people they work with, and have found their calling which may lead to a higher level of job satisfaction. In contrast, assistant principals who aspire to return to the classroom may be dissatisfied with their job. These individuals should be recognized by school leaders in order to either identify their challenges in order to provide professional development to support them or help them transition back into the classroom. Either way, an assistant principal who does not want to be in that position may have a negative impact on the school. School leaders may want to consider the aspirations of individual assistant principals to provide support in specific areas.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following questions and suggestions should be considered for further study:

1. What challenges are unique for assistant principals in rural, urban, and suburban schools and what supports can be implemented to address those challenges?
2. To what degree is the level of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals impacted by age?
3. What is the correlation between assistant principal salary level and job satisfaction? How does the salary and workload of assistant principals compare to other school leaders?
4. How does the level of overall job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama school schools compare to the same measure of assistant principals in other states?

5. A study could be conducted to better understand the types of professional development assistant principals are receiving and whether or not this support impacts job satisfaction.
6. As college administrative preparatory programs prepare students to be instructional leaders, the focus and requirements of the programs is to prepare students to be instructional leaders. Since the role of assistant principal tends to be more varied and inclusive, should more time be spent specifically preparing students for the role of assistant principal? Also, administrative preparatory programs may want to consider as part of the curriculum to focus more on the unique challenges that a school setting may present for assistant principals.

Concluding Thoughts

The gaps of research that exist for assistant principals in the state of Alabama along with the professional experiences of the researcher led to the development and implementation of this study. Findings of this study supported existing research and paralleled the few prior studies of assistant principals. It came as little surprise to find that for assistant principals in Alabama public schools school setting, age, salary, total years' experience as an assistant principal, and aspiring to be a career assistant principal were significant predictors of job satisfaction levels. Professional conversations and personal experiences of this study's researcher also parallel the findings of this study.

The challenges facing assistant principals truly are unique in the school setting. Challenges faced by an assistant principal in rural Alabama may be completely different than the challenges faced by an assistant principal in urban Alabama. College preparatory programs and system professional development plans may want to focus more on the

specific needs of each school setting. With age comes experience. What we do with those experiences sometimes determines how we face issues and look at life which in turn impacts of levels of satisfaction. It is possible that age and total years' experience as an assistant principal go hand-in-hand. Life experiences along with professional experiences many times determine our outlook on life. Mentoring relationships within the assistant principal profession may have a positive impact on job satisfaction for all ages and experience levels of assistant principals.

Lastly, salary may be the most influential yet hardest to address area of job satisfaction. From experience and professional conversations, many assistant principals feel overworked and underpaid. They see their time investment equal to or surpassing other people with higher salaries and similar responsibilities. At the same time, funding limitations in education make it difficult to change the current salary structures in many school systems. Further research should delve into the specific factors that influence assistant principal job satisfaction. Professional development and preparatory programs should place more emphasis on preparing and supporting individuals in the unique challenges of being an assistant principal. Job satisfaction is important in any profession. Assistant principals are no different and as they are the future leaders of education, the issues impacting their job satisfaction should be acknowledged and addressed in order to build the strongest educational leaders possible.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Allanach, R. (2002). A tale of two schools. *Principal Leadership: High School Edition, 2*(9), 6-9.

Armstrong, D. E. (2015). Listening to voices at the educational frontline: New administrators' experiences of the transition from teacher to vice-principal. *Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 24*(2), 109-122.

Barnett, B. G., Shoho, A. R., & Oleszewski, A. M. (2012). The job realities of beginning and experienced assistant principals. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 11*(1), 92-128. doi: 10.1080/15700763.2011.611924

Bartholomew, S. K., Melendez-Delaney, G., Orta, A., & White, S. (2005). Untapped resources: Assistant principals as instructional leaders. *Principal Leadership, 5*(9), 22-26.

Brodke, M. R. H., Sliter, M. T., Balzer, W. K., Gillespie, J. Z., Gillespie, M. A., Gopalkrishnan, P., . . . Yankelevich, M. (2009). The job descriptive index and job in general: Quick reference guide. Bowling Green State University.

