STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2006

A Comparison Of Mentored And Non-mentored Novice Elementary Principals In Respect To Job Satisfaction

Colleen Skinner
University of Central Florida

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd

University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

A COMPARISON OF MENTORED AND NON-MENTORED NOVICE
ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS IN RESPECT TO JOB SATISFACTION

by

COLLEEN H. SKINNER
B.A. University of Central Florida, 1986
M.S. Nova Southeastern University, 1993

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

Fall Term
2006

Major Professors: George E. Pawlas
                    Stephen A. Sivo

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if mentoring programs had an impact on job satisfaction for beginning elementary principals in the state of Florida. It also examined if the following factors impacted job satisfaction: (a) length of the mentoring program, (b) frequency of meetings, (c) selection process for the mentor, (d) the position of the mentor, or (e) age and gender of the beginning principal. The population for the study consisted of 108 elementary principals with more than six months and less than fours years of experience in the state of Florida. Twenty-four districts participated in the study, covering all five regional areas in Florida.

An online questionnaire, consisting of Bowling Green State University's Job Description Index and Job in General, was administered. The Job Description Index contained five subcategories of Work, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People at Work. The instrument Job in General provided an overall job satisfaction rating.

An analysis of the Pearson Correlation found there was no statistically significant relationship for those who were in a mentor program compared to those who were not in a mentor program as a beginning principal. However, a Pearson Correlation found a statistically significant relationship between the frequency a mentor met with the beginning principal and job satisfaction in four subcategories: (a) Supervision, (b) Promotion, (c) Pay and (d) People at Work. There was also a significant relationship between the frequency of meeting with a mentor and the Job in General score.

Additional analysis showed no statistically significant difference based on the length of the mentoring program, age and gender of the beginning principal, and the position held by the mentor.

Recommendations based on this study include providing a formal mentoring program with established guidelines for the frequency of meetings. A school district may design mentor programs to meet the needs of their beginning principals, but close attention should be given to guidelines ensuring regular contact between the mentors and beginning principals. Future studies may continue the research into other factors of mentoring, such as whether a reporting system is in place or follow-up is required by the mentor. Also, this study may be replicated with secondary principals or expanded beyond the state of Florida.

To Jeff, my husband, for his love and support, and our children, Kailey, Alex, Shevon, and Michelle, for reminding me of what truly matters in life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincerest appreciation goes to my dissertation team who assisted throughout this process. To Dr. George Pawlas, my University of Central Florida advisor and co-chair for this dissertation, I offer my heartfelt gratitude for the many times we met to discuss this study, and for his guidance throughout the past four years. His manner of working with graduate students is inspiring to educators who have the privilege of working with him.

To Dr. Stephen Sivo, who co-chaired the dissertation committee and helped me to understand the world of statistics, I offer my deepest appreciation for providing his expertise and guidance through this process. His ability to share information in a collegial manner helped make this process a positive experience.

To Dr. Kenneth Murray and Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, members of the dissertation committee, I thank each of them for their valuable input and assistance in the development of this study.

Thank you to the many Florida district superintendents who provided the resources and access to information for this dissertation.

Thank you to the administrators who participated in this study. Their willingness to be forthcoming in their answers provided the basis for this study.

This journey was inspired by the many educators I have had the privilege of knowing and working with in recent years. Thank you to those who provided input into this study, encouraged me along the way, and shared their insights on leadership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

The principalship is a complex, multi-faceted role which focuses on educational

leadership of the school with increasingly difficult student achievement standards (Crow,

Hausman, & Scribner, 2002). Researchers confirm educational leadership is a necessary

driving force for school improvement efforts (Educational Research Service, 1985;

Fullan, 1985; Haberman & Dill, 1999; Rutherford, 1985). Although school-based

decision making and strong leadership is a critical part of a successful school, Zellner,

Ward, McNamara, Gideon, Camacho and Edgewood (2002) touted the principal as one of

the "loneliest jobs in town." (p. 3) The role of the principal has expanded from simply

managing schools to high-stakes in student achievement and accountability, fundraising,

and cultivating business partnerships (Usdan, 2004; Winston, 2002). A research-based

study by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) correlated the effect of school leadership

on student test scores.

Quinn (2002) drew a bleak picture related to the lack of qualified candidates for

the school leadership position to fill vacancies created from administrators reaching

retirement age. The situation has reached the crisis stage and the immediate shortfall is a

reality for education. Leaders need to be cultivated and assisted in school administration;

training for new administrators must be addressed by school districts and state leaders.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals surveyed its members in 2002

and found that 66% of the responding principals planned to retire in the following six to

ten years (National Association of Elementary School Principals, n.d.). Diane Curtis

(2002) wrote and posted on a website:

> Just as the sink-or-swim method often delays mastery of the job for
>
> teachers, it can also impeded the success and job satisfaction for
>
> principals. Recognizing the need for a sympathetic ear and voice of
>
> experience, many principals are seeking mentors on their own
>
> since the number of formal mentor programs is still relatively
>
> small (Section 3).

According to Vincent Ferrandino, Executive Director of the National Association

of Elementary School Principals, the role of the principalship has significantly increased

in the demands of responsibilities and commitment of time (Winston, 2002). Kelley and

Peterson (2001) characterized the position of the principal as concision, multiplicity and

fragmented tasks. Decisions are made in a matter of minutes to ensure the safety of

students; various problems arise each day, and often a new situation occurs before the

tasks from a previous crisis can be completed. Administrators often come to the job

unprepared, and internships are cited as the least effectual component of administrative

training programs (Donaldson, 2004).

Hammond, Muffs, & Sciascia (2001) declared if the principalship and its

responsibilities were not so overwhelming, then principals would have a greater level of

satisfaction and fewer vacancies in the principalship would arise. Commitment to professional development and training for principals in all areas of their position is necessary for them to be effective (Petzko, Clark, Valentine, Hackmann, Nori, & Lucas, 2002). Evans (1996) pointed out the level of stress and the intensity of the job of the principal has grown. Mentor programs may provide principals with an opportunity to develop the capacity to handle the multi-faceted job of the principalship (Lovely, 2004). Mentoring can accelerate the rate of learning for new principals (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). It also assists new principals in dealing with the stress and accountability that now faces school leaders (Gallegos, 1999).

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study</div>

In previous studies by Thornton (1996), Neal (2002), and Border (2004), the job of the assistant principal was examined to determine the degree of job satisfaction among assistant principals in Florida. Thornton found that job satisfaction for the Central Florida middle school assistant principals was impacted by their coworkers, responsibilities of their job, and their level of supervision. Neal determined that job satisfaction would be positively impacted if there was an offering of staff development for assistant principals, and an increase in positive interactions with peers, students, and teachers. Border concluded that assistant principals were generally satisfied with their jobs, and the level of supervision they had was the strongest area of job satisfaction. The amount of experience had a negative correlation to job satisfaction (Border).

This study was conducted to determine if a relationship exists between mentoring programs for beginning elementary principals in Florida and job satisfaction. The following three key attributes of a mentor program were analyzed to determine if they had a statistically significant impact on job satisfaction: (a) how often the mentor communicated with the beginning principal, (b) the mode of communication between the mentor and beginning principal, and (c) how the mentor was selected to work with the novice principal. This study sought to determine if age or gender of the beginning principal had an impact on job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

An impending principal shortage and the difficulty of the principalship in 21st century schools make it necessary for school districts to provide effective programs for support and professional development to build school leaders. Beginning principals must have a vast range of knowledge and be able to make decisions which will foster learning. Time is limited for school administrators, and providing effective programs to support them maximizes the school districts' resources.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to guide this study:

1. What is the relationship between mentoring programs for beginning elementary principals and their level of job satisfaction?

2. What difference exists among principals with varying degrees of mentoring in terms of reported job satisfaction?

3. Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job satisfaction between those who chose their mentor and those who were assigned a mentor principal?

4. Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job satisfaction for those who were mentored by an immediate supervisor, mentor practicing principal, or other professional?

5. What impact do gender and age have on the new principal's rating of job satisfaction?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, commonly used terms are defined as follows.

Assistant Principal: The official title of a school administrator as defined by school districts. The assistant principal supports and works under the direction of the school principal in managing and leading a school.

Beginning or Novice Principal: A principal who has been in the principalship for less than four years.

Colleagues: Peers who work in the same profession and are at the same level in their job.

Job Description Index: Job satisfaction questionnaire developed by Bowling Green State University (Balzer et al., 1997). The Job Description Index has five facets: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People at Work.

Job in General: A scale which provides a rating for overall satisfaction with a job. It is used in conjunction with the Job Description Index (Balzer et al., 1997)

Job Satisfaction: A general feeling or attitude towards the job (Brayfield, Wells, & Strate, 1957).

Mentee: Person who is the "learner" in the mentoring relationship (Kerka, 1998).

Mentor: Individual who holds experience and knowledge and works with others to develop their skills (Cohen, 1995).

Mentoring: A relationship in which an experienced person provides guidance and support to a less experienced person (Haney, 1997).

Opportunities for Promotion: A subcategory of the Job Description Index which refers to advancement possibilities within the organization.

Pay: A subcategory for the Job Description Index that describes the monetary compensation for the job.

People at Work: A subcategory that refers to the coworkers of the employee. This may include subordinates as well as peers.

Principal: Person whose main responsibility is to serve as the educational and instructional leader of the school (Brayfield, Wells, & Strate, 1957; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

Protégé: Person who is being mentored.

Purposive Sampling: Selecting participants based on specific characteristics.

Supervision: A subcategory of the Job Description Index which refers to the boss or manager of the employees.

Work on Present Job or Present Job: A subcategory of the Job Description Index referring to the requirements and conditions of the job.

Study Design

Florida elementary principals with less than four years of experience were surveyed through an online questionnaire using the Job Description Index, with permission granted by Bowling Green State Univeristy. Scale scores were determined for the areas of Work on Present Job, Opportunities for Promotion, Pay, Supervision, and People at Work. A Job in General score was identified for each respondent. Demographic information was also gathered as part of the survey.

Twenty-four school districts from each of the five regions designated by the Florida Department of Education participated in the study. The following counties were represented in the study: Alachua, Brevard, Collier, Columbia, Escambia, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Holmes, Jackson, Lake, Leon, Manatee, Marion, Martin, Osceola, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, Santa Rosa, Seminole, Sumter, Volusia, Walton, and Washington. One hundred seventy-seven principals were found to qualify for the study in these participating counties.

Assumptions

It was assumed that the following conditions were present:

1. School districts were concerned about supporting beginning principals as they took over the leadership of the schools.

2. School districts wanted to retain administrators already in their employment.

3. Beginning principals were forthcoming with their answers as it related to job satisfaction and their participation in a mentor program.

4. Results of this study would accurately determine a level of job satisfaction for the respondents.

5. This study would add to the existing research on job satisfaction and mentor programs in elementary education.

Limitations and Delimitations

1. Since the sample was restricted to elementary principals in Florida, the results of the study were generalized to all elementary principals in the United States.

2. Only principals in public schools were surveyed, thus the study was not used to provide assumptions regarding private, charter, and parochial schools.

3. This study was limited by the candid responses of the participants to the questionnaire. Anonymity of the respondents was assured in an attempt to ensure honest responses by the participants.

4. The population for this study was restricted to elementary principals and was not generalized to include secondary administrators or elementary assistant principals.

<u>Conceptual Frameworks</u>

This study is based on theories surrounding job satisfaction and motivation. Many researchers viewed job satisfaction as a direct cause of improving the working environment and quality of work (Balzer et al., 1997), while others believed that it is a consequence of attending work and improving the quality or methods at the work place. Supervisors rewarded employees for positive outcomes, so job satisfaction rose as a result.

According to Maslow (1970), there are five basic needs which drive people. The lower level needs must be met before an individual is motivated by the next level. The needs are: (a) physiological, (b) security, (c) belongingness, (d) esteem, and (e) self-actualization needs. Employers or leaders should watch for the needs of the employees to enable them to reach the higher levels (Wren, 1995).

Bass (1985) coined the term "transformational leadership" to mean that leaders have a profound effect on employees. The leader can transform the employee's self-interest and even move their needs to a higher level based on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. The leader has a direct impact on the employees according to "transformational leadership."

9

Rosener (1990) believed that women, as leaders, wanted the workers to share power and participate in the work place. This would then lead to employees having a higher feeling of self-worth and they would improve their performance. This interactive leadership was based on creating an environment or situation that would foster these positive feelings.

Expectancy Theory was started with the work of Tolman and Lewis in the 1930s. Although Tolman worked with animals and Lewis concentrated his work on humans, they both came to the conclusion that behavior is goal oriented (Beck, 2000). Expectancy Theory, was defined by Vroom (1964) as the goal or accomplishment is obtained as a result of a specific activity. Two basic assumptions of Expectancy Theory were (a) an individual thought about the possible outcomes and the future when they made their decisions, and (b) an individual's behavior was impacted by their standards and beliefs in conjunction with their environment (Vroom).

Locke (1976) found a relationship between motivational factors, job satisfaction, and performance in the expectancy model. Motivational factors were evident in job satisfaction. Miskel, DeFrain, and Wilcox (1980) found that the expectancy model was a reliable predictor of job satisfaction for graduate students and public school teachers.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) determined that there are five necessary job characteristics: (a) task identity, (b) task significance, (c) feedback, (d) autonomy, and (e) skill variety. Hackman and Oldham also believed that if a job was meaningful then

10

employees would work harder. They also determined that the employees would have a

higher degree of job satisfaction.

<center>Significance of the Study</center>

New administrators often feel incredible stress as they work to learn the job of the

principal. The stress is due to the need to master new technical skills, balance the

demands of a wide range of stakeholders, working through the feelings of inadequacy in

a fast-paced environment, supervision of staff members, and extreme isolation in their

new position (Holloway, 2004). The National Staff Development Council (2001)

determined that staff development must be presented in a manner that is supportive of

adult learning, the participant must be actively involved in the learning, and prior

learning must be tied to new concepts for a deeper understanding.

School leaders must have experiences which make sense of the theories,

discussions, and research conducted while training for administration (Howard &

Sheffler, 1996). Principals must learn how to work with various stakeholders of a school,

problem solve in collaboration with staff, identify strategies for improving school

climate, and effectively manage time. Determining areas of weakness would improve the

leadership effectiveness of principals.

Newly appointed administrators often either wait for outsiders to give advice or

they delay action by seeking permission from others. Decisions may be set back because

they are unsure of available resources. The novice school leaders may not know the

source to get the answers they need, and often do not know the resources available to them (Lovely, 2004). New principals face three hurdles which induce stress: (a) absorbing enormous amounts of information, (b) fighting resistance to change, and (c) proving themselves as school leaders.

