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Introduction

Job satisfaction has been an area of study since the beginning of the twentieth century (Davis & Lofquist, 1981). Initial studies were conducted among corporate organizations. The educational reform of the 1980s in the United States became a turning point for the study of job satisfaction among educators. Most of these early studies on job satisfaction paid more attention to teachers as compared to school administrators (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983; Borg & Riding, 1993; Hill, 1994). This may have reflected influence of earlier organizational research that studied extensively the productivity of lower-level employees (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983).

Gruneberg (1979) pointed out that it is important to understand the factors that affect job satisfaction because the well-being of individuals in a working environment is affected. In addition, there is a belief that job satisfaction relates to overall job productivity. This implies that individuals who are satisfied with their jobs show a higher level of job performance and productivity than individuals who are dissatisfied with their jobs. Consequently, this increased productivity should lead to improved organizational profits.
School administrators such as superintendents and principals hold the highest positions in the hierarchy of a school district and school respectively (Richford & Fortune, 1984). Their leadership is important to the creation of a good working environment (Friesen, Holdaway, & Rice, 1983; Gunn & Holdaway, 1986; Whitaker, 1994).

The purpose of this research paper is to identify and discuss the factors of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among school administrators, especially principals, and the implications of these factors for educational administration. From a practical standpoint, understanding the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among school administrators can help identify important ways to create a working climate that will enable teachers, staff, and students to work in an enriched environment.

The first section of this research paper includes a brief overview of various definitions and theoretical perspectives of job satisfaction proposed by various researchers. The concept of motivation is very closely related to job satisfaction.
Consequently, the conceptual framework of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in relation to specific theories of motivation will be discussed.

The second section of this paper will provide a review of educational studies on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in an attempt to identify various sources that affect the working performance of school principals.

The last section of this paper includes recommendations for educational administrators who supervise principals, central office personnel, and pre-service training programs that identify the need to understand and further explore the dynamics that influence the nature of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among principals.

Theoretical Perspectives and Definitions

Definitions

In the field of psychology, job satisfaction has been a well-researched topic (Gruneberg, 1979). Consequently, a lot of attention has been paid to defining the meaning of job satisfaction, the factors that influence it, and its relationship to work performance. Early studies of job satisfaction were conducted on the premise that satisfaction influenced work performance although researchers were uncertain
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about the correlation between these two variables. This uncertainty has not hindered the continuous research on job satisfaction in relation to its presence or absence in organizations (Candler, Yarbrough, & Sparkman, 1988). Davis (1977) pointed out that low job satisfaction is an indication that an organization is deteriorating.

One of the earlier definitions of job satisfaction was stated by Hoppock (1935) as the combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental factors that cause people to say that they are satisfied with their jobs. Following this definition, the concepts of emotional states and feelings were used to describe the meaning of job satisfaction (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

Lawler (1973) recognized the difference between overall job satisfaction and specific aspects of job satisfaction or what Lawler called "facet job" satisfaction. Facet job satisfaction refers to people's affective responses toward specific aspects of their jobs while job satisfaction is the affective responses of individuals toward their overall work role (Lawler, 1973).
Locke (1976) stated, "Job satisfaction may be viewed as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception of one's fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing these values are compatible with one's needs" (p. 1342). This cognitive perspective argues that job satisfaction relates to an individual's perception of the relationship between one's job values and one's needs.

The above definitions emphasized that an individual's affective response is closely related to facet and overall job satisfaction. Lawler's (1973) cognitive perspective viewed job satisfaction as a result of one's thought processes. However, Locke (1976) identified values as the main determinant of job satisfaction. According to Gruneberg (1979), there is no one agreed upon definition of job satisfaction because aspects of job satisfaction are combined in different ways by researchers.

**Theoretical Perspectives**

**Content and Process Theories**

In order to understand job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, it is important to consider the
question of its meaning and the development of its research in relation to theories of motivation. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weik (1970) identified theories of job satisfaction into content theories and process theories. Content theories try to identify the factors that influence job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Process theories describe the interaction between variables such as expectations, needs and values and the characteristics of the job that influence job satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979). Content theories such as Maslow’s (1954) Needs Hierarchy Theory and Herzberg et al.’s (1959) Motivation and Hygiene Theory and process theories such as Equity Theory will be discussed under this heading.

Maslow’s (1954) Needs Hierarchy Theory posited that human needs can be arranged in a hierarchy and the fulfillment of one level of needs will initiate the next level of needs. These needs fall into two categories of lower order needs and higher order needs. Physiological, security, and belongingness are lower order needs while esteem and self-actualization are higher order needs. This theory of hierarchy of needs has been widely used by
corporate organizations, especially by managers to understand the basic nature of human actions because of its commonsense appeal (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996). The implication of this theory for organizational management allows managers to focus on their employees' job satisfaction by meeting their lower order needs after which they can aim at the higher order needs.