Capelluti, J., & Nye, K. (2005). The principal as salesperson. *Principal Leadership: Middle Level Edition, 5*(8), 8-8.

Colwell, C., & Potter, L. (2013). So you want to be the principal? *Principal Leadership, 14*(4), 48-50.

Conrad, T. L., & Rosser, V. J. (2007). Examining the satisfaction of educational leaders and their intent to pursue career advancement in public school administration. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*(5), 570-600.

Cooke, W. D., & Licciardi, C. (2007). Principals' salaries, 2006-2007. *Principal, 86*(5), 46-50.

Cooke, W. D., & Licciardi, C. (2008). Principals' salaries, 2007-2008. *Principal, 87*(5), 46-51.

Cooke, W. D., & Licciardi, C. (2009). Principals' salaries, 2008-2009. *Principal, 88*(5), 27-30.

Curry, T. M. (2009). *Administrator's perceptions of mentoring programs for new assistant principals.* (Doctor of Education), Georgia Southern University.

Dansby, M., Jefferson-Isaac, S., Klipp, J., McMichael, S., & Yates, A. (2016, 2016/05//May/Jun2016). *What assistant principals think.*

Danzig, A., Zhang, J., & You, B.-k. (2005). Learning to be an education leader: How a web-based course meets some of the challenges of leadership training and development. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly, 3*(1), 25-38.

Davis, J. (2008). Assisting the assistant principal. *Principal Leadership: High School Edition, 9*(2), 6-7.

Drago-Severson, E., & Aravena, J. L. (2011). The power of connectivity. *Journal of Staff Development, 32*(2), 50-53.

Duke, D. L. (2010). *The challenges of school district leadership*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Eadens, D., Bruner, D., & Black, W. (2012). The intentions of Florida educational leadership graduate students to pursue administrative positions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 7*(1).

Enomoto, E. K. (2012). Professional development for rural school assistant principals. *Planning & Changing, 43*(3/4), 260-279.

Fatima, Q. (2012). A study of the effectiveness of socio-economic conditions on job satisfaction of secondary school seachers. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Education, 2*(1), 259-266.

Flanary, D. (2009). Building leadership capacity. *Principal Leadership, 10*(4), 60-62.

Frascone, A. C. (2011). Climate change. *Leadership, 41*(2), 34-35.

Fraser, J., & Brock, B. L. (2006). Catholic school principal job satisfaction: Keys to retention and recruitment. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice, 9*(4), 425-440.

Gale, T. (2010). Social inquiry and social action: Priorities for preparing school leaders. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly, 4*(4), 316-318.

Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2009). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (Eighth ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Gurley, D. K., Peters, G. B., Fifolt, M., Collins, L., & McNeese, R. (2015). Addressing the multiplicity of roles of the assistant principal: Insights from the field. *Journal of Behavioural and Social Sciences, 3*, 135-147.

Hall, B. F. (2008). *Job satisfaction experienced by career assistant principals in the state of Georgia.* Georgia Southern University. Retrieved from digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd (278)

Houchens, G. W. (2012). The ritual 'hazing' of assistant principals. *School Administrator, 69*(11), 14-15.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th edition ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jackson, D. (2015). Twists and turns on the road to where I am today. *Journal of Staff Development, 36*(5), 67-67.

Johnson-Taylor, C. & Martin, M. B. (2007). Next in line. *Principal Leadership: High School Edition, 7*(8), 22-25.

Kersten, T. A., & Kersten, J. R. (2006). Career development: Have you considered school administration? *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 42*(3), 120-123.

Konan, N. (2013). Relationship between locus of control and problem-solving skills of high school administrators. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Education, 3*(3), 786-794.

Kwan, P., & Walker, A. (2012). Linking vice-principals' perceptions of responsibilities, job satisfaction and career aspirations. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM)), 40*(1), 3-17.

Leonard, L. (2008). Preserving the learning environment: Leadership for time. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning, 12*(16).