This study determined best practices in designing a mentor program to support beginning principals. It increased the body of research on mentor programs for principals, and may lead to an increase in mentor programs for school administrators. As new principals begin the journey of school leadership, a determination of the level of support which leads to an increase in competency and job satisfaction may assist districts in creating an effective program of support.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 introduced the problem statement and design components. Chapter 2 presents a review of relevant literature regarding the problem in this study. Chapter 3 details the methodology and procedures used for data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 contains a description and analysis of the data. Chapter 5 provides a summary and discussion of the findings of the study, the implications for practice, conclusions and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Principals are a key element in developing effective schools (Austin, 1979; Lipham, 1981). "The principal is the pivotal position," stated Richard Laine, Director of Education for the Wallace Foundation. "They are the ones who can influence the staff, who are the source of vision that get teachers to concentrate on instruction" (Ramsey, 2006). Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) reported "our meta-analysis indicates that principals can have a profound effect on the achievement of students in their schools."(p. 38) They cited 21 leadership factors that had an impact on student achievement. Monitoring and evaluation, culture, belief and values, and knowledge of the curriculum were among the responsibilities of a principal that affected academic achievement. Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) found that an improvement of principal skills by one standard deviation would translate into a ten percentile gain for students on standard achievement tests.

The intensity of the principalship with the increase in accountability has driven the position to a new level of complexity (Crow, Hausman, & Scribner, 2002). Principals report frustration in being able to address the issues in education (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001; Ramsey, 2006). Forty-nine percent of the principals surveyed in research conducted for *Rolling Up Their Sleeves* cited difficulties with bureaucracy

and politics in their position as a principal, while thirty-eight percent of the responding principals noted the accountability driven by higher standards as a source of frustration (Farkas et al.).

School districts reported an increasing number of school leaders leaving the profession (Daresh, 2004). Principals were retiring or choosing careers out of the field of education. This was occurring at a time when fewer educators were showing an interest in administration. A non-profit organization, Public Agenda, surveyed districts and discovered that forty percent of the superintendents reported a shortage of administrators (Stricherz, 2001b).

Components of the Literature Review

This review of literature contains research focusing on specific areas of educational leadership. Research regarding the role of the principal and changes which have occurred in the educational setting are initially detailed in this chapter. Secondly, job satisfaction and its relationship in education are discussed. Next, principal mentor programs which have been implemented and components of a mentoring program are reviewed. Finally, development and research on the Job Description Index and Job in General are examined.

<center>The Role of the Principal</center>

Principals were increasingly accountable for instructional change, academic success of students and curriculum design in the schools (Ferrandino, 2001). Schools have become centers for full community services such as feeding students beyond the school day, counseling and physical health care (The Principal Shortage, 2000). Principals have been held accountable for decisions in technology, fundraising, and the security of students and facilities (Farkas et al., 2001). The many requirements of the job were intertwined with that of the instructional leader; principals must have concentrated on student learning as the basis for decisions within the school (Thompson & Legler, 2003).

Leithwood, Seashore Lewis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) studied over 300 research reports and articles to determine the impact of the principal on student achievement. Their conclusive findings were that school leadership is only outranked by classroom instruction in terms of factors at the school that impact student achievement. They cited that approximately one-fourth of the effects on learning are caused by direct and indirect school leadership. They also noted that leadership has the greatest impact on those schools that are in most need to improve learning. They found no documented cases of distressed schools being turned around without it being contributed to strong leadership.

Effective principals need to be visionary leaders, and their role in 21st century schools does not resemble the principalship of the past (Institute for Educational

<center>15</center>

Leadership, 2002). Principals must be (a) instructional leaders who are committed to academic success for students, (b) community oriented to bring the stakeholders of a school together, and (c) a leader with a vision for the school and a belief that all students can learn and be successful. The school leader needs to be cognizant of the school culture rather than a manager of a facility.

According to the *Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto:*

The principal's job has changed profoundly in the decades since the familiar certification regimen was put into place. At that time, its main tasks were supervising teachers, managing the building, and dealing with parents. If the school was tidy and orderly, the staff content, the parents quiescent, and the downtown bureaucracy untroubled, the principal was assumed to be doing his or her job. Today, however, while all of those old responsibilities endure, the principal's main task had evolved into something very different: to develop a vision of learning; to build a school culture and instructional programs conducive to learning for all pupils; to manage staff, students and parents with needs and problems that did not exist or were largely ignored in the past; and above all, to produce excellent academic results as gauged by external measures such as state proficiency tests keyed to statewide academic standards. (p. 17)

Research conducted to determine the cause of stress for principals found that state accountability was one of the leading sources of pressure (Howley, Pendarvis, & Gibbs,

2002). Alabama principals reported standards and accountability as the largest change in the role of the principalship in recent years (Kochan, Spencer, & Matthews, 1999). Other factors have attributed to the frustration of principals, such as lack of resources (Public Agenda, 2001) and budgeting concerns (Kochan et al.).

Taylor and Williams (2001) concurred that the pressures facing school principals are due in part to accountability measures which place the blame on educators if scores do not improve. They cited an example of a principal at a struggling school in an urban area transferring to a high performing school in a suburban setting. The prodigious pressures at lower performing schools in states which post grades in the local newspapers, such as Florida, California, and Texas may cause some educators to raise student scores at all costs. Sergiovanni (1996) believed the corporate managerial models were not working in the school system and "We need to develop our own theories and practices-theories and practices that emerge from and are central to what schools are like, what schools are trying to do, and what kinds of people schools serve." (p. 13)

Educators have internship programs and preparatory classes to prepare them for the principalship (Cordeiro & Smith-Sloan, 1995). Internships have been reported to be a weak component in leadership development (Geismar, Morris, & Lieberman, 2000). Zellner and Erlandson ((1997) wrote that preparation and support for the principal should be ongoing throughout the career of the school leader. McCarthy (1999) determined that leadership preparatory programs had to transform from a managerial emphasis to that of a visionary leader focused on students learning.

Chenoweth, Carr, and Ruhl (2002) summarized their findings in professional development for school leaders with the following stance:

> Professional development offered in the traditional manner of discrete and isolated in-services has resulted in often ineffectual and inefficient use of professionals' time. Best practice demands that content be more tightly organized to match topics covered in preparation programs, recent research, and context specific or current district initiative and state mandates. Mentoring, coaching and feedback have been shown to be essential in fostering adoption of new educational techniques and strategies. (p. 36)

Administrators earned advanced degrees in leadership, but practical knowledge was unlikely to transfer to the day-to-day operations of the school (Malone, 2001). Educational administration preparatory programs were challenged to provide the guidance for school leaders who would be able to work with the restructured role and navigate through the bureaucracy of the system (Goodlad, 1984). The current turnover of administrators brings an exciting opportunity to build stronger schools, if the new principals can be supported through the school districts (Archer, 2002).

Casavant and Cherkowski (2001) noted the radical changes that have occurred in educational leadership. According to their research, the accountability and high stakes testing has placed new pressures on principals. Paul Young, former President of the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), determined four

important skills which new principals must master: delegation, time management, ability to see the "big picture", and working with various personalities (Curtis, 2002).

RAND Education (2003) conducted a study to determine if the predictions of a principal shortage were true. The alarming conclusions of the disturbing study were (a) a significant number of principals were close to retirement age, (b) incentives for administrators were vastly different between the states, and (c) teachers were reluctant and unwilling to take on the principalship.

Senators John Kerry, D-Massachusetts, and Gordon Smith, R-Oregon, proposed a bill that was to address the concerns of retaining administrators. Professional development was at the heart of this bill that would address the critical shortage of administrators for our nation's schools ("Senator Kerry's Home Page", n.d.; Stricherz, 2001a). While other measures to address the concern of the school leadership shortage by U.S. Senators have failed due to the spending implications, Senator Kerry and Senator Smith were successful in having the amendment they sponsored attached to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2001, which was signed by President W. George Bush ("Senator Kerry's Home Page"

Mentoring Programs

Mentoring was defined by Bell (2002) as "the act of helping another learn" (p.1). There is a difference between mentoring and coaching new principals (Hobson, 2003). Mentoring, as described by Hobson, consists of a more experienced person helping a less

19

experienced individual. Coaching refers to helping someone with specific skills or tasks at the workplace. A mentor has the task of establishing a relationship that meets the needs of the protégé (Samier, 2000).   The mentor relationship is unique, and the mentor must be compassionate, understanding, and willing to share information (Bell, 1996).

Studies have shown that principals in all phases of their careers would benefit from a formal mentoring program (Malone, 2001). Principals have identified other administrators as having the greatest impact on their success as a school leader, and these mentoring relationships helped them to survive not only in the beginning stages, but throughout their careers. The importance of a mentoring program has become more prominent as research indicates that graduate training alone does not prepare school leaders to improve education.

Hobson (2003) found that mentoring programs not only helped school leaders, but also the mentor and the schools themselves.

Novice leaders benefited by (a) reduction in the feeling of isolation, (b) increased confidence in self esteem, (c) the opportunity to reflect on the new role, (d) an accelerated rate of learning, (e) reduced stress and frustration and therapeutic benefits, and (f) improved personal skills, including communication and political skills. Benefits for the mentors included (a) benefits to their own professional development, (b) improved performance and problem analysis, (c) insights into current practice, (d)

increased awareness of different approaches to leadership, (e) improved

self-esteem, and (f) and increased reflectiveness. (p. 5)

Mentoring in education has been cyclical (Daresh, 2004). In the 1980s, there was

a concern over the number of retiring principals. The National Associations of

Elementary and Secondary School Principals began to recruit educators into

administration (Clark, 1999). Concern over the readiness of newly appointed

administrators developed and programs such as Leadership in Educational

Administration Development (LEAD) were established in many states (Daresh). Mentor

programs were designed to provide one year of support to new administrators. Interest in

mentoring programs decreased in the early 1990s (Lashway, 1998). Many programs

suffered from lack of resources. The late 1990s began to see the reemergence of

mentoring programs due to expected principal shortages (Daresh).

Crow and Matthews (1998) related the need for mentoring programs for school

administrators to the need for socialization. They asserted that principals in reform-

minded schools were in special need of this type of support program. They also

described the need for the program at all stages of a principal's career. The mentoring

program should be systematic in approach, rather than haphazard or left to chance. The

mentor programs should be developed with the focus on planning, mentor selection,

matching training, and evaluation.

Daresh (2004) found successful mentor programs must be established with

planning and consideration of the mentor and mentee relationship. The mentor process

requires that both the experienced administrator and protégé develop an open and interactive relationship. Daresh also noted the selection of mentors was critical to establishing an effective, successful program. He warned that future principals should also be knowledgeable of the programs which may be available to them. They needed to be ready to engage in the program before they were even appointed to the principalship.

The success of a mentoring relationship can be determined by the first meeting between the mentor and protégé (Bell, 2002). The tone of this meeting sets the precedent which will be carried forward throughout the year. The level of respect often determines the success of the mentoring relationship.

Zachary (2000) defined the stages that successful formal and informal mentoring relationships process through:

Phase One- Preparation is made by the mentor to begin the relationship with the beginning principal.

Phase Two-The protégé and mentor enter into dialogue and negotiate the parameters of the mentoring relationship.

Phase Three-The mentoring begins and the beginning principal works closely with the mentor to meet new challenges.

Phase Four-The objectives of the mentoring program are met and the relationship either ends or is renegotiated.

The characteristics of a good mentor may include a desire and willingness to give up time to help others, maintaining a positive and realistic outlook, and also a

demonstration of a strong desire for professional growth (Mentors Forum, 2005). In order to be effective, mentors need to be good listeners and self-assured. They must be able to give constructive criticism when needed. Mentors must be adept at questioning and probing to discern information from the mentee.

Gooden and Spencer (2003) cautioned that although mentoring can be beneficial to both the protégé and the mentor, not all principals should be mentors. Ethical behavior and communication skills were two characteristics identified by both mentors and beginning administrators as the most important interpersonal characteristics when selecting a mentor. Prospective mentors need to be aware of the needs of beginning principals.

Longevity should not be a determining factor in choosing a mentor (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). Those that have the personality, patience and skills to do the job need to be sought for the mentor position. Walker and Scott (1994) argued that if poor choices are made for mentors, then the results would be the continuation of inadequate leadership skills in an organization.

School districts were increasingly turning over important decisions and more control to individual schools (Crews & Weakly, 1996). This made it critical to have a well prepared principal as the driving force. A model of systematic professional development, created and implemented by the Southern Regional Education Board, incorporated four components: teamwork, personal planning, building collaboration between educators and community, and coaching and mentoring. The use of an external

coach or mentor from a different school system was an important part of this program. Since the mentor was not part of the school district of the beginning principal, there was no fear of being judged or in competition with the mentor principal. However, it was advised that the experienced principal needs to be familiar enough with the school district to guide the new administrator.

Reyes and Wagstaff (2003) studied high-performing, high-poverty schools. They determined that successful leaders welcomed the accountability for principals, focused on instruction and academic success for all students, realized that they did not have all the answers and sought solutions to the concerns of the school, knew what was occurring in the classrooms, and were seen by the stakeholders of the school as being accessible. They also believed in the community of learners and innovative teaching to meet the needs of the students.

<div align="center">Mentoring Programs for Principals</div>

Mentoring programs differed in their approach to training mentors, matching mentor and mentee, and stipulating a focus and desired outcomes. Jacobi (1991) determined that some programs may provide detailed training for mentors, while others leave the method of services and outcome to the mentor. Some programs assign mentees, whereas others allow the mentee to select their mentor. Mentoring programs may dictate the number of meetings which must occur, or they may leave this decision to each pair of administrators. Even evaluations of mentor programs vary widely, with formal

evaluations or simple observations and minimal feedback provided to the program coordinators.

Gov. Rod Blagojevich, D-Illinois, signed into law the requirement of mentoring for principals in their first year of school leadership (Archer, 2006). Other states with similar mandated programs included Alaska, Arizona, and Missouri. The Wallace foundation provided $43 million in grants in 24 states in 2001 to improve the conditions for school leaders so they could improve their effectiveness. Director of the Wallace foundation, Richard Laine, stated "No one is completely prepared when they're done, even with the best preparation program. We have to support adults to continue to learn." (p. 10)

The San Diego Unified School District, located in southern California, faced the shortage of principals by developing a mentor program in 2000 (Barry & Kaneko, 2002). The mentor program matched each new principal with a mentor. The program, which continued to provide assistance to new mentors, was financed through district funds (San Diego Unified). Mentors in this program were assigned by the district, may have had more than one mentee, and were paid a stipend for their work (Barry & Kaneko).

The School Leadership Learning Community (SLLC) was an active network in 16 states: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2005). The SLLC, sustained by the Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University in Philadelphia,

found a mentoring program was a critical component for participants in leadership programs. It was determined that mentors needed to be carefully selected and training had to be provided. One of the programs of the SLLC, the School Leadership Program, provided mentors or "lead principals" for beginning principals and assistant principals in New York State (Institute for Educational Leadership).

E-mail was the primary method of communication in the School Leadership Learning Community programs (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2005). Additional technology, such as e-portfolios; online assessment; and video conferencing, was incorporated into the programs with staff development opportunities for the participants. Online training and Internet dialogue groups were part of the Rural Education in the Administrative Leadership Program, a program offered through the School Leadership Learning Community.