Similarly, Herzberg et al.'s (1959) two-factor Motivation and Hygiene theory categorized motivation to work into two groups. Maintenance factors or hygienes such as salary, fringe benefits, working conditions, climate of the work group, and attitudes and policies of the organization's administration must be present in order to avoid dissatisfaction among employees. Motivational factors such as achievement, advancement, work itself, growth, responsibility, and recognition lead to job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959) claimed that the presence of some factors affect job satisfaction but their absence may not necessarily cause job dissatisfaction. This implies that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction can occur simultaneously.
On the other hand, process theories such as Equity Theory consider job satisfaction as an interaction of variables such as expectations, needs and values with certain facets of the job (Gruneberg, 1979). The main idea of Equity Theory is the concept of deserving rewards related to efforts. Workers compare their efforts put into the job and the rewards achieved with that of their colleagues' before deciding if they are satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs. Thus, this theory claims that perceptions of workers regarding their jobs may determine either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

In the job situation, Maslow's (1954) theory tried to explain the direct relationship between attainment of needs and job satisfaction. Consequently, the importance of needs can be placed in a hierarchy. Herzberg et al.'s (1959) Motivation and Hygiene theory is similar to Maslow's because the maintenance factors equal the lower order needs and the motivating factors equal the higher order needs respectively.

Equity Theory tried to account for the sources of job satisfaction as more than just fulfilling individuals' needs. In addition, the values and
expectations of individuals are perceived as related to their job satisfaction. Consequently, job satisfaction is the result of the interaction between individuals’ needs, values, and job expectations.

Both content and process theories present the notion that job satisfaction is related to helping individuals match their needs, values and expectations to their jobs (Gruneberg, 1979).

Review of Literature

Early studies on job satisfaction in educational settings focused on teacher job satisfaction. Ratsoy (1973) claimed that teacher job satisfaction is related to the degree of bureaucracy in schools. Some studies show that there is a correlation between participative decision making between teachers and principals and its relationship to teacher job satisfaction (Cooke & Rousseau, 1981; Holdaway, 1978). However, the study of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among school administrators, especially principals has become significantly important because of the concerns regarding occupational stress and burnout among principals and their high turnover rate (Borg & Riding, 1993; Friedman, 1995; Whitaker, 1994)
Bacharach and Mitchell (1983) investigated the sources of dissatisfaction among educational administrators because there is little attention paid to job satisfaction concerns among superintendents and principals as compared to teachers. The emphasis of Bacharach and Mitchell’s (1983) study is the role-specific analysis of superintendents and principals as related to organizational structure and processes. The potential variables that may affect job satisfaction between the two groups were identified as bureaucratization, supervision, decision-making power, district environment, work demands, and individual attributes.

Data were collected from 83 school districts in New York according to location, size, wealth of the district, and district expenditures. A total of 46 superintendents and 95 principals responded to the survey. The results concluded that variables affecting job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction differ between superintendents and principals. The percentage of families below poverty level in a school district and the number of committees were the strongest predictors of job dissatisfaction among superintendents. This implies that the environment and the processing of information which is needed for
consensus in the school district is closely related to superintendents' job dissatisfaction.

Conversely, the strong predictors of the principal's job dissatisfaction were the factors of negative supervision and district enrollment. Negative supervision occurred when the principals' had to deal with their supervisor's negative behavior and attitude. Consequently, this form of negative supervision contributed to the subordinate's job dissatisfaction. The results indicated that there is a correlation between negative supervision and principals' job dissatisfaction. The principals in larger districts with higher enrollment than smaller districts may have heavier responsibilities. Consequently, job pressures emerge from the expectations of different groups such as the student body and the community while trying to obtain a consensus between these two groups and other groups which the principals have to deal with. The percentage of families below poverty level was a weaker predictor of job dissatisfaction. The authors of this study pointed out that organizational factors can be used to predict job satisfaction but in any job, specific variables influence job satisfaction.
In a study by Derlin and Schneider (1994), a survey was conducted among teachers and principals in urban and suburban areas to determine the influence of role and contextual differences as predictors of job satisfaction in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. A total of 5,496 teachers and 333 principals from urban and suburban districts responded to the surveys. For analytical purposes, 10 comparable job satisfaction items were included in the teachers’ and principals’ surveys to determine if the roles of teachers and principals differ. These items included career advancement, encouraging their child to enter the teaching profession, looking forward to the job each working day, staff involvement in making decisions, pay, present plans, job recognition, job security, success, and support from the district administrators.