Moore, D. C. (2013). Race specialists: What a black administrator ought to be and do. *Journal of School Leadership, 23*(3), 490-510.

Munoz, M., & Barber, H. (2011). Assistant principals in high-stakes accountability environments: The effects of job attributes and school characteristics. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 23*(2), 12.

Nieuwenhuizen, L. M. (2011). *Understanding complex role of the assistant principal in secondary schools.* ProQuest LLC. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED550667&site=ehost-liveRetrieved from http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqm&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:3535659 Available from EBSCOhost eric database.

Norton, M. S. (2008). *Human resources administration for educational leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Osabutey-Aguedje, T. (2015). The drive to strive: An assistant principal reflects on a career built on constant learning. *Journal of Staff Development, 36*(5), 30-33.

Peters, G. B., Gurley, D. K., Fifolt, M., Collins, L., & McNeese, R. (2016). Assistant principals' perceptions regarding the role and the effectiveness of an educational leadership program. *International Journal of Higher Education, 5*(1), 183-199.

Purpose - Job Descriptive Index - BGSU. Retrieved from http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/psych/io/jdi/index.html

Robinson, J., Horan, L., & Nanavati, M. (2009). Creating a mentoring coaching culture for Ontario school leaders. *Adult Learning, 20*(1-2), 35-38.

Schroder, R. (2008). Job satisfaction of employees at a Christian university. *Journal of Research on Christian Education, 17*(2), 225-246. doi: 10.1080/10656210802433467

Shillingstad, S. L. (2011). Balancing life roles as a leader: An interview with Dr. Melissa Byington. *Part of a special issue: Models of Leadership* (Vol. 77, pp. 37-39).

Shoho, A. R., & Barnett, B. G. (2010). The realities of new principals: Challenges, joys, and sorrows. *Journal of School Leadership, 20*(5), 561-596.

Smerek, R. E., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a University. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(2), 229-250. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9042-3

Sodoma, B., & Else, D. (2009). Job satisfaction of Iowa public school principals. *Rural Educator, 31*(1), 10-18.

Stanton, D. J., IV. (2012). *A hermeneutical phenomenological study of the role of new secondary school assistant principals.* (Doctor of Education), Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA.

Swenson, P. W. (2009). Learning from the best. *Part of a special issue: Leadership for a Changing World, 39*(1), 34-37.

Taylor, J. R. (2007). *Job satisfaction among high school assistant principals in seven Florida counties.* (Doctor of Education), University of South Florida.

Thornton, B., Peltier, G., & Medina, R. (2007). Reducing the special education teacher shortage. *Clearing House, 80*(5), 233-238. doi: 10.3200/TCHS.80.5.233-238

Tredway, L., Brill, F., & Hernandez, J. (2007). Taking off the cape: The stories of novice urban leadership. *Theory Into Practice, 46*(3), 212-221. doi: 10.1080/14241270701402181

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3), 411-434.

Walton, E. (2012). The instructional capacitor. *Principal Leadership, 12*(8), 54-56.

Williams, A. R. (2004). Principals' salaries, 2003-04. *Principal, 83*(5), 48-53.

Williams, A. R. (2005). Principals' salaries, 2004-05. *Principal, 84*(5), 45-50.

Williams, A. R. (2006). Principals' salaries, 2005-2006. *Principal, 85*(5), 45-49.

Yu-kwong, P. K., & Walker, A. (2010). Secondary school vice-principals: Commitment, challenge, efficacy and synchrony. *British Educational Research Journal, 36*(4), 531-548. doi: 10.1080/01411920903018026

APPENDIX A

JDI AND JIG PERMISSION

JOB DESCRIPTION INDEX

Home [/] / College of Arts and Sciences [/arts-and-sciences.html] / Psychology [/arts-and-sciences/psychology.html] / Services [/arts-and-sciences/psychology/services.html] / Job Description Index

Job Descriptive Index and related scales

Thank you for your interest in the Job Descriptive Index and related scales, owned by Bowling Green State University. This is the official home of the Job Descriptive Index, Job In General, Stress In General, and Trust in Management.