The Southeastern Regional Principals' Academy, as reported at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Howley, Chadwick, & Howley, 2002), was successful in implementing a mentoring program that supported new principals with a statewide group of colleagues. The program was created at Ohio University in coordination with members of the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools, and was funded through the Ohio Legislature. The 22 early career principals attended group meetings and were matched with a mentor principal. Howley et al. studied the rural principals' reactions to the program through quantitative and qualitative methods. Formal feedback was collected over a two year period, and included

questionnaires, observations of study groups, and documentation of procedures in the program. They found the beginning principals believed the support of the mentor, as well as the group meetings, were beneficial. Eighty-two percent of the participants found the opportunity to meet with an experienced principal was an important part of the Southeastern Regional Principals' Academy.

Santa Cruz principals had a mentoring program available to them through the New Teacher Center's New Administrators Program (Moir & Bloom, 2003). Beginning principals received coaching and professional development support for the first two years as an administrator. Participants reported they believed the program was critical to their success in their new positions.

Sanders and Simpson (2005) detailed the findings of The Council of Chief State School Officers which had a framework for school administrators. These five key state policy levers consisted of: (a) professional certification, (b) professional standards and assessments, (c) professional preparation, (d) professional development, and (e) state reporting and accountability for administrator quality. (p. i) The Lever Three was focused on administration preparation for those not only entering school leadership programs, but support for those currently in school administration. Kentucky was identified in this report as having mentor programs for not only first-year principals, but as they continue through their beginning years. The Kentucky Principal Internship Program revised its components to bring together university personnel, new principals and experienced school leaders.

Daresh (2004) studied the benefits of mentoring programs in education. Beginning principals, mentoring principals and school districts benefit from principal mentoring programs. One benefit was the support system for newly appointed principals. Educators cited isolation as one reason for not entering into the principalship. Effective mentoring programs can dispel this concern for those considering educational leadership. Also, one of the benefits for mentees in the mentoring relationships was their willingness to take on the role of mentor in the future. They reported a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction in working with beginning principals. School districts benefited from mentoring programs by having stronger leadership at the schools.

Organizations and employees benefit from mentoring programs (Allen, Lentz, & Day, 2006). The principals were more competent when they participated in a mentoring program (Donaldson, 1987). Mentors also provided new principals with support when they wanted to try new strategies or innovative ideas (Daresh, 2004). A collegial climate was also more likely when a successful mentoring program was established for employees (Burke, 1984; Daresh, 2004). Although a difficult benefit to measure, beginning principals reported they felt more successful if they had a mentor (Daresh, 2003). Mentors reported that working with aspiring principals resulted in an increase in job satisfaction (Daresh, 2004).

In a study of a formal mentoring program for federal employees, the majority of the mentors reported a positive outcome and personal satisfaction from working with mentees (Allen, Lentz, & Day, 2006). In a questionnaire study, mentors also reported

that their own performance improved as a result of the mentoring program (Reich, 1986).

However, in a research study of five Florida school districts, mentoring was not found to

have a relationship to job satisfaction (Schwartz, 2002).

Principals must be more active in the development and implementation of

mentoring programs in order for the programs to be effective and long lasting (Daresh,

2004). Resources must be made available for mentoring programs, and focus on the

importance of the programs as a support system for administrators must be maintained.

Mentor programs must also prepare the mentor and protégé before they enter the

program.

Job Satisfaction

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1975) defined job satisfaction as "the perceived

characteristics of the job in relation to an individual's frames of reference. Alternatives

available in given situations, expectations, and experiences play important roles in

providing the relevant frame of reference." (p. 12). Job satisfaction is an important factor

in an employee's mental health (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1975) and his/her performance

on the job (Chambers, 1999). It has been a major concern of managers and supervisors as

well as researchers (Balzer et al., 1997). Discord and stress, associated with

dissatisfaction, can negatively impact productivity in an organization. In a study of

engineers and accountants, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) developed a two-

dimensional construct of factors which had an effect on the workers' attitude about their

jobs. There were hygiene factors such as salary, working conditions, supervision and interpersonal relations which did not motive workers. The hygiene factors could cause dissatisfaction if they were missing in the work environment. Motivators such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, promotion, and work associated with the job were labeled as satisfiers. These satisfiers can make workers more productive, creative and committed (Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999). The hygiene factors deal with the work environment and satisfiers describe the relationship a worker has with what they actually do on the job.

The Herzberg Theory of Motivators and Hygiene Factors was found to be false in a study of agricultural faculty members because job satisfaction could be explained by both motivators and hygiene factors (Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1991). However, Blezek's (1987) work confirmed Herzberg's Theory of Motivators and Hygiene Factors in a study of university faculty in the College of Agriculture. The study found that motivator factors were linked to job satisfaction, and hygiene factors were not a positive force in motivating the faculty.

Maslow (1970) determined that there were five levels in the hierarchy of needs, ranging from survival to self-actualization. Maslow's work, first published in 1954, described how people need to satisfy personal needs in a specific order and pattern. A person could not move on to the next level if a need was not fulfilled. This theory has relevance in the world of business and work (Gawel, 1997).

Research varies on the impact of personal and environmental factors on job satisfaction. Vroom (1962) found a relationship between job satisfaction and an opportunity for self-expression. Workers who had an opportunity to express themselves through their work reported a higher level of job satisfaction. Hackman and Lawler (1971) determined that workers who did not feel a desire to have an opportunity for growth or engaging work were found to be less satisfied with a job having a low rate of variety.

Zingeser (2004) examined an American Speech-Language survey which correlated job satisfaction with three areas: (a) type of setting, (b) pay, and (c) collaborative relationships. These factors had a positive relationship with the level of job satisfaction for the workers. As employees indicated a setting with a highly collaborative staff, the level of job satisfaction rose. In a separate study by Syptak, Marsland and Ulmer (1999), it was determined that one of the most important factors of job satisfaction was the belief that the work they were doing was important and the tasks were meaningful.

Research on the relationship between career stages and job satisfaction had mixed results. Van Maanen and Katz (1976) found that job satisfaction did not increase as employees progressed through career stages. Ornstein, Cron, and Slocum (1989) reported that the level of job satisfaction increased as workers moved through the career phases. Benke and Rhode (1980) found tenure positively impacted job satisfaction and lessened frustration.

The needs of workers in creative, challenging jobs differed from those in routine, less innovative careers (Jensen, 2000). Thompson, McNamara, and Hoyle (1997) reported that as school administrators had an increase in role conflict, the sense of job satisfaction decreased. High school principals reported that the high demands of their job and especially the time consuming aspects of running a school caused personal and work conflicts which led to dissatisfaction (Vadella & Willower, 1990).

There is conflicting research as to whether gender influences job satisfaction. Several studies involving teachers found that gender of the participants did not have a significant impact on job satisfaction (Cano & Miller, 1992). Eckman (2003) found no significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female principals in a study of 304 high school principals. The Leadership in Border Rural Areas, New Mexico, found that mentoring differed based on gender, race, and ethnicity (The Laboratory for Student Success, 2005).

Srivastava (1982) found female secondary teachers had a higher level of job satisfaction as compared to male secondary teachers. In a study conducted by Chiu (1998), female lawyers had a lower level of job satisfaction as compared to their male counterparts. The females had 88% of the job satisfaction rating as that held by men. The women had lower job satisfaction in four areas: (a) influence and promotional opportunity, (b) financial rewards, (c) non-competitive atmosphere, and (d) time.

Research had conflicting results regarding job satisfaction and a correlation with age and experience. Bowen and Radhakrishna (1991) found that demographic and

situational factors such as tenure, years of education, and size of the institution did not influence job satisfaction for agricultural faculty members. Culver, Wolfle, and Cross (1990) derived from their research that demographic factors such as gender decreased when additional elements such as school climate were considered in relationship to job satisfaction.

Herzberg (1959) found that job satisfaction was high for younger workers, and then declined at a higher age. Job satisfaction then increased again as the worker continued to grow older. Sweeny (1981) found that younger teachers were less satisfied with their positions than older teachers. Eckman (2003) found no correlation between age and job satisfaction. Lee, Dedrick, & Smith (1989) discovered little correlation between demographics and levels of experience of a teacher and the level of job satisfaction.

Blackburn, Horowitz, Edington, & Klos (1986) conducted a study of job satisfaction for university faculty members and found that job related stress had a positive relationship to job related strain, which in turn negatively impacted job satisfaction for the faculty. Sorcinelli and Near (1989) determined that job satisfaction was positively impacted by university faculty members' satisfaction with life in general. Research on specific university departments found that home economics faculty in large institutions of over 500 undergraduates were satisfied with their job pressures and administration (Schultz, 1977).

Anderman, Belzer, & Smith (1991) conducted a study of 758 classroom teachers in Arizona, Illinois and Florida, and found that teachers were more likely to have a higher level of job satisfaction when they felt they were working in a close, familiar staff where recognition and affiliation were evident. Teachers who work in an environment where employees respected one another and supported their efforts correlated to greater job satisfaction. Hulin's (1966) research determined that satisfied employees usually have a higher attendance rate and lower turnover than their counterparts.

<div align="center">Job Description Index</div>

Job satisfaction is one of the most researched and studied phenomenon of the work place (Williams, 2004). Organizations are interested in determining their employees' state of mind. Also, research has been conducted to determine factors which affect job satisfaction.

A variety of measures have been used to determine job satisfaction. Single-item measures (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983) were developed for job satisfaction. Vroom (1964) noted the use of multi-faceted, multi-item measures. The Job Description Index (JDI) was touted as the most widely used instrument (DeMeuse, 1985). The Job in General (JIG) was created to provide an overall rating for job satisfaction.

The JDI was developed by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1975). Patricia Smith joined Bowling Green State University, and brought the instrument with her (Balzer et al, 1997). The JDI is one job satisfaction measurement tool which produced valid and

reliable results (Williams, 2004). The JDI and JIG were managed through the JDI Research Group at Bowling Green State University. Dr. Smith headed the research which refined and normed the instruments as studies which use the JDI and JIG in various settings were conducted.

The JDI has been used in studies during the past 25 years, with over 12,000 research studies using the instrument. Recent work included creating a subset of data available to the research community on the studies which have been performed (Balzer et al., 1997). Revisions of the JDI and JIG have been made as additional research indicated a need to adjust the instrument. The JDI was found to have internal stability and consistency (Smith et al., 1987). Border (2004) utilized the JDI in a study of job satisfaction and retention of Florida's middle school principals. The JDI provided the necessary ratings for subcategories of job satisfaction, as well as the Job in General score (Balzer et al., 1997).

Kerr (1985) reported that the JDI "possesses good content validity, impressive construct validity, and adequate reliability." (p. 755) The JDI has received a great deal of attention and has been scrutinized by researchers. The JDI also has a high degree of performance for the facets. Crites (1985) cited the JDI has the most frequently used instrument due to its simple format and ease of use.

The JDI contains the five facets of job satisfaction: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision and People on Present Job. The JDI was not intended to be used as an overall rating for job satisfaction. The five facet scores were

not designed to be summed for an overall score in job satisfaction (Balzer et al., 1997).

The JDI facets scales were developed to measure specific aspects of a job. It is believed

that a higher satisfaction in one area would not necessarily make up for a lower score in a

different subcategory. Also, the facets do not carry the same weight in relationship to job

satisfaction. One aspect of the job may be more important to an individual than another

area. Thus, adding the scores would be misleading in determining overall job

satisfaction.

A supplemental scale of Job in General was developed to determine in overall

feeling of satisfaction in the workplace. This scale directly inquires if the participant is

satisfied with their working environment. The Job in General was designed to be

administered in conjuncture with the Job Description Index (Balzer et al., 1997).

The JDI and JIG were developed to be used to determine job satisfaction in a

variety of professions, and in order to yield reliable results, the following parameters

were instituted. The instruments measured the primary facets of job satisfaction. The

instruments were easily completed and simple to score and interpret the results. The job

satisfaction measures were generic in nature so they would apply to a variety of jobs and

careers. The instruments were consistent in measuring what they were designed to

measure. Finally, the instruments assisted in determining problem areas and provided

feasible solutions for the organizations.

A set of measures of relevant variables such as Stress in General and Intention to

Quit were developed and revised by the JDI Research Group. An abridged version of the

JDI and JIG was also created with fewer items than the original version (Balzer et al., 1997). The complete JDI contains 90 items, while the abridged JDI has only 33 items.

Summary

School leadership requires a multitude of skills and knowledge in this age of accountability. The need for new principals was documented by school district surveys. This need was a result of principals reaching retirement age, turnover of principals, and few incentives for teachers to move into the leadership position.

In order to support the new principals, some school districts have created mentor programs. Mentoring programs may be beneficial to both the beginning principal and the mentor. Mentor programs may vary in the delivery of service, length of program, and expectations of the participants.

Job satisfaction has been highly researched both in education and the general work place. Conflicting results of whether or not age and gender impact job satisfaction have been reported in case studies. The Job Description Index, developed by Bowling Green State University, was developed to measure job satisfaction in five subcategories, while the Job in General instrument provided an overall score for job satisfaction.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 provided the statement of the problem, significance of this study and the research questions to be determined by this study. Chapter 2 detailed a review of

literature for the principalship, mentor programs and job satisfaction. Chapter 3 details

the population and procedures used for this study. Chapter 4 contains an analysis of the

data. Chapter 5 concludes the study with a summary, implications and recommendations

for further studies.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter 3 is to provide the methodology and procedures used to determine if there is a relationship between mentoring programs and job satisfaction for beginning elementary principals in the state of Florida. The study consisted of an online questionnaire of principals with less than four years of experience. Principals throughout the state of Florida were surveyed using the Job Description Index with additional demographic questions regarding their experience, gender, age, and use of a mentor. Data were collected and analyzed to determine if there was an existing relationship between mentors and job satisfaction.

Population

A purposive sampling strategy (Patton, 1990) was used to identify the sample for this study. The sample consisted of 113 elementary principals in 24 Florida school districts with six months to three years of experience in the role of the principalship. Five of these respondents did not complete a minimum number of questions and had to be deleted from the study, leaving a sample size of 108 respondents. This sample was contingent on the information gathered from the 24 Florida school districts.

All 67 Florida school district superintendents were contacted to request their participation in the study. A follow-up request was sent to staff development personnel in each of the 67 school districts. Once a contact person was established for a particular district, a list of elementary principals with six months to three years of experience was requested. When the list was provided by the district, the information was added to an Excel database.

The Florida school districts are divided into five geographic regions as determined by the Florida Department of Education: Panhandle, Crown, East Central, West Central, and South. Each Florida Department of Education region was represented in this study. Table 1 provides information on the districts that participated in this study, with the number of principals contacted to participate in the study and the actual number of principals who completed the survey.