The results of this study indicate that principals’ job satisfaction is influenced by factors such as pay, security, and advancement. Conversely, teachers’ job satisfaction is influenced by factors pertaining to student achievement, recognition, involvement, and support. This analysis suggests that the level of job satisfaction among principals is influenced by extrinsic factors. Conversely, teachers’ job satisfaction is influenced by intrinsic
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factors. In addition, the authors discovered that salary was a more important consideration for job satisfaction among urban principals than suburban principals. Suburban principal satisfaction was more affected by encouraging impressions regarding work environment than urban principal satisfaction. These differences imply that urban principal satisfaction may be more affected by extrinsic factors than suburban principal satisfaction.

The overall results of this study indicate that different jobs within the field of education have different sources of job satisfaction. This implies that job satisfaction may be role specific. In addition, contextual differences or the location of the school can affect different perceptions regarding job satisfaction due to differences in the size of the population, the enrollment of students, the size of the staff, and the funding that is available.

Oberman (1996), reported the summary findings of a survey conducted by the Department of Research, Evaluation, and Planning of the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) in the fall of 1994 among 550 principals in that city. A total of 457 principals responded to the survey. The survey included questions on roles, school leadership, and other topics. Also, 61 former
principals who left their jobs after July 1, 1993 were interviewed. The main purpose of the survey was to determine if there is a relationship between principal turnover and the reform efforts of the CPS which was conducted in three phases. The purpose of the reform was to decentralize certain decision making processes from the central office to the principals. For example, direct influence was given over certain major concerns such as personnel assignments, curriculum and instruction, and staff development.

The results of the comprehensive survey of 457 principals revealed that management issues such as governance, district and central office demands, planning, and budgeting took up the their week's work. The principals felt that they were accountable for student achievement but discovered that progress towards this area was difficult because of several factors. These factors included staff development, difficulty removing ineffective teachers, time use, inadequate funding, parental apathy, and collective bargaining concerns. In addition, the survey discovered that most of the principals considered leaving the principalship after five or ten years.
Approximately two-thirds of the former principals found much satisfaction from the professional and personal development of their teachers and staff. Success of students in academic areas such as reading and math, and higher test scores was another source of satisfaction for more than half of the former principals. Conversely, many of these principals felt that bureaucratic concerns was one of the main sources of job dissatisfaction. Most of them conveyed negative sentiments toward both the Board of Education and the Central Office.

The former principals were not happy with the regulations imposed upon the schools and found that instructions given by the district administrators were conflicting. Also, many of the principals were uncomfortable with the political role they had to play with the implementation of the school reform for which they were not prepared because of the lack of knowledge and the skills to do so.

The results of this study imply that the principals who were holding positions at the time of the study found that the job itself posed challenges because they had to deal with different variables such as students, teachers, parents, and the community within a typical week. Consequently, there was
insufficient time for the principals to proceed with their primary concern such as students' achievement.

For the former principals, changes mandated by educational administrators in the central office appeared to be a cause of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction among principals. Although the former principals gained some autonomy to make major decisions for their school, they would have preferred some training to help them undertake their new responsibilities in a more effective way. Consequently, the study indicates that an attempt by central administration to empower principals by granting them more autonomy in decision making issues without training may cause job dissatisfaction among principals.

Avant and Miller (1992) conducted a study to examine the relationship between the work role expectations of public school principals and work outcomes. The Miller-Carey Work Role Inventory questionnaire was administered to 200 elementary and secondary principals in 1990. This questionnaire consists of four sub-sections: 1) Demographic Data Form; 2) Role Trait Scale; 3) Role Behavior Scale; and 4) Work Role Inventory.
The analysis of the questionnaires indicated that principals experience a higher degree of satisfaction when their perceived role as leaders of their schools is not in conflict with their work results. It was discovered that principals who defined their leadership roles as instructional leaders were found to have a higher degree of satisfaction when their work results were closely related to their expectations of their work roles. Conversely, principals who perceived their work roles as instructional leaders but whose main preoccupation in the school was as school managers experienced a higher degree of dissatisfaction.

In addition, the principals who felt that their work role related to the guidelines of their profession as instructional leaders experienced a high sense of job fulfillment. Similarly, they experienced a higher level of self-esteem, accomplishment, recognition, and usefulness. However, the principals who felt that the expectations of their work role was primarily as school managers experienced less job fulfillment and had the least sense of job satisfaction.
The outcome of the study by Avant and Miller (1992) implies that there is a relationship between role dissonance and job satisfaction. Principals who found agreement between their work roles and the outcome of their work in schools experienced a higher level of job satisfaction. Conversely, the principals who perceived themselves to be school managers instead of instructional leaders experienced job dissatisfaction.

Duke (1988) interviewed four exceptional high school principals who were considering quitting the profession. These four principals achieved recognition as first-rate school administrators earlier than their own expectations of having to spend an entire career to achieve it. All the principals had doctorates from prestigious universities. They were working in high-paying suburban school districts where the job market is competitive. These principals ranged from 34 to 38 years old and had teaching experience prior to becoming principals. Among these principals, three of them were in their first principalship