Obtaining and using the Job Descriptive Index and related scales

The JDI and related scales are frequently used by academic researchers and workplace professionals as a means of measuring employee attitudes such as job satisfaction. These scales are easy to administer, easy to read, simple in format, and scores may be compared to those from a nationally-representative sample of United States workers.

You can download the JDI and related scales, free of charge, for use in your research study or workplace development project. DOWNLOAD NOW! [https://webapp.bgsu.edu/jdi/]

About the scales

For more than 50 years, the Job Descriptive Index and related scales have been continually developed and refined by the university's noted Job Descriptive Index Research Group. Comprised of numerous faculty members and Ph.D. students, members of the research group have used their expertise in psychology, scientific research methods, and organizational behavior to study workplace attitudes and behaviors using these scales. To encourage the use of the scales, the scales are available for you to use free of charge. Products and services related to our scales are available for purchase, and proceeds help to fund efforts in the future.

- The **Job Descriptive Index** is designed to measure employees' satisfaction with their jobs. The JDI is a "facet" measure of job satisfaction, meaning that participants are asked to think about specific facets of their job and rate their satisfaction with those specific facets. The JDI is comprised of five facets, including satisfaction with: coworkers, the work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, and supervision.
- The **Job In General** is also designed to measure employees' satisfaction with their jobs. The JIG is a measure of global satisfaction, meaning that participants are asked to think about how satisfied they are with their job in a broad, overall sense.
- The **Abridged Job Descriptive Index** and **Abridged Job in General** are shortened versions of the original scales. The abridged versions maintain adequate reliability, while reducing the administration time.
- The **Stress in General** is designed to measure employees' general level of workplace stress. Participants are asked to think about whether or not particular stress-related descriptors are characteristic of their job.
- The **Trust in Management** is designed to measure employees' feelings of trust toward senior management in their organization. Analysis of the scale revealed four factors (components) of trust: ability, benevolence, consistency, and integrity.

User's Manuals, Automated Scoring Services, Norm-Referenced Scoring, and other services

It is strongly recommended that researchers and workplace professionals acquire the Quick Reference Guide prior to administering the JDI or other scales. These documents describe the development, validity, and reliability of the scales, as well as the proper administration, scoring, and interpretation of the scales. We offer solutions that can help you quickly recode your data for interpretation (automated scoring) and even compare scores from your sample to scores obtained from a large-scale, nationally-representative sample of United States workers (norm-referenced scoring).

Please visit our Secure Website (https://commerce.cashnet.com/BGSUPSY) to order these resources or contact the JDI Office (/arts-and-sciences/psychology/services/job-descriptive-index/contact-us.html) with any inquiry or to speak with us about your project.

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Assistant Principal,

My name is Mr. James A. Rainey, Jr., and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Alabama at Birmingham majoring in Educational Leadership. As a requirement for completion of my EdD degree, I am working on a dissertation entitled, "A Quantitative Study of Job Satisfaction of Assistant Principals in Alabama Public Schools."

The study will require input from currently employed assistant principals in Alabama public schools through an online, web-based survey. At no time will any assistant principal, principal, superintendent, school, or school district be identified in any way.

Here is a link to the survey for assistant principals:
https://uab.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yX5wjL7uRvDZOd

The input in this study will help us understand the level of job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama public schools. This information may help develop assistant principals who are better prepared to move into higher leadership roles.

Participation in this research study is voluntary and may be completed online at your convenience from any computer with an Internet connection. The online survey will take between 8-10 minutes complete. It will consist first of demographic questions. The second part of the survey will ask for responses regarding 6 areas of job satisfaction. All responses will be confidential and will be used only for this study. You may end your participation by not completing the survey. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

The findings of this research may be used for publications in the future. Your identity and the identity of your institution will be protected in the reporting of results. In fact, data provided cannot be linked to individuals or school districts, thereby ensuring your confidentiality.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this study and/or would like a summary of the final report, please contact James (Jami) A. Rainey, Jr. at (205) 412-0023 or jarainey@uab.edu.