Table 1

Respondents from Participating School Districts
(N = 108)

Districts	Number Contacted	Number of Respondents	% Returned
Alachua	5	3	60
Brevard	18	16	89
Collier	10	7	70
Columbia	2	1	50
Escambia	5	2	40
Gadsden	4	2	50
Hillsborough	17	10	59
Holmes	2	1	50
Jackson	7	1	14
Lake	5	2	40
Leon	8	2	25
Manatee	3	2	67
Marion	6	2	33
Martin	2	1	50
Osceola	8	6	75
Pasco	3	3	100
Polk	21	16	76
Putnam	4	6	67
Santa Rosa	8	4	50
Seminole	13	9	69
Sumter	4	1	25
Volusia	21	8	38
Walton	5	2	40
Washington	1	1	100
TOTAL	177	108	61

Note: 113 respondents returned surveys, however five were incomplete and not used in the study.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument for this study was an adapted form of the Job Description

Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) obtained through Bowling Green State University

(Balzer et al., 1997). The JDI measured five areas of job satisfaction: (a) work on present

job, (b) pay, (c) opportunities for promotion, (d) supervision, and (e) people at work. The complete JDI subscales contain 9 or 18 items each, with a total of 72 items. The items are a word or phrase which is rated by the respondent. The Job in General provided an overall job satisfaction score using 18 items.

It was believed that workers have independent feelings towards the five areas of job satisfaction (Balzer et al., 1997). It was also assumed that workers could distinguish the different areas and would rate them accordingly. The five areas of job satisfaction for the JDI were researched and were proven to generalize job satisfaction for the respondents (Balzer et al.).

The original forms of JDI and JIG allowed respondents to choose "Yes" "No" and "Undecided". The scoring of the JDI allowed three points for a positive answer, one point for undecided, and zero points for a negative answer. After great consideration, it was determined that "Undecided" would not be used in this study, as it allowed respondents an alternate choice that would provide a point for an indecision rather than an answer that is between "Yes" and "No". Respondents, on the adapted version of the JDI and JIG, could respond only "Yes" or "No". The scores for subcategories of Pay and Opportunities for Promotion were doubled as described in the Job Description Index Manual (Balzer et al.,1997).

Data Collection and Analysis

The JDI survey was created through Survey Monkey, an online service which provided a secure website. Participants had to enter a password to gain access to the survey. This website also tracked the respondents which allowed follow-up emails to be sent to those who did not respond to the initial request to complete the questionnaire. The online questionnaire included an introductory paragraph and a notice of consent to participate. Demographic information was requested at the end of the survey. Participants also had the option of choosing a link to decline future emails regarding the survey.

The first contact with participants was sent via email on August 3, 2006. An explanation of the survey and a link to the online questionnaire along with the password to access the survey was included in the email. Participants also could respond by email to request a copy of the research results. The first request yielded 36 responses. A second email request sent one week after the initial email yielded 16 responses. The third email, sent the following week, produced 29 responses. The fourth email request, sent three days following the third request, produced 22 responses. The fifth contact was made through email to remind participants of the survey and to provide the access information. This final request yielded 10 responses. Responses with subcategories missing three or more answers were discarded for use in this study. There were five surveys which had a significant amount of data missing; therefore, these surveys were eliminated from the data base.

The responses on the Survey Monkey website were directly exported to an Excel worksheet. The negative response answers such as whether a supervisor is boring or the job is unpleasant were transformed as described by the Job Description Index Manual (Balzer et al., 1997). Positive answers were given three points for a "Yes" response and zero points for a "No" response. Negative answers were given three points for a "No" response and zero points for a "Yes" response. The points for each category were totaled. The scores for Pay and Opportunities for Promotion were doubled as there were nine responses as opposed to 18 responses in each of the other categories. The data for the resurvey responses, including demographic information, were imported into Social Science, Version 11.5 (SPSS) computer software.

The method to conduct this study was an Ex Post Facto correlational design since the treatment was past participation in a mentor program. The SPSS software was used to analyze the survey responses. The following analysis was conducted for each research question.

1. A Pearson Correlation was conducted to determine the correlation, if any, between beginning principals (six months to three years of experience), their job satisfaction and their participation in a mentor program.

2. The factors involving mentor programs were examined to determine if they impacted job satisfaction. A *t-test* was used to determine the difference in job satisfaction, if any, between principals who were mentored for one year versus principals who were mentored for two years. A Pearson Correlation was used to

determine if the frequency of mentoring had an effect on job satisfaction. An analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a difference in the level of job satisfaction for the beginning principals based on the type of communication with their mentor.

3. A *t-test* was used to establish the difference in job satisfaction, if any, between those who chose their mentor and those who were assigned a mentor principal.

4. A t- test was run to determine what was the difference in job satisfaction, if any, for those who were mentored by an immediate supervisor and those who were mentored by a non-immediate supervisor.

5. A *t-test* was used to determine what impact, if any, gender had on the beginning principal's level of job satisfaction. A one-way ANOVA was used to determine what impact, if any, age had on the new principal's rating of job satisfaction.

Instrument Reliability and Validity

Reliable and valid scores were obtained through the use of the JDI under various occasions with certain populations. A study of 7,000 employees, with 1,600 responses, provided the basis for the development of the norms described in the JDI User Manual (Harwell, 2003). The data collected from the 1,600 respondents were used to compute the reliability estimates of each of the five areas. The Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .86 to .91 (Harwell). Validity was proven in a study with 795 employees. The JDI

was found to have strong evidence of construct validity as it correlated with other measures of job satisfaction (Harwell).

Summary

The Job Description Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) instruments were used to survey beginning elementary principals in Florida with less than 4 years experience as principals. The 108 respondents answered demographic information on their experience, age, gender, and involvement in a mentor program. Information regarding mentors with whom they worked was also ascertained.

Data were analyzed using the SPSS computer software. The analysis included the *t-test*, Pearson Correlation, and one-way ANOVA as appropriate. The scores obtained from using the JDI and JIG were found to be reliable and valid through research studies.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 began the study with the problem and research questions. Chapter 2 provided a review of relevant literature. Chapter 3 presented the methods for the study. Chapter 4 details the data analysis. Chapter 5 offers the summary and implications for future studies.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents a description and an analysis of data gathered during this study. First, a description of the respondents to the survey will provide demographic data. Information such as age, gender, years of experience as a principal and as an educator, whether or not the principal participated in a mentoring program, and how many years the mentor worked with the principal is detailed. Then, data on job satisfaction for participants are described as defined by the Job Description Index from Bowling Green State University.

The analysis will continue with a determination of whether or not job satisfaction had a relationship to mentoring for beginning principals. Factors such as gender and age were examined to determine if these impact job satisfaction. Finally, an analysis of whether or not the number of times a mentor met with the beginning principal and the method of communication impacted job satisfaction for the beginning principal is included in this chapter. Additional findings were added to this chapter based on their relevance to the study.

Description of the Respondents

Participants in this study were elementary principals in Florida with six months to three years of experience. A purposive sampling was used to determine the sample population. All five regions of the state, as defined by the Department of Education, were represented in this study. The counties that participated in the study were: Alachua, Brevard, Collier, Columbia, Escambia, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Holmes, Jackson, Lake, Leon, Manatee, Marion, Martin, Osceola, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, Santa Rosa, Seminole, Sumter, Volusia, Walton, and Washington.

The following tables provide information on the demographics of the respondents to the survey. Table 2 provides the number and percentage of male and female participants as well as their current age.

Table 2

Florida Beginning Elementary Principals
(N = 108)

Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Gender (n = 108)		
Female	75	70.1
Male	32	29.9
Age (n = 107)		
30 - 35 Years	8	7.5
36 - 40 Years	15	14.0
41 - 45 Years	26	24.3
46 - 50 Years	14	13.1
51 - 55 Years	24	22.4
56 - 60 Years	17	15.9
61 +	3	2.8
Race (n = 108)		
African-American	9	8.3
Asian	0	0
Caucasian	92	85.2
Hispanic	7	6.5
Other	0	0

Table 3 provides information on the experience of the beginning principals.

Included in the data are years of experience in education, the number of years as

administrators, and the number of years as a principal. Principals with less than six

months or more than three years of experience were not included in this study.

Table 3

Experience of Respondents in the Study
(N = 108)

Experience	Number	Percentage
Years in Education		
1 - 5 Years	3	2.8
6 - 10 Years	1	.9
11 - 15 Years	23	21.5
16 - 20 Years	28	26.2
21 - 25 Years	19	17.8
26 - 30 Years	18	16.8
31 - 35 Years	12	11.2
35 +	3	2.8
Years as Administrator		
(Assistant Principal and		
Principal)		
1 - 5 Years	30	28.3
6 - 10 Years	61	57.5
11 - 15 Years	9	8.5
16 - 20 Years	4	3.8
21 - 25 Years	1	.9
26 - 30 Years	1	.9
31 - 35 Years	0	0
35 +	0	0
Years as Principal		
One Year	48	44.4
Two Years	16	14.8
Three Years	44	40.7

Table 4 contains data on mentors who worked with the novice principals.

Beginning principals responded to whether they currently had a mentor, if the mentor

worked with them for more than one year, and how the mentors were assigned to the

beginning principal. The majority of the mentors were assigned and worked with the

beginning principal.

Table 4

Mentors for Beginning Principals
(N = 108)

Mentor	Number	Percentage
Currently Has a Mentor		
Yes	40	37.0
No	68	63.0
Number of Years Mentored		
Mentor for One Year	58	53.7
Mentor for Two Years	15	13.9
Mentor for More		
than Two Years	1	.9
No Mentor	34	31.5
Method of Mentor Selection		
Mentor Assigned	42	46.2
Mentor Selected by Self	25	27.5
Mentor Volunteered	7	7.7
Not Sure	17	18.7

Analysis of Job Satisfaction

As described by Balzer et al. (1997), if a respondent did not answer three of

questions in a subcategory, that subcategory was not used in the analysis of data. The use

of individual scores was discouraged when analyzing JDI and JIG results. The

distribution of scores was suggested for analysis and comparisons in research studies.

The middle point of the scores was used to determine satisfaction and dissatisfaction of

employees.

The five subcategories of Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion,

Supervision, and People at Work as well as the Job in General (JIG) score were used to

determine job satisfaction. The range of possible scores for the five subcategories and

JIG was 0 to 54.   Pay and Opportunities for Promotion each had a possible range of 0 to

27 points, however, according to Balzer et al. (1997) those scores were to be doubled by

the researcher to ensure they were weighted to the same degree as the other

subcategories.

Balzer et al. (1997) utilized the median score at the determining point for job

satisfaction. Present Job, which had a range of 0 to 54 points, had a median score of 27.

The scores well above 27 (i. e., 32 or above) were considered satisfied and those well

below 27 (i. e., 22 or below) were in the dissatisfied range. Scores of 23 to 31 were

defined as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table 5 provides the subcategories of the JDI and the JIG by the frequency and

the percentage for each rating. The subcategories of Pay and Opportunities for

Promotion had the highest dissatisfied ratings. The People at Work and Job in General

had the lowest ratings of dissatisfaction among the respondents.

Table 5

Job Description Index and Levels of Satisfaction for Beginning Principals
(N = 108)

Category	Dissatisfied		Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		Satisfied	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Present Job	5	5	21	19	82	76
Pay	30	28	46	43	32	30
Promotion	33	31	12	11	63	58
Supervision	9	8	7	6	92	85
People at Work	7	6	2	2	99	92
Job in General	5	5	3	3	100	93

The highest job satisfaction ratings were for People at Work and Job in General.

Both of these categories held over 90% of the respondents as satisfied. Pay and

Promotion showed the lowest scores for job satisfaction among the respondents, with

only 30% being satisfied with Pay and 58% satisfied with Promotion.

Research Question 1

What is the relationship between mentoring programs for beginning elementary
principals and their level of job satisfaction?

A Pearson Correlation was run and an analysis of whether having a mentor

impacted job satisfaction showed no statistically significant relationship. Table 6 shows

the correlations for Present Job, Pay, Promotion, Supervision, People at Work, and Job in

General were all found to not have a statistically significant relationship with mentoring

programs for beginning principals.

Table 6

Pearson Correlation for Mentoring Beginning Principals and Job Satisfaction
(N = 108)

Factors	r	p
Present Job	.142	.143
Pay	.151	.118
Promotion	.099	.307
Supervision	.176	.069
People at Work	.180	.062
Job in General	.150	.121

Research Question 2

What difference exists among principals with varying degrees of mentoring in
terms of reported job satisfaction?

An analysis of an independent *t*-test determined there was no statistically

significant difference between those who were mentored for one year and those who were

mentored for two years. This was true for all five subcategories of the Job Description

Index and the Job in General. The facets of job satisfaction, Present Job (F = .383, df =

71, p > .05), Pay (F = 1.141, df = 71 , p > .05), Opportunities for Promotion (F = .660, df

= 71, p > .05), Supervision (F = 1.297, df = 71, p > .05), People at Work (F = 5.521, df =

71, p > .05), and the Job in General (F = 1.419, df = 71, p > .05), did not yield

statistically significant results. Table 7 provides information on the mean and standard

deviation for length of mentoring in relationship to the job satisfaction subcategories.

Table 7

t-test for Job Satisfaction and Having a Mentor for One or Two Years
(N = 108)

Mentor Relationship	Mentor One Year		Mentor Two Years	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Present Job	35.02	5.630	33.80	5.003
Pay	27.72	12.707	30.40	15.459
Promotion	34.45	16.805	35.20	19.358
Supervision	44.22	11.275	46.20	7.921
People at Work	46.86	10.206	49.40	3.376
Job in General	47.12	8.75	45.20	12.497

A Pearson Correlation found a statistically significant relationship between the

frequency in which a mentor met with the beginning principal and four Job Description

Index subcategories. This analysis was performed with the respondents who had been in

a mentoring program. As shown on Table 8, Supervision had the strongest statistically

significant relationship (r = .374, p < .01) with the frequency of mentoring. Promotion

showed a statistically significant relationship (r = .318, p < .01). The third area found to

have a statistically significant relationship was Pay (r = .316, p < .01). The final

subcategory with a statistically significant relationship with the frequency of meeting

with a mentor was People at Work (r = .256, p < .05). Job in General (r = .237, p < .05)

was found to have a statistically significant relationship with frequency of meeting with

the mentor as well. Table 8 displays data for the Pearson Correlation for the frequency of

mentoring and the Job Description Index and Job in General.