If you have questions about research participant rights, or concerns/complaints about the research, you may also contact the Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use (OIRB) at the University of Alabama at Birmingham at (205) 934-3789 or toll-free 1-855-860-3789. Regular hours for the Office of the IRB are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. CT, Monday through Friday. The protocol number for this study is E141208004.

Thank you for your willingness to participate. If you consent to take this survey you may begin now. Again, here is a link to the survey for assistant principals:
https://uab.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yX5wjL7uRvDZOd

Sincerely,
James A. Rainey, Jr.

APPENDIX C

E-MAIL REQUESTING PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY

Initial e-mail to superintendents and principals:

Dear Superintendents and Principals,

My name is Mr. James A. Rainey, Jr., and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Alabama at Birmingham majoring in Educational Leadership. As a requirement for completion of my EdD degree, I am working on a dissertation entitled, "A Quantitative Study of Job Satisfaction of Assistant Principals in Alabama Public Schools."

The study will require input from currently employed assistant principals in Alabama public schools through an online, web-based survey. I would be very grateful if you would encourage assistant principals in your district and schools to participate in this anonymous survey. At no time will any assistant principal, principal, superintendent, school, or school district be identified in any way.

Attached to this e-mail is a recruitment letter for assistant principals which includes an explanation of the study, a link to the survey, and Informed Consent. Thank you for encouraging your assistant principals to participate in this study. If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this study and/or would like a summary of the final report, please contact James (Jami) A. Rainey, Jr. at (205) 412-0023 or jarainey@uab.edu.

Thank you for your assistance,

James A. Rainey, Jr.

Dear Assistant Principal,

My name is Mr. James A. Rainey, Jr., and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Alabama at Birmingham majoring in Educational Leadership. As a requirement for completion of my EdD degree, I am working on a dissertation entitled, "A Quantitative Study of Job Satisfaction of Assistant Principals in Alabama Public Schools."

The study will require input from currently employed assistant principals in Alabama public schools through an online, web-based survey. At no time will any assistant principal, principal, superintendent, school, or school district be identified in any way.

Here is a link to the survey for assistant principals:
https://uab.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yX5wjL7uRvDZOd

The input in this study will help us understand the level of job satisfaction for assistant principals in Alabama public schools. This information may help develop assistant principals who are better prepared to move into higher leadership roles.

Participation in this research study is voluntary and may be completed online at your convenience from any computer with an Internet connection. The online survey will take between 8-10 minutes complete. It will consist first of demographic questions. The second part of the survey will ask for responses regarding 6 areas of job satisfaction. All responses will be confidential and will be used only for this study. You may end your participation by not completing the survey. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

The findings of this research may be used for publications in the future. Your identity and the identity of your institution will be protected in the reporting of results. In fact, data provided cannot be linked to individuals or school districts, thereby ensuring your confidentiality.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this study and/or would like a summary of the final report, please contact James (Jami) A. Rainey, Jr. at (205) 412-0023 or jarainey@uab.edu.

If you have questions about research participant rights, or concerns/complaints about the research, you may also contact the Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use (OIRB) at the University of Alabama at Birmingham at (205) 934-3789 or toll-free 1-855-860-3789. Regular hours for the Office of the IRB are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. CT, Monday through Friday. The protocol number for this study is E141208004.

Thank you for your willingness to participate. If you consent to take this survey you may begin now. Again, here is a link to the survey for assistant principals: https://uab.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yX5wjL7uRvDZOd

Sincerely,

James A. Rainey, Jr.

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP E-MAILS

First follow-up e-mail:

Dear Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, and Colleagues,

Please help! Recently, I sent you information about a research study on assistant principal job satisfaction I am conducting for my dissertation. I need more responses! If you are a superintendent, principal, or education employee other than an assistant principal please forward this e-mail to any and all assistant principals.

If you are an assistant principal, please click on https://uab.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yX5wjL7uRvDZOd to participate in this study. The survey only takes 8-10 minutes and will help understand how satisfied assistant principals are with their jobs. If you've already completed the survey I THANK YOU IMMENSELY!!! If you have not yet completed the survey, I THANK YOU IMMENSELY in advance for clicking on https://uab.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6yX5wjL7uRvDZOd and taking the survey. Your input is greatly valued and appreciated!!!!

Thank you,
James A. Rainey, Jr.

Final follow-up e-mail:

Dear Superintendents, Principals, Assistant Principals, and Colleagues,

I recently sent two e-mails about research I am conducting on assistant principal job satisfaction. If you've already forwarded this link or completed the survey I THANK YOU IMMENSELY!!! If you have not yet completed the survey, I THANK YOU IMMENSELY in advance for clicking on xxxxx and taking the survey. If you are a superintendent, principal, or education employee other than an assistant principal please forward this e-mail to any and all assistant principals. If you are an assistant principal, please click on xxxxx to participate in this study. The survey only takes 8-10 minutes and will help understand how satisfied assistant principals are with their jobs. Your input is greatly valued and appreciated!!!!

Thank you,
James A. Rainey, Jr.

APPENDIX E

ELECTRONIC SURVEY

Default Block

A Quantitative Study of Job Satisfaction of Assistant Principals in Alabama Public Schools
Demographic and Job Satisfaction Survey

Select the type of school in which you currently work.

- Elementary School
- Elementary/Middle School
- Middle School
- High School
- Unit School
- Other

Select your current school setting

- Rural
- Urban
- Suburban

Your gender

Male

Female

Your age

- Under 30
- 30-35
- 36-40
- 41-45
- 46-50
- 51-55
- 56-60
- Over 60

Your race/ethnicity

- African American
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Native American of Alaska Native
- White
- Other

Your highest education degree

- Masters
- Ed.S.
- Ed.D. / Ph. D.

Your total number of years in education

Less than 5	5-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Your total number of years being an assistant principal

3 or less	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21	More than 21
○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Your current salary range

- ○ Less than $40,000
- ○ $40,001 - $50,000
- ○ $50,001 - $60,000
- ○ $60,001 - $70,000
- ○ $70,001 - $80,000
- ○ More than $80,000
- ○ Prefer not to answer

Your career aspirations (check all that apply)

- ☐ Return to the classroom
- ☐ Career Assistant Principal
- ☐ Principal (any level)
- ☐ Central Office Position (not superintendent)
- ☐ Superintendent

- [ ] State Department of Education
- [ ] Other

The following 6 question sets are taken from the Job Descriptive Index and The Job in General Scale to measure levels of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Please select the appropriate responses for each set.

Work on Present Job

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work?

Select "Yes" if it describes your work.
Select "No" if it does not describe your work.
Select "?" if you cannot decide.

	Yes	No	?
Fascinating	○	○	○
Routine	○	○	○
Satisfying	○	○	○
Boring	○	○	○
Good	○	○	○
Gives sense of accomplishment	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Respected	○	○	○
Exciting	○	○	○
Rewarding	○	○	○
Useful	○	○	○
Challenging	○	○	○
Simple	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Repetitive	○	○	○
Creative	○	○	○

Dull	○	○	○
Uninteresting	○	○	○
Can see results	○	○	○
Uses my abilities	○	○	○

Pay

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

Select "Yes" if it describes your work.
Select "No" if it does not describe your work.
Select "?" if you cannot decide.

	Yes	No	?
Income adequate for normal expenses	○	○	○
Fair	○	○	○
Barely live on income	○	○	○
Bad	○	○	○
Comfortable	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Less than I deserve	○	○	○
Well paid	○	○	○
Enough to live on	○	○	○
Underpaid	○	○	○

Opportunities for Promotion

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these?

Select "Yes" if it describes your work.
Select "No" if it does not describe your work.
Select "?" if you cannot decide.

	Yes	No	?