Table 8

Pearson Correlation for Frequency of Mentoring and Job Satisfaction for Beginning
Principals
(N = 74)

Factors	r	p
Present Job	.211	.071
Pay	.316	.006
Promotion	.318	.006
Supervision	.374	.001
People at Work	.256	.028
Job in General	.237	.042

A cross-tabulation was used to confirm the relationship of the frequency of

meeting with the mentor and job satisfaction for beginning principals. Table 9 details the

number of principals who responded that they met weekly, monthly, every three months,

once during the year, or never with their mentor. There were seven respondents who

chose Other as an option. Those principals who reported meeting Weekly had the highest

mean for job satisfaction for Present Job. Those meeting once a year had the lowest level

of job satisfaction for Present Job. A comparison of the three categories with the highest

number of respondents showed that Weekly ($M = 37.50$) had the highest level of job

satisfaction for Present Job, followed by Monthly ($M = 35.57$), and Every 3 Months ($M =$

33.45). Those reporting Other for the frequency of meetings replied that meetings were

"infrequent", "as needed", or "e-mail".

Table 9

Cross-tabulation for Present Job and Frequency of Meeting with Mentors
($N = 76$)

Frequency Met With Mentor	Number	Mean %	SD
Weekly	12	37.50	5.50
Monthly	28	35.57	4.81
Every 3 Months	20	33.45	4.89
Yearly	2	25.50	10.61
Never	3	37.00	6.25
Other	11	34.36	5.59

Statistically significant findings for Pay and how often mentors met with

beginning principals were found (df = 45, p < .05). Table 10 shows the cross-tabulation

of frequency of meeting with the mentor and the mean and standard deviation for the job

satisfaction subcategory of Pay. Weekly ($M = 37.00$) had the highest level of job

satisfaction for Pay. This was followed by Every 3 Months ($M = 30.90$) and Monthly ($M = 27.21$). The principals who met Yearly had the lowest level of job satisfaction for Pay.

Table 10

Cross-tabulation of Pay and Frequency of Meeting with Mentors
(N = 76)

Frequency Met With Mentor	Number	Mean %	SD
Weekly	12	37.00	11.68
Monthly	28	27.21	13.01
Every 3 Months	20	30.90	13.52
Yearly	2	18.00	.00
Never	3	20.00	15.10
Other	11	21.27	11.18

A third statistically significant finding was Supervision and how often mentors met with beginning principals ($df = 70$, $p < .001$). Table 11 presents the cross-tabulation for this analysis. The strong relationship was shown with the categories having a large difference in the means. Weekly ($M = 48.25$) had the highest mean for Supervision. Monthly ($M = 47.36$) had the second highest level of job satisfaction for Supervision. The third highest level was those who met Every 3 Months ($M = 44.40$). Those who reported meeting with their mentor Yearly ($M = 15.00$), Never ($M = 33.00$) and Other ($M = 37.09$) had a lower job satisfaction for Supervision.

Table 11

Cross-tabulation for Supervision and Frequency of Meeting with Mentors
(N = 76)

Frequency Met With Mentor	Number	Mean %	SD
Weekly	12	48.25	8.17
Monthly	28	47.36	8.02
Every 3 Months	20	44.40	8.57
Yearly	2	15.00	8.49
Never	3	33.00	19.67
Other	11	37.09	16.66

A final pair, People at Work and Frequency of Meeting with Mentor, were found to be statistically significant (df = 55, p < .05). Table 12 presents the cross-tabulation of People at Work and the frequency of meeting with mentors. The three highest levels of job satisfaction for People at Work were Weekly ($M = 48.50$), Monthly ($M = 48.75$), and Every 3 Months ($M = 48.90$). The lowest level of job satisfaction was for those who met Yearly ($M = 33.00$).

Table 12

Cross-tabulation for People at Work and Frequency of Meeting with Mentors
(N = 76)

Frequency Met With Mentor	Number	Mean %	SD
Weekly	12	48.50	8.17
Monthly	28	48.75	5.58
Every 3 Months	20	48.90	8.38
Yearly	2	33.00	29.70
Never	3	40.00	12.12
Other	11	44.45	9.14

A summary of the cross-tabulation is provided in Table 13. The four categories of Supervision, Pay, People at Work, and Present Job are shown below, with the mean percentile of job satisfaction for each of the levels of the frequency of communication between the beginning principals and their mentors. This table shows that beginning principals who met weekly or monthly with their mentors had a higher rate of job satisfaction as opposed to those who met every three months, yearly or never with their mentors. The categories of Yearly and Never were combined, and it must be noted that the number of principals in these two categories was minimal. Comparison of the three categories of Weekly, Monthly and Every 3 Months shows the trend of a higher level of

job satisfaction for the beginning principals who communicated on a regular basis with

their mentors.

Table 13
Cross-tabulation Summery for Frequency of Meeting with a Mentor and Job Satisfaction
(N=76)

Frequency of Meeting with Mentor	n	Supervision Mean %	Pay Mean %	People at Work Mean %	Present Job Mean %
Weekly	12	48.25	37.00	48.50	37.50
Monthly	28	47.36	27.21	48.75	35.57
Every 3 Months	20	44.40	30.90	48.90	33.45
Yearly/Never	5	24.00	19.00	36.50	31.25

When the cross-tabulation analysis was run with all 108 respondents, the same

areas were found to be statistically significant, with minimal change in levels of

significance. Supervision showed the strongest statistically significant relationship ($r =$

$.397$, $p = .000$). Promotion ($r = .353$, $p = .001$), Pay ($r = .344$, $p = .002$), Job in General (r

$= .247$, $p = .027$), and People at work ($r = .225$, $p = .045$) were found to be statistically

significant.

An analysis of variance showed there was no statistically significant difference

between the method of communication in the mentoring program and the level of job

satisfaction in all five subcategories. Table 14 provides the data for this analysis using

the respondents who were in a mentoring program. There were eight respondents who

chose Other for the method of communication used most often, with three respondents

replying that the communications were a combination of the choices and three stating that

they did not have any communication. Two respondents did not complete this option.

Table 14

Analysis of Variance for Job Satisfaction and Method of Communication
(N = 76)

Job Satisfaction	MS	F	p
Present Job	34.693	1.167	.328
Pay	386.008	2.364	.078
Promotion	276.348	6.67	.462
Supervision	318.237	2.511	.065
People at Work	52.417	.614	.608
Job in General	73.369	.824	.485

Note. Between Groups *df*=3

Research Question 3

Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job
satisfaction between those who chose their mentor and those who were assigned a mentor
principal?

An independent *t*-test found no statistically significant difference for those who

chose a mentor and those who were assigned a mentor as it related to job satisfaction. As

shown in Table 15, the five subcategories as well as the Job in General had no

statistically significant difference between the group of beginning elementary principals

who selected a mentor and those who were assigned a mentor.

Table 15

t-test for Job Satisfaction and Method of Mentor Selection
(N = 67)

JDI	Selection Method	Mean %	SD	SE of Mean	*t*	*p*
Present Job	Assigned	34.29	5.510	.850	-1.527	.132
	Chosen	36.36	5.147	1.029		
Pay	Assigned	30.29	13.315	2.055	1.802	.076
	Chosen	24.48	11.737	2.347		
Promotion	Assigned	34.57	17.621	2.719	.220	.827
	Chosen	33.60	17.321	3.464		
Supervision	Assigned	44.00	10.921	1.685	-.189	.851
	Chosen	44.52	10.909	2.182		
People at Work	Assigned	47.64	9.041	1.40	.166	8.69
	Chosen	47.28	9.950	1.590		
Job in General	Assigned	47.57	8.049	1.242	.304	.762
	Chosen	46.92	9.201	1.840		

Note. Mentor Assigned n = 42, Mentor Chosen n = 25

Research Question 4

Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job satisfaction for those who are mentored by an immediate supervisor, mentor practicing principal, or other professional?

A one-way ANOVA analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a difference in job satisfaction between the beginning principals who were mentored by a principal, beginning principals who were mentored by district personnel, those who were mentored by retired principals and those who were mentored by other professionals.

Table 16 shows there were no statistically significant results for the subcategories of the

Job Description Index and Job in General Present Job (F = .246, df = 3, 71, p > .05), Pay

(F = 1.388, df = 3, 71, p > .05), Opportunities for Promotion (F = 1.161, df = 3, 71,

p>.05), Supervision (F = .797, df = 3, 71, p > .05), People at Work (F = .618, df = 3, 71, p

> .05), and Job in General (F = .647, df = 3, 71, p > .05) based on the type of position

held by the mentor.

Table 16

An Analysis of Variance for Job Satisfaction and the Position of the Mentor
(N = 74)

Job Satisfaction	MS	F	p
Present Job	7.533	.246	.864
Pay	243.587	1.388	.253
Promotion	363.221	1.161	.331
Supervision	109.265	.767	.500
People at Work	53.073	.618	.606
Job in General	58.613	.647	.587

Note. Between Groups *df* = 3; Within Groups *df* = 71.

Research Question 5

What impact do gender and age have on the new principal's rating of job satisfaction?

A *t-test* analysis of the data, as shown in Table 17, determined that there was no

statistically significant difference between gender of the beginning principals and their

ratings of the five subcategories and the Job in General. A one-way ANOVA was used to

determine if age had an impact on a new principal's rating of job satisfaction. Again,

there were no statistically significant findings from this analysis of data.

Table 17

t-test for Impact of Gender on Job Satisfaction
(N=107)

Job Satisfaction Category	Gender	Mean	SD	SE	P
Present Job	Female	34.24	6.619	.764	.909
	Male	34.41	7.504	1.327	
Pay	Female	28.24	12.928	1.493	.093
	Male	23.63	12.745	2.253	
Opportunity For Promotion	Female	34.64	17.688	2.042	.281
	Male	30.56	18.184	3.214	
Supervision	Female	43.72	11.839	1.367	.353
	Male	41.34	12.607	2.229	
People at Work	Female	46.32	10.266	1.185	.733
	Male	45.56	11.054	1.954	
Job in General	Female	45.72	10.690	1.234	.600
	Male	46.88	9.721	1.718	

Note. Female N=75, Male N=32; df=105

The one-way ANOVA found no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction based on the age of the beginning principal. As shown in Table 18, Present Job (F = .383, df = 6, 100, p > .05), Pay (F = 1.634, df = 6, 100, p > .05), Promotion (F = .823, df = 6, 100, p > .05), Supervision (F = .253, df = 6, 100, p > .05), People at Work (F = .488, df = 6, 100, p > .05) and Job in General (F = .331, df = 6, 100, p > .05) were found to have no statistically significant difference for the age categories of the beginning principals.

Table 18

Analysis of Variance for Job Satisfaction and Age of Beginning Principal
(N = 108)

Job Satisfaction	*F*	*MS*	*p*
Present Job	.383	19.287	.888
Pay	1.634	267.098	.146
Promotion	.823	270.706	.555
Supervision	.253	38.717	.957
People at Work	.488	58.609	.816
Job in General	.331	42.158	.919

Note. Between Groups *df* = 6; Within Groups *df* = 100.

Additional Findings

Further analysis of the data found results worthy of reporting in this study. A cross-tabulation, as shown in Table 19, determined that Supervision had a statistically

significant relationship with the number of Years in Administration for the beginning

principal, whether or not a beginning principal had a Mentor, and the Frequency of

Meeting with a Mentor. Supervision was the only subcategory which showed reliance on

these three factors of the mentoring program; the other subcategories of Present Work,

Pay, Promotion, People at Work, and Job in General did not have the level of significance

in these factors.

Table 19

Cross-tabulation of Supervision and Mentoring Factors

Variables	Mean	P
Supervision*Years in Administration	80	.000
Supervision*Mentor	48	.004
Supervision* Mentoring Frequency	75	.000

Note. The pair of variables are shown in the cross-tabulation by *.

Another finding from this study was the statistically significant difference

between those whose mentor worked with six or more beginning principals and those

who worked with one to three beginning principals in the job satisfaction subcategory of

Pay. Table 20 provides the information from the *t*-test analysis for job satisfaction facets

and mentors with one to three beginning principals and those with six or more principals.

Table 20

t-test for Job Satisfaction and the Number of Principals Assigned to a Mentor
(N = 27)

Job Satisfaction	Mean	SD	SE	P
Present Job	36.43	4.831	1.291	.246
1-3 Principals	34.15	5.129	1.423	
More than 6				
Pay				
1-3 Principals	25.71	15.862	4.239	.049
More than 6	37.38	13.226	3.668	
Promotion				
1-3 Principals	32.14	15.180	4.057	.447
More than 6	37.38	19.923	5.526	
Supervision				
1-3 Principals	44.79	10.621	2.838	9.18
More than 6	44.31	13.086	3.629	
People at Work				
1-3 Principals	47.36	8.581	2.293	.576
More than 6	48.92	5.251	1.456	
Job in General				
1-3 Principals	47.79	6.27	1.578	.811
More than 6	48.46	8.202	2.275	

Note. df = 25

Comments from Responding Principals

The survey provided an opportunity for respondents to write comments which related to the mentoring program. The following remarks were included in the survey results due to their relevance to the study.

A female respondent who had a retired principal for a mentor, who met with the beginning principal every three months reported, "The first year mentoring was useful in some ways. The second year was a waste of time."

A female principal who met on a weekly basis with her mentor wrote, "I am very fortunate to work with an outstanding mentor and area director. I am very satisfied with the support available."

A female principal who met on a monthly basis with her mentor wrote, "Our district has a wonderful principal mentoring program for first year principals."

A female principal who met with her principal every three months wrote, "I love the work I do. The most difficult part of the job is the supervisory role. Parents, children and other responsibilities are often manageable."

A female principal who met with the mentor "as needed" wrote, "Principals do not get to fulfill the leadership roles as we would like. We are simply directed by state and district mandates. New leaders need a chance to show how our leadership can make changes and improvements before being told what we must do."

A female respondent who did not have a mentor as a beginning principal reported, "This is an excellent district in which to work. Prior to my becoming a principal, mentor principals were assigned to new principals. When I assumed my principalship, no mentors were being assigned. As a result, I conferred with a friend who was also a new principal, and we relied upon one another. We also consulted with other principals we knew and trusted, and they were more than willing to help. Our district has now returned

to the practice of assigning mentors to new principals, which I consider to be a very good move."

A male respondent who met with his mentor every three months wrote, "I hate AYP! As a new principal to the school I am in, we have been an "A" school for every year except the second year (B). We have not made AYP for several years. The last two have been "provisional." Want to talk about stress? I've made some great improvements in my short months on the job, according to what I am hearing. But I've also been told that if we don't make AYP this year, there is a good chance that I will not have the job next year and the teachers may all be displaced! That is stress!"

A male respondent who reported very " infrequent meetings" also had this comment to add, "I did not work much with my mentor principal because I had so many other former coworkers currently in principal positions. My support group was, thankfully, very large. My mentor was someone I had just met upon appointment, therefore, it was easier - and quicker - to contact someone I previously knew."

A male respondent who met yearly with the mentor who was a practicing principal wrote, "My current mentor does not wish to communicate with me. I would much rather contact another colleague to ask a question than to ask my mentor. I am left to sink or swim based on my own determination. Many times I will seek other council based on my personal friendships that I have made."

A male respondent without a mentor wrote, "We have no mentor program in place, curious isn't it."

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if mentoring programs for beginning principals would have an impact on job satisfaction. This study focused on the variables of the length of the mentoring program, age, race and gender of the beginning principal, the selection of the principal, and the position the mentor held in the school district. An analysis of data found a statistically significant relationship between the frequency of meetings with a mentor as opposed to other variables in this study. Age, gender, position of the mentor, and how the mentor was selected did not impact job satisfaction for the Florida beginning elementary school principals in this study.

Problem Statement

This study sought to determine if a relationship existed between mentor programs for Florida beginning elementary principals and their level of job satisfaction.

Methodology

Twenty-four Florida school districts participated in this study. Alachua, Brevard, Collier, Columbia, Escambia, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Holmes, Jackson, Lake, Leon, Manatee, Marion, Martin, Osceola, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, Santa Rosa, Seminole, Sumter,

Volusia, Walton, and Washington were represented in this study. The school districts provided contact information and a contact was made to the beginning elementary school principals with a link to the consent form and online survey. The survey consisted of the Job Description Index and the Job in General. Demographic information was also collected through the survey. The first email had a response of 36 participants. A second contact by email yielded 16 responses. A third follow-up email produced 29 responses. The fourth email contact netted 22 responses. A final email was sent with 10 responses. A total of 113 responses were returned. However, five of the surveys were incomplete and could not be used for the purposes of this study. Responses with subcategories missing three or more answers were discarded as recommended by Balzer et al. (1997). The total respondents used in this survey was 108 for a 61% response rate.

The online questionnaire was created through the Internet website SurveyMonkey. This website provided a secure, password-protected location for the questionnaire. Results were collected into an Excel database. This information was transferred to the SPSS software. The answers to the modified Job Description Index and Job in General were "Yes" or "No" responses. The response of "Undecided" was eliminated from this survey. Positive questions received three points for each "Yes" response. Negative answers were transformed to provide appropriate responses. Items such as whether the supervisor was "Annoying" were transformed so that a "No" response would receive three points whereas positive response items would receive three points for a "Yes" response. Each subcategory was calculated for a sum score. Pay and

Opportunities for Promotion required the score to be doubled as they had nine questions as compared to the 18 questions in each of the other subcategories. The subcategories were not to be added together as this would not provide a total job satisfaction score. The Job in General score provided the overall satisfaction for the respondents.

Demographic information gathered as part of this study were age, gender, race, experience in education and years of experience as a principal. Seventy-five, or 69.4%, of the respondents were female. Thirty-two, or 29.9%, were male respondents. Seven respondents, or 6.5%, reported themselves to be 30-35 years of age. Sixteen, or 15%, were between the ages of 36-40. Twenty-six, or 24.1%, were 41-46 years of age. Twenty-four, or 22.2%, were 51-55 years old. Seventeen, or 15.7%, reportedly were 56-60 years old. Only 3, or 2.8%, were 61 years or older.

Ninety-two, or 85.2%, beginning principals for this study were Caucasian. Nine or 8.3%, beginning principals were African-American, and seven, or 6.5%, were Hispanic. There were no principals who reported their race as Asian or Other.

A substantial number of the principals had 11-20 years of experience in education. There were 53 respondents, or 49.6%, of the principals in this category. Beginning principals with only one to ten years of experience in education accounted for just two respondents, or 1.8%. Eighteen, or 16.8%, of the respondents had between 26-30 years of experience in education. Fifteen principals, or 14%, reported 31 years or more of experience in education.

A majority of the respondents in this survey, 62 principals, or 57.4%, had between 6-10 years experience as an administrator. This included years spent as an assistant principal and principal. Twenty-nine principals, or 26.9%, had five or fewer years as an administrator. Only 15 principals, or 13.8%, of the respondents had eleven or more years experience as an administrator. There were 48 principals, or 44.4%, reporting one year of experience, 16 respondents, or 14.8%, with two years of experience, and 44 principals, 40.7%, with three years of experience.

Data Analysis

This study was guided by the following five research questions.

1. What is the relationship between mentoring programs for beginning elementary principals and their level of job satisfaction?

2. What difference exists among principals with varying degrees of mentoring in terms of reported job satisfaction?

3. Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job satisfaction between those who chose their mentor and those who were assigned a mentor principal?

4. Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job satisfaction for those who are mentored by an immediate supervisor, mentor practicing principal, or other professional?

5. What impact do gender and age have on the new principal's rating of job satisfaction?

Research Question 1

What is the relationship between mentoring programs for beginning elementary principals and their level of job satisfaction?

Job satisfaction was measured by the five subcategories of the Job Description Index and the Job in General, provided by Bowling Green State University. A Pearson Correlation was used to determine if a relationship existed between mentoring and job satisfaction. All five subcategories of the Job Description Index and the Job in General showed no statistically significant relationship with principals being in a mentoring program. There was no relationship between being mentored and the level of job satisfaction as determined by the Job Description Index and the Job in General instruments.

Research Question 2

What difference exists among principals with varying degrees of mentoring in terms of reported job satisfaction?

An analysis of the number of years the beginning principals reported being in a mentoring program yielded results which were not statistically significant. Fifty-eight of the total respondents, or 53.7%, were mentored during their first year in the principalship. Fifteen principals, or 13.8%, were mentored for two years. Only one respondent, or less

than 1%, was mentored for three years. Thirty-four principals, or 31.5%, did not

participate in a mentoring program as a beginning principal. An independent *t-test* was

used to determine if there was a difference between those who were mentored for one

year and principals who were mentored for two years. There was no statistically

significant difference between the two groups of principals in all five subcategories as

well as the Job in General.

However, those who reported a more frequent meeting with their mentor did have

a higher level of job satisfaction. There was a statistically significant positive

relationship between the frequency of meeting with a mentor and job satisfaction in four

of the facets of the Job Description Index. The subcategory of Supervision had the

strongest relationship with the frequency of meetings. Pay and Opportunity for

Promotion had the same level of significance in the relationship with frequency of

meeting with the mentor. The fourth facet which showed a statistically significant

positive relationship was People at Work. Beginning principals who met frequently with

their mentors had a strong job satisfaction rating for their boss or supervisor. They also

had a higher degree of satisfaction with their compensation for the job and opportunities

for advancement. The higher the rate of meeting with their mentor resulted in a higher

job satisfaction rating for their co-workers. Job in General, the overall rating for job

satisfaction, also had a statistically significant relationship with the frequency of meetings

with mentors.

The method of communication did not impact job satisfaction for the beginning principals. Whether fact-to-fact communication, phone calls, emails or other types of communication were used, there was no significant difference between the mentored, beginning principals in this study.

Research Question 3

Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job satisfaction between those who chose their mentor and those who were assigned a mentor principal?

This question determined if one method of selecting a mentor would impact job satisfaction for the beginning principal. Forty-two, or 39%, of the beginning principals had a mentor assigned to them. Twenty-five, or 23%, of the beginning principals were able to choose their own mentor. An independent t-test determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the group of principals who selected their mentor and those who had a mentor assigned to them in their rating scores for the five job satisfaction subcategories and the Job in General.

The principals who were assigned a mentor had a mean percentile score of 34.29 for Present Job compared with those who chose their mentor with a mean percentile score of 36.36. Beginning principals who were assigned a mentor had a mean percentile score of 30.29 in Pay, while those who chose their mentor had a score of 24.48. Promotion had similar mean percentile scores of 34.57 for those assigned a mentor and 33.60 for those who chose their mentor. Supervision and People at work had even closer scores with a

mean percentile score of 44.00 in Supervision for those who were assigned a mentor compared to 44.52 for those who chose a mentor. People at Work had a mean percentile score of 47.64 for assigned mentor and beginning principals who chose their mentors had a mean percentile score of 47.28. Three out of the five areas in the Job Description Index had slightly higher scores for those who chose their mentor. However, the Job in General score was slightly higher for those who were assigned a mentor. The mean percentile score for principals who were assigned a mentor was 47.57 compared to the mean percentile score of 46.92 for those who chose their mentor.

Research Question 4

Among those who participated in a mentor program, what is the difference in job satisfaction for those who are mentored by an immediate supervisor, mentor practicing principal, or other professional?

This research question was to determine if beginning principals would have a higher rate of job satisfaction if they were mentored by a person in a particular position as a factor in their mentoring program. Forty-nine beginning principals, or 32%, were mentored by another practicing principal. Ten beginning principals, or 6.5%, were mentored by retired principals. District personnel accounted for 6, or 3.9%, of the mentors. Ten respondents chose "Other" in response to the position of their mentor. Those responses included five who were mentored by retired area superintendents and one who was mentored by the superintendent.

The one-way ANOVA determined there was no significant difference between the level of job satisfaction for beginning principals based on their mentors' job positions. Whether the beginning principals were mentored by other principals or a retired superintendent, it did not impact job satisfaction for the beginning principals. However, in the additional findings, what did impact job satisfaction was whether or not that mentor had more than six beginning principals they were mentoring. A cross-tabulation of the subcategory of Pay had a statistically significant difference for those who were mentored by someone working with one to three principals as opposed to those working with six or more beginning principals.

Research Question 5

What impact do gender and age have on the new principal's rating of job satisfaction?

This research question was included to determine if the gender or race would impact the scores for job satisfaction for beginning principals. The majority of the beginning principals were female, with 75 principals, or 70.1%, in this category. Thirty-two, or 29.9%, of the beginning principals were male.

An independent *t-test* determined there was no statistically significant difference between male and female respondents in job satisfaction rating in five facets of the Job Description Index and the Job in General.

A one-way ANOVA was used to determine if age of the beginning principal impacted the job satisfaction ratings. An analysis of variance did not produce any

statistically significant differences among the age groups for beginning principals and their job satisfaction ratings. Twenty-three, or 21.5%, of the beginning elementary principals were 40 years old or younger. Forty, or 37.4%, of the principals were between 41 and 50 years old. Forty-four, or 41.1%, reported being over 51 years of age.

Summary and Discussion of the Findings

This study was designed to determine if mentoring would impact job satisfaction for beginning elementary principals. The study looked at variables in mentoring programs such as the position of the mentor, age and gender of the beginning principal, length of the mentor program, selection of the mentor, position of the mentor, communication method, and the frequency of meetings in the mentor program. A careful analysis of the data determined that the main variable that affected job satisfaction for beginning principals was the frequency of meetings between the beginning principals and their mentors. Clear evidence of the relationship between a higher frequency of meetings and an increase in job satisfaction in four of the facets of the Job Description Index, as well as the Job in General overall score, was determined in this study. Within the Literature Review, many variables of the mentoring program were addressed. However, none of the studies cited related to the frequency of meetings between the mentor and the beginning principal.

Enrolling beginning principals in a mentoring program will not impact job satisfaction unless meetings occur between the beginning principal and the mentor. If the

mentor and beginning principal do not meet on a regular basis, the impact will be minimal, according to the results of this survey. Mentoring programs must have an established goal for the frequency of meetings to assist the beginning principals. The higher the frequency of meeting, the more likely the level of job satisfaction will increase for beginning elementary principals.

School districts may design their mentoring programs to fit the needs of the administrators, as the selection process of mentors and position held by the mentors does not impact job satisfaction. Beginning principals may work with retired principals or principals within their district. The mentor program also does not need to be a specific length in order to affect job satisfaction. There was no statistical significance between those who were in a mentor program for one year as compared to those who were in a mentor program for two years.

The comments provided by some of the respondents showed the stress the beginning elementary principals felt as they took on the challenge of leading the school. Some reported a positive mentoring program, while others felt they could not meet or communicate with their assigned mentor. Some comments reflected the varied demands of the job of the principalship.

Conclusions

A mentoring program for beginning elementary principals can significantly impact job satisfaction if the mentor works closely with the novice principal. The

frequency of meetings is the most important variable of the mentoring program. Districts that provide a mentoring program must ensure that the mentors and beginning principals have ample opportunity to meet and to communicate in order for the program to have a positive impact.

Beginning principals who were in a mentoring program that did not have consistent contact with their mentors did not have an increase in their job satisfaction. A mentoring program that established minimal contact between the participants was ineffective and provided little support to the beginning principal. The level of job satisfaction was lower for those beginning principals who met every three months or less with their mentors.

This study was intended to: (a) develop a description of the beginning principals who responded to the survey, (b) determine if mentoring was beneficial to beginning principals, (c) examine the variables of a mentoring program that would impact job satisfaction. As a result of the review of literature and analysis of the data, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Mentor programs have a positive effect on beginning principals if the frequency of meetings occurs on a regular basis.

2. The length of the mentoring program does not impact the effectiveness of the program.

3. Beginning principals in Florida in this study reported having a higher level of job satisfaction in Present Job, Supervision, People at Work and Job in General.

Present Job referred to the daily work they perform. Job satisfaction related to how pleased they were with their supervisor or boss. People at Work referred to the level of job satisfaction with their co-workers. The Job in General was an overall rating for contentment with their job.

4. Beginning principals in Florida in this study reported they were more dissatisfied in Pay and Opportunities for Promotion than the other areas of job satisfaction. Pay referred to the monetary compensation and other benefits of the job. Opportunities for Promotion are the advancement and recognition of principals.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

Analysis of the data from this study, in conjunction with the literature inquiry conducted as part of this study, has led to the following recommendations for future studies:

1. Explore the relationship of mentoring for elementary assistant principals or secondary administrators and job satisfaction.

2. Conduct a qualitative study of the factors impacting job satisfaction for school administrators. This may include beginning administrators as well as those who have several years of experience.

3. Replicate this study in states other than Florida. Regional studies in the northern states or west coast would be appropriate.

4. Conduct a paired sample study of job satisfaction at the beginning and the end of the year to determine if there is a change in an individual's scores.

5. Examine additional factors such as size of school and school district to determine if they impact job satisfaction for beginning principals.

6. Conduct a quantitative study to determine if the location, such as rural, urban or suburban, impacts a mentoring program.

7. Conduct a phenomenological study on mentoring programs in Central Florida for school administrators to determine if specific mentoring qualities impacted the beginning principals.

8. Examine the components of the mentoring program in a quantitative study for educational leaders. This comparison study would include the preparation, length, requirements, and activities of the mentoring program.

9. Conduct a study to determine if a school's socioeconomic level has an impact on job satisfaction. Additional demographic data would be collected for this study.

10. Investigate whether the supervision styles of area superintendents and superintendents impact job satisfaction for beginning principals.

11. Determine if mentoring programs for district personnel impact job satisfaction through the use of the Job Description Index and Job in General instruments.

12. Examine the impact of mentoring on the mentors and district personnel. The focus of the study would be those assisting new principals and the benefits or concerns in working with new principals.

APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

IRB Committee Approval Form

#06-3607

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S): Colleen Skinner
(Supervisor – George Pawlas, Ph.D. and Stephen Sivo, Ph.D.)