Good opportunities for promotion	○	○	○
Opportunities somewhat limited	○	○	○
Promotion on ability	○	○	○
Dead-end job	○	○	○
Good chance for promotion	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Very limited	○	○	○
Infrequent promotions	○	○	○
Regular promotions	○	○	○
Fairly good chance for promotion	○	○	○

Supervision

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this?

Select "Yes" if it describes your work.
Select "No" if it does not describe your work.
Select "?" if you cannot decide.

	Yes	No	?
Supportive	○	○	○
Hard to please	○	○	○
Impolite	○	○	○
Praises good work	○	○	○
Tactful	○	○	○
Influential	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Up-to-date	○	○	○
Unkind	○	○	○
Has favorites	○	○	○
Tells me where I stand	○	○	○
Annoying	○	○	○

Stubborn	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Knows job well	○	○	○
Bad	○	○	○
Intelligent	○	○	○
Poor planner	○	○	○
Around when needed	○	○	○
Lazy	○	○	○

People on your present job

Think of the majority of people with whom you work or meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words of phrases describe these people?

Select "Yes" if it describes your work.
Select "No" if it does not describe your work.
Select "?" if you cannot decide.

	Yes	No	?
Stimulating	○	○	○
Boring	○	○	○
Slow	○	○	○
Helpful	○	○	○
Stupid	○	○	○
Responsible	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Likeable	○	○	○
Intelligent	○	○	○
Easy to make enemies	○	○	○
Rude	○	○	○
Smart	○	○	○
Lazy	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Unpleasant	○	○	○
Supportive	○	○	○
Active	○	○	○

Narrow interests	○	○	○
Frustrating	○	○	○
Stubborn	○	○	○

Job in General

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time?

Select "Yes" if it describes your work.
Select "No" if it does not describe your work.
Select "?" if you cannot decide.

	Yes	No	?
Pleasant	○	○	○
Bad	○	○	○
Great	○	○	○
Waste of time	○	○	○
Good	○	○	○
Undesirable	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Worthwhile	○	○	○
Worse than most	○	○	○
Acceptable	○	○	○
Superior	○	○	○
Better than most	○	○	○
Disagreeable	○	○	○
	Yes	No	?
Makes me content	○	○	○
Inadequate	○	○	○
Excellent	○	○	○
Rotten	○	○	○
Enjoayble	○	○	○
Poor	○	○	○

APPENDIX F

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM

Institutional Review Board for Human Use

Form 4: IRB Approval Form
Identification and Certification of Research
Projects Involving Human Subjects

UAB's Institutional Review Boards for Human Use (IRBs) have an approved Federalwide Assurance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP). The Assurance number is FWA00005960 and it expires on January 24, 2017. The UAB IRBs are also in compliance with 21 CFR Parts 50 and 56.

Principal Investigator: RAINEY, JAMES A

Co-Investigator(s):

Protocol Number: **E141208004**

Protocol Title: *A Quantitative Study of Job Satisfaction of Assistant Principals in Alabama Public Schools*

The above project was reviewed on 1/28/15. The review was conducted in accordance with UAB's Assurance of Compliance approved by the Department of Health and Human Services. This project qualifies as an exemption as defined in 45CF46.101, paragraph 1.

This project received EXEMPT review.

IRB Approval Date: 1/28/15

Date IRB Approval Issued: 1/28/15

Cari Oliver
Assistant Director, Office of the
Institutional Review Board for Human Use
(IRB)

Investigators please note:

IRB approval is given for one year unless otherwise noted. For projects subject to annual review research activities may not continue past the one year anniversary of the IRB approval date.

Any modifications in the study methodology, protocol and/or consent form must be submitted for review and approval to the IRB prior to implementation.

Adverse Events and/or unanticipated risks to subjects or others at UAB or other participating institutions must be reported promptly to the IRB.

470 Administration Building
701 20th Street South
205.934.3789
Fax 205.934.1301
irb@uab.edu

The University of
Alabama at Birmingham
Mailing Address:
AB 470
1720 2ND AVE S
BIRMINGHAM AL 35294-0104