PROJECT TITLE: A Comparison of Mentored and Non-Mentored Novice Elementary Principals in Respect to Job Satisfaction

[**X**] New project submission   [ ] Resubmission of lapsed project #
[ ] Continuing review of lapsed project #   [ ] Continuing review of #
[ ] Study expires   [ ] Initial submission was approved by expedited review
[ ] Initial submission was approved by full board review but continuing review can be expedited
[ ] Suspension of enrollment email sent to PI, entered on spreadsheet, administration notified _____

Chair   **IRB Reviewers:**
[ ] Expedited Approval

    Dated: _____
        Cite how qualifies for   Signed: _____
        expedited review: Dr. Sophia Dziegielewski, Vice-Chair
        minimal risk and _____
                                         Signed: _____
[X] Exempt   Dr. Jacqueline Byers, Chair

    Dated: 7/31/06   Signed: _____
        Cite how qualifies for   Dr. Tracy Dietz, Vice-Chair
        exempt status: # 2
        minimal risk and _____

[ ] Expiration   *Complete reverse side of expedited or exempt form*
    Date: _____   [X] Waiver of documentation of consent approved
                                         [ ] Waiver of consent approved
                                         [ ] Waiver of HIPAA Authorization approved

NOTES FROM IRB CHAIR (IF APPLICABLE): _____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

APPENDIX B: JDI CONSENT FORM

Bowling Green State University

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

Date: 06/07/2006

Purchaser: Colleen Skinner

Address: University of Central Florida

Permission to reproduce: 400 copies of Job Descriptive Index and Job in General

Maya Yankelevich
JDI Research Assistant

To obtain copyright information for the JDI and JIG, contact:

APPENDIX C: FIRST CONTACT

To   smith@brevard.k12.fl.us
Re   Online Principal Survey

Dear Ms. Smith,

I am writing to ask your help in a study of beginning principals being conducted in the state of Florida. This study is part of an effort to determine the effect of mentor programs on beginning principals. This online questionnaire is being conducted as part of my studies in Educational Leadership as a doctoral candidate at the University of Central Florida.

It is my understanding that you have been in the principal position for less than three years. I am contacting a random sample of principals to determine if they had access to a mentor as a beginning principal.

Results of the survey will be used to assist educators in creating leadership professional development programs. Your answers are extremely important to the study. The questionnaire will take approximately five minutes to complete. Just follow this link to the consent page of this online questionnaire www.net. The login is UCF and password is SURVEY.

Please be assured your answers are completely confidential and will be released only as summaries in which no individual's answers can identified. When you complete the online questionnaire, your name will not be connected to your answers in any way. This questionnaire is voluntary. However, you will help me very much by taking a few minutes to share your experiences and opinions as a principal. If for some reason you wish to not respond, please let me know by replying to this email.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, I would be happy to talk with you at (321) 779-2040 or you may email me at skinnerc@brevard.k12.fl.us.

Thank you again for helping with this very important study.

Sincerely,
Colleen Skinner
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

P.S. If you would like to receive the results of this survey, please email me.

APPENDIX D: SECOND CONTACT

| To | smith@brevard.k12.fl.us |
| Re | Online Principal Survey |

Dear Ms. Smith,

Last week a link to an online questionnaire seeking your opinions about principal mentor programs was emailed to you. Your name was drawn randomly from a list of principals with less than three years of experience.

If you have already completed the questionnaire, please accept my sincere appreciation. If not, please take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it today. I am especially grateful for your help because it only by hearing from people in your position that we are able to fully understand the impact of mentor programs for new principals. Your experiences are vital to this study.

Here is the link to the questionnaire www.net. The login is UCF and password is SURVEY.

If you would rather complete a paper copy of the questionnaire, please email me at skinnerc@brevard.k12.fl.us or call (321) 779-2040 and I will mail one to you. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Colleen Skinner
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

APPENDIX E: THIRD CONTACT

| To | smith@brevard.k12.fl.us |
| Re | Online Principal Survey |

About two weeks ago I emailed a link to a questionnaire to you that asked about your experiences as principal and mentor programs. This brief online survey will take just a few minutes of your time. Valuable information will be gained from your responses.

Please click on the following link to access the online questionnaire www.net. The login is UCF and password is SURVEY.

If you no longer are in the principal position or have more than three years of experience as a principal, please let me know by return email and I will remove your name from the list of participants. If you would rather complete a paper copy of the questionnaire, simply return this email with your address and I will send the questionnaire through the U.S. Postal Service.

Just a reminder that survey results are not tied to an individual once the questionnaire is returned. Protecting the confidentiality of people's answers are extremely important to me, as well as the University of Central Florida. Participation is voluntary.

I sincerely hope you will fill out and return the questionnaire soon, but if for some reason you choose not to, simply reply to this email with a note you will not be participating. Thank you for your time in this matter.

Respectfully,

Colleen Skinner
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

P.S. If you have any questions, please call me at (321) 777-5209 or email skinnerc@brevard.k12.fl.us.

APPENDIX F: FOURTH CONTACT

To	smith@brevard.k12.fl.us
Re	Online Principal Survey

Dear Ms. Smith,

About three weeks ago I emailed a questionnaire to you that asked about your experiences as principal and mentor programs. To the best of my knowledge, it has not yet been completed. The results of the questionnaires which have been completed include a wide variety of responses on the experiences of principals. The early results appear to be very useful to educational leaders who may choose to design a mentor program.

I am writing again because of the importance that your questionnaire has for assisting me in getting accurate results. Although principals were sampled throughout the state of Florida, it is by hearing from nearly everyone in the sample that I can be sure that the results are truly representative. Please click on the following link to access the online questionnaire www.net. The login is UCF and password is SURVEY. If you no longer are in the principal position or have more than three years of experience as a principal, please let me know by return email and I will remove your name from the list of participants.

Just a reminder that survey results are not tied to an individual once the questionnaire is returned. An identification number is printed on each questionnaire to ensure responses are returned. Once your name has been checked off the list the identification number is removed from the questionnaire and your responses are not tied to an individual name. Protecting the confidentiality of people's answers are extremely important to me, as well as the University of Central Florida. Participation is voluntary.

I sincerely hope you will fill out and return the questionnaire soon, but if for some reason you choose not to, simply reply to this email with a note you will not be participating. Thank you for your time in this matter.

Respectfully,

Colleen Skinner
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

P.S. If you have any questions, please call me at (321) 777-5209 or email skinnerc@brevard.k12.fl.us.

APPENDIX G: FIFTH CONTACT

To	smith@brevard.k12.fl.us
Re	Online Principal Survey

During the past two months I have sent you several emails about an important study I am conducting as part of my doctoral studies in Educational Leadership at the University of Central Florida.

Its purpose is to help educators determine the effects of a mentor program for new principals. This study is drawing to close, and this is the last contact that will be made to request your participation in the study. The random sample of administrators is representative of the state and your participation would be greatly appreciated. Your answers to the questionnaire are important to ensure the accuracy of the study.

I want to assure you that your answers to the questionnaire would be keep in confidence and only reported in group scores. Also, your participation in the study is voluntary. If you decide to not participate, please respond via email. It would be very helpful.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to consider being part of this important study of educational leaders. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Colleen Skinner
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

APPENDIX H: JOB DESCRIPTION INDEX

Dear Principal,

You are among several principals in the state of Florida who have been selected to participate in an anonymous online survey. Your participation and honest answers are crucial to this study of beginning principals.

By completing this survey you are consenting to participation in this voluntary study. There is no compensation or personal gain from participating and completing the questionnaire.

This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Your answers will not be reported individually, but only analyzed as a group with other responses.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me at (321) 243-7782. My faculty supervisor, Dr. George Pawlas, may be contacted at (407) 384-2194 or by email at gpawlas@pegasus.cc.ucf.edu.

Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to UCF Institutional Review Board Office at the University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246. The phone numbers are 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276.
If you would like to receive a copy of the results of the study, please email me at skinnerc@brevard.k12.fl.us.
Thank you for participating in this important educational study.

Please answer the question below and choose "Next"

1. Do you wish to participate in this study?

◡ Yes, I will participate in the study.

◡ No, I do not wish to participate in this study (do not continue with survey and choose submit at the end of the survey).

How would you describe your current job?

	Yes	No
1. Fascinating	◌	◌
2. Routine	◌	◌
3. Satisfying	◌	◌
4. Boring	◌	◌
5. Good	◌	◌
6. Creative	◌	◌
7. Respected	◌	◌
8. Can see my results	◌	◌
9. Pleasant	◌	◌

10. Useful	○	○
11. Uncomfortable	○	○
12. Uses my abilities	○	○
13. Challenging	○	○
14. Repetitive	○	○
15. Dull	○	○
16. Uninteresting	○	○
17. Simple	○	○
18. Gives sense of accomplishment	○	○

How would you describe your pay?

	Yes	No
19. Income adequate for normal expenses	○	○
20. Fair	○	○
21. Barely live on income	○	○
22. Bad	○	○
23. Income provides luxuries	○	○
24. Insecure	○	○
25. Less than I deserve	○	○
26. Well paid	○	○
27. Underpaid	○	○

How would you describe your job in the area of career advancement?

	Yes	No
28. Good opportunities for promotion	○	○
29. Opportunity somewhat limited	○	○
30. Promotion on ability	○	○
31. Dead-end job	○	○
32. Good chance for promotion	○	○
33. Unfair promotion policy	○	○
34. Infrequent promotions	○	○
35. Regular promotions	○	○
36. Fairly good chance for promotion	○	○

How well does each of the following words describe your supervisor?

	Yes	No
37. Asks my advice	○	○
38. Hard to please	○	○
39. Impolite	○	○
40. Praises good work	○	○
41. Tactful	○	○
42. Influential	○	○
43. Up-to-date	○	○
44. Doesn't supervise enough	○	○
45. Has favorites	○	○

46. Tells me where I stand	○	○
47. Annoying	○	○
48. Stubborn	○	○
49. Knows job well	○	○
50. Bad	○	○
51. Intelligent	○	○
52. Poor planner	○	○
53. Around when needed	○	○
54. Lazy	○	○

How well does each of the following words describe the people you work with in your current job?

	Yes	No
55. Stimulating	○	○
56. Boring	○	○
57. Slow	○	○
58. Helpful	○	○
59. Stupid	○	○
60. Responsible	○	○
61. Fast	○	○
62. Intelligent	○	○
63. Easy to make enemies	○	○

64. Talk too much	○	○
65. Smart	○	○
66. Lazy	○	○
67. Unpleasant	○	○
68. Gossipy	○	○
69. Active	○	○
70. Narrow interests	○	○
71. Loyal	○	○
72. Stubborn	○	○

How would you describe your job in general?

	Yes	No
73. Pleasant	○	○
74. Bad	○	○
75. Ideal	○	○
76. Waste of time	○	○
77. Good	○	○
78. Undesirable	○	○
79. Worthwhile	○	○
80. Worse than most	○	○
81. Acceptable	○	○

82. Superior	○	○
83. Better than most	○	○
84. Disagreeable	○	○
85. Makes me content	○	○
86. Inadequate	○	○
87. Excellent	○	○
88. Rotten	○	○
89. Enjoyable	○	○
90. Poor	○	○

Please answer each of the following questions by selecting the appropriate response:

91. What is your age group?

- ◡ < 30 years old
- ◡ 30 - 35 years old
- ◡ 36 - 40 years old
- ◡ 41 - 45 years old
- ◡ 46 - 50 years old
- ◡ 51 - 55 years old
- ◡ 56 - 60 years old
- ◡ 61+ years old

92. What is your gender?

- ◡ Female
- ◡ Male

93. What is your race?

- ◡ African-American
- ◡ Asian
- ◡ Caucasian
- ◡ Hispanic
- ◡ Multiracial
- ◡ Other _____

94. How many years of experience do you have in the field of education?

- �””1-5 Years
- �”6-10 Years
- �” 11-15 Years
- ”16-20 Years
- ”21-25 Years
- ”26-30 Years
- ”31-35 Years
- ”35+ Years

95. How many years have you been an administrator?

- ”1-5 Years
- ”6-10 Years
- ”11-15 Years
- ”16-20 Years
- ”21-25 Years
- ”26-30 Years
- ”31-35 Years
- ”35+ Years

96. How long have you been a principal? (choose the closest answer)

- ◡ Less than 6 months
- ◡ One Year
- ◡ Two Years
- ◡ Three Years
- ◡ Four Years
- ◡ More than four years

97. As a principal, do you currently have a mentor principal?

- ◡ Yes
- ◡ No

98. As a principal, did you have a mentor principal in the past?

- ◡ Yes, I had a mentor for my first year as a principal.
- ◡ Yes, I had a mentor for my first two years as a principal.
- ◡ Yes, I had a mentor for more than two years as a principal.
- ◡ No, I did not have a mentor as a beginning principal. (Skip to final question for remarks.

99. How was your mentor principal selected?

- ◡ Mentor principal was assigned to me
- ◡ Mentor was selected by myself
- ◡ Mentor volunteered his/her services
- ◡ Not sure

100. How did you communicate most frequently with your mentor?

◡ Face-to-face meetings

◡ Phone calls

◡ E-mail messages

◡ Other _____

101. How often did you meet with your mentor?

◡ Weekly

◡ Monthly

◡ Approximately every 3 months

◡ Once a year

◡ Never

◡ Other _____

102. Did your mentor also mentor other beginning principals?

◡ No, my mentor did not mentor other beginning principals at the same time

◡ Yes, my mentor also mentored 1-3 beginning principals at the same time

◡ Yes, my mentor also mentored 3-6 beginning principals at the same time

◡ Yes, my mentor also mentored more than six beginning principals at the same time

Please answer the following questions about your mentor.
Click on the button by the most appropriate response.

103. What is your mentor's age group?

⦾ < 30 years old

⦾ 30 - 35 years old

⦾ 36 - 40 years old

⦾ 41 - 45 years old

⦾ 46 - 50 years old

⦾ 51 - 55 years old

⦾ 56 - 60 years old

⦾ 61+ years old

104. What is your mentor's gender?

⦾ Female

⦾ Male

105. What is your mentor's race?

⦾ African-American

⦾ Asian

⦾ Caucasian

⦾ Hispanic

⦾ Multiracial

⦾ Other _____

106. What is the position of your mentor?

⏾ Practicing principal in my district

⏾ Practicing principal outside of my school district

⏾ District personnel

⏾ Retired principal

⏾ Other _____

107. Please use the space below to share additional information.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Allen, T. D., Lentz, E., & Day, R. (2006). Career success outcomes associated with mentoring others. *Journal of Career Development, 32*(3), 272-285.

Anderman, E. M., Belzer, S., & Smith, J. (1991, April). *Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 375497).

Archer, J. (2002). Novice principals put huge strain on N.Y.C. schools. *Education Week*, *21*, 1-15.

Archer, J. (2006). Mentoring for new principals gains policy attention. *Education Week, 26*(3), 10-11.

Austin, G. R. (1979). Exemplary school and the search for effectiveness. *Educational Leadership, 37*1, 10-11.

Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A. Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., et al. (1997). *Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI: 1997 Revision) and the Job in General scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.

Barry, C. K., & Kaneko, J. (2002). Mentoring matters. *Leadership, 31*(3), 26-29.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Beck, R. C. (2000). *Motivation: Theories and principles* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bell, C. R. (1996). *Managers as mentors: Building partnerships for learning*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Bell, C. R. (2002). *Managers as mentors: Building partnerships for learning* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Benke, R. L. Jr., & Rhode, J. G. (1980). The job satisfaction of higher level employees in certified public accounting firms. *Accounting, Organizations and Society,* 5(2), 187-201.

Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto. (2003). Retrieved August 13, 2006 from http://broadfoundation.org/medpubs/betterleadersforamericasschools. pdf#search=%22better%leaders%20for%20america's%20schools%3a%20a %20manifesto%22

Blackburn, R. T., Horowitz, S. M., Edington, D. W. , & Klos, D. M. (1986). University faculty and administrator responses in job strains. *Research in Higher Education, 25*(1), 3141.

Blezek, A. G. (1987). Job satisfaction priorities of faculty in the college of agriculture. *NACTA Journal, 31*(2), 46-48.

Border, H. R. (2004). Job satisfaction of Florida's middle school assistant principals as a factor for preserving an administrative workforce (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2004). 1777, 151.

Bowen, B. E., & Radhakrishna, R. B. (1991). Job satisfaction of agricultural education faculty: A constant phenomena. *Journal of Agricultural Education,* 16-22.

Brayfield, A.H., Wells, R.V., & Strate, M.W. (1957). Interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 41*, 201.

Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. *Group and Organization Studies, 9*, 353-372.

Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier, factors, and job dissatisfier factors of agricultural teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education,* 33(3) 40-46.

Casavant, M. D., & Cherkowski, S. (2001). Effective leadership: Bringing mentoring and creativity to the principalship. *NASSP-Bulletin, 85*(624), 71-81.

Chambers, J. (1999). The job satisfaction of managerial and executive women: Revisiting the assumptions. *Journal of Education for Business, 75*(2), 69-74.

Chenoweth, T., Carr, C., & Ruhl, T. (2002). *Best practice in educational leadership preparation programs.* A paper presented August 19, 2002 at the Administrator Licensure Planning Forum, University of Oregon.

Chiu, C. (1998). Do professional women have lower job satisfaction than professional men? Lawyers as a case study. *Sex Roles, 38*(7,8), 521-537.

Clark, J. (1999, March). *Confronting the educational leader shortage.* Paper presented at the Summer Conference of the American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA.

Cohen, N. H. (1995). *Principles of adult mentoring inventory.* Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Cordeiro, P. A., & Smith-Sloan, E. (1995, April). *Apprenticeships for administrative interns: learning to talk like a principal.* Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Crews, A. C., & Weakley, S. (1996). *Making Leadership Happen: The SREB Model for Leadership Development.* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Crites, J. O. (1985). Review of the Job Description Index. In J.V. Mitchell (Ed). *The ninth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 753-754). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute.

Crow, G. M., Hausman, C. S., & Scribner, J. P. (2002). Reshaping the role of the school principal. In J. Murphy (Ed.) *The leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 189-210). Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.

Crow, G. M., & Matthews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one's way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Culver, S. M., Wolfle, L. M., & Cross, L. H. (1990). Testing a model of teacher satisfaction for black and whites. *American Educational Research, 27*, 323-349.

Curtis, D. (2002). *Helping state leaders shape education policy.* Retrieved November 3, 2005 from www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/64/57/6457.doc

Daresh, J. (2003). *Teachers mentoring teachers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Daresh, J. (2004). Mentoring school leaders: Professional promise or predictable problems? *Educational Administration Quarterly. 40*(4), 495-517.

DeMeuse, K. P. (1985). A compendium of frequently used measures in industrial/organizational psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 23*, 53-59.

Donaldson, G. (1987). The Maine principals' academy. *NASSP Bulletin, 71*(495), 40-43.

Donaldson, G. (2004). The lose-lose leadership hunt. *Education Week*, *21*, 5.

Eckman, E. W. (2003). Similarities and differences in role conflict, role commitment, and job satisfaction for female and male high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly. 40*(3), 366-387.

Educational Research Service, Inc. (1985). *Effective schools: A summary of research.* Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc.

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Foleno, F. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talks about school leadership.* New York: Public Agenda. Retrieved May 23, 2006 from http://www.publicagenda.org/specials/leadership/leadership.htm

Ferrandino, V. L. (2001). Challenges for 21st century elementary school principals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 440-442.

Fullan, M. G. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. *The Elementary School Journal, 85*(3), 391-422.

Gallegos, K. (1999). Mentors can prevent death of optimism for new principals. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 29*(1), 27.

Gawl, J. E. (1997). Herzberg's theory of motivation and maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 5*(11)

Geismar, T.J., Morris, J.D., & Lieberman, M.G. (2000). Selecting mentors for principalship interns. *Journal for School Leadership, 10,* 233-47.

Gooden, J. S., & Spencer, L. (2003). Reforming educational leadership programs: Identifying the ideal principal mentor. *Connections, 4*.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Haberman, M., & Dill, V. (1999). Selecting star principals for schools serving children in poverty. *Instructional Leadership, 12* (1), 1-5, 11-12.

Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*, 259-286.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279.

Haney, A. (1997). The role of mentorship in the workplace. *Workplace Education,* 211-228.

Harwell, M. R. (2003). Job description index 1997 and the job in general scales. *Mental Measurements Yearbook.* Retrieved May 25, 2006 from http://gateway.ut.ovid.com/ gw2/ovidweb.cgi

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, R. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). NY: Wiley and Sons.

Hobson, A. (2003). *Mentoring and coaching for new leaders.* Retrieved June 21, 2006 from http://72.14.209.104/search?q=cache:f5vEqMmxAQ0J: www.ncsl.org.uk/media/1D0/FF/m

Holloway, J. H. (2004). Mentoring new leaders. *Educational Leadership, 61*(7), 87-88.

Hopkins-Thompson, P.A. (2000). Colleagues helping colleagues: Mentoring and coaching. *NASSP Bulletin, 84*(617), 29-36.

Howard, V. A., & Scheffler, I. (1996). *Work, education & leadership: Essays in philosophy of education.* NewYork:Lang.

Howley, A., Chadwick, K., & Howley, C. (2002, April). Networking for the nuts and bolds: The ironies of professional development for rural principals. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Howley, A., Pendarvis, E., & Gibbs, T. (2002). Attracting principals to the superintendency: Conditions that make a difference to principals. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10(43).

Hulin, C.L. (1966). Job satisfaction and turnover in a female clerical population. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 50,* 285.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2002). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Retrieved May 4, 2006 from http://www.iel.org/ programs/21st/reports/principal.pdf

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2005). *Preparing leaders for rural school: Practice and policy considerations.* Retrieved May 4, 2006 from http://www.iel.org/pubs/ ruralleaders.pdf

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 505-532.

Jensen, D. (2000). Keys to job satisfaction. Retrieved May 5, 2006 from http://www.searchmastersinternational.com/eprise/main/we/us/smi/en/ candidates_career_dev_job_satis

Kelley, C., & Peterson, K. (2001). Transforming school leadership. *Leadership*, *30*(3), 8-13.

Kerka, S. (1998). New perspectives on mentoring. *Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education.* Retrieved October 3, 2005, from http://eric.ed.gov

Kerr, B. A. (1985). Review of the Job Description Index. In J.V. Mitchell (Ed), *The ninth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 754-756). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute.

Kochan, F. K., Spencer, W. A., & Matthews, J. (1999). The changing face of the principalship in Alabama: Role, perceptions, and gender. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 431 232.

Laboratory for Student Success. (2005). Preparing and supporting school principals. Retrieved on July 20, 2006 from http://www.temple.edu/lss/pdf/ fieldnotes/FieldNotesSLLC.pdf

Lashway, L. (1998). Trends and issues: Training of school administrators. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service)

Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith, J. B. (1989). The effect of the social organization of schools on teacher satisfaction. *Sociology of Education, 64*, 190-208.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Lewis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning.* University of Minnesota: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

Lipham, J. M. (1981). *Effective principal, effective school.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational behavior.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lovely, S. (2004). Scaffolding for new leaders. *School Administrator, 61,* 10-13.

Malone, J. (2001). Principal mentoring. *Clearinghouse on Educational Management.* Retrieved February 2, 2005, from http://eric.uoregon.edu/ publications/roundup/winter_00-01.html

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.) New York: Harper and Row.

McCarthy, M. M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed. Pp. 119-139). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.

Mentors Forum. (2005). Retrieved February 4, 2005 from http://www.exemplas. com/people/11228_12178.asp

Miskel, C., DeFrain, J. A., & Wilcox, K. (1980). A test of expectancy work motivation theory in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 16* (1), 70-92.

Moir, E., & Bloom, G. (2003). Fostering leadership through mentoring. *Educational Leadership, 60,*(8), 58-60.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (n.d.). NAESP Fact Sheet on the Principal Shortage. Retrieved October 1, 2005 from http://www.naesp. org/contentload do?contentId=1097

National Staff Development Council. (2001). NSDC standards for staff development. Retrieved February 1, 2005 www.nscd.org/library/standards2001.html

Neal, M. E. (2002). *Job satisfaction of Florida's high school assistant principals as a factor in the maintenance of an administrative work force.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando.

Ornstein, S., Cron, W., & Slocum, J. Jr., (1989). Life stage versus career stage: A comparative test of the theories of Levinson and Super. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10,* 117-133.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Petzko, V., Clark, D., Valentine, J., Hackmann, D., Nori, J., & Lucas, S. (2002). Leaders and leadership in middle school level schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 86.

Public Agenda. (2001). Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership. New York: Public Agenda Online. Retrieved March 16, 2004 from http:www.publicagenda.org/specials/leadership/leadership.htm

Quinn, T. (2002). Succession planning: Start today. *Principal Leadership*, *3*(2), 24-28.

Ramsey, K. (2006). Principal pressure: A school's most important job comes loaded with all kinds of stress. *The Enquirer.* Retrieved May 16, 2006 from http://news.enquirer.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060514/EDIT03/6051/-1/all

RAND. (2003). Are schools facing a shortage of qualified administrators? Retrieved May 2, 2006 from http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB8021/RB8021.pdf

Reich, M. H. (1986). The mentor connection. *Personnel. 63,*50-56.

Reyes, P., & Wagstaff, L. (2003). Leadership, diverse students and successful teaching and learning. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting. Chicago, IL. Retrieved November 13, 2005 from http://www.cepa.gse.rutgers.edu/Division%20A%20Papers%202003/ Reyes@20Wagstaff4-28.pdf

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, Nov.-Dec., 119-125.*

Rutherford, W. L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(1), 31-34.

Samier, E. (2000). Public administration mentorship: Conceptual and pragmatic considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration,38*(1), 83-101.

San Diego Unified District Educational Leadership Academy (n.d.) Retrieved
    November 5, 2005 from www.sandiego.edu/soe/acadprog/elda

Sanders, N. M., & Simpson, J. (2005) *State policy framework to develop highly qualified
    administrators.* Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J. P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there?
    Personnel Psychology, 36, 577-600.

Schultz, J. B. (1977). Job satisfaction of home economics college faculty. *Journal of
    Vocational Education Research, 2*(2), 59-72.

Schwartz, K. M. (2002). New Principal Support Programs and Job Satisfaction. (Doctoral
    dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2004). 1772, 213.

Senator Kerry's home page (n.d.). Retrieved November 5, 2005 from
    http://kerry.senate.gov/text/congress/educaton.html

Sergiovanni, T. (1996). *Leaderhship for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it
    important?* SanFrancisoco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, P. C., Balzer, W., Brannick, M., Chia, W., Eggleston, S., Gibson, W., et al.
    (1987). The revised JDI: A facelift for an old friend. *The Industrial-Organizational
    Psychologist, 24, 33-33.*

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1975). *The measurement of satisfaction in
    work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes.* Chicago: Rand McNalley
    & Co.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Near, J. B. (1989). Relations between work and life away from work
    among university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 60*(1), 59-81.

Srivastava, S. K. (1982). Job satisfaction among private and public secondary school
    teachers. *Perspectives in Psychological Research, 5*, 29-30.

Stricherz, M. (2001a). Groups pushing for measures to attract, retain principals.
    Education Week, *20*, 31.

Stricherz, M. (2001b). School leaders feel overworked, survey finds. *Education Week,
    21*(12), 5.

Sweeney, J. (1981). Professional discretion and teacher satisfaction. *High School
    Journal,* 1-6.

Syptak, M. J., Marsland, D. W., & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job satisfaction: putting theory into practice. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from http://www.aafp.org/fpm/991000fm/26.html

Taylor, R., & Williams, R. D. (2001). Accountability: Threat or target? *The School Administrator. 58*(6), 30-33.

The principal shortage: Issues and recommendations. Presentation before the Commission on Teacher and School Administrator Shortage and Minority Recruitment, Connecticut State Legislature (2000) (testimony of Vincent L. Ferrandino. Retrieved May 23, 2006 from http://www.naewp.org/cttestimony.pdf

Thompson, D. P., McNamara, J. F., & Hoyle, J. R. (1997). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33*(1), 7-37.

Thompson, M. A., & Legler, R. (2003). The principalship and principal preparation. *NCREL Policy Issues,* (14).

Thornton, C. L. (1996). *Job satisfaction and the assistant principalship in central Florida school districts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, Orlando.

Usdan, M. (2004, Spring). Keynote speaker. *Laboratory for Student Success,* 2.

Vadella, R., & Willower, D. (1990). High school principals discuss their work. *NASSP Bulletin, 74*(525), 108-118.

Van Maanen, J., & Katz, R. (1976). Individuals and their careers: Some temporal considerations for work satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 29*, 601-616.

Vroom, V. H. (1962). Ego-involvement, job satisfaction and job performance. *Personnel Psychology, 15,* 159-177.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Walker, A., & Scott, K. (1994). Mentoring programs for aspiring principals: Getting a solid start. *NASSP Bulletin*, *78*(588), 72-77.

Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* McREL.

Wren, J. T. (1995). *The leader's companion*. New York: The Free Press.

Williams, J. (2004). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Retrieved May 25, 2006 from http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=244

Winston, E. (2002). Principal openings abundant. *Cincinnati Enquirer*. Retrieved January 20, 2005 from enquirer.com/editions/2002/05/16/loc_principal_openings.html

Zachary, L. J. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zellner, L., & Erlandson, D. (1997). Leadership laboratories: Professional Development for the 21st Century. *NASSP Bulletin, 81,* (585), 45-50.

Zellner, L., Ward, S. M., McNamara, P., Gideon, B., Camacho, S., & Edgewood, S.D. *The loneliest job in town: Sculpting the recruitment and retention of the principal.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association on February 14-16, 2002.

Zingeser, L. (2004). Career and job satisfaction: What ASHA surveys show. *The ASHA Leader*. 4-5, 13-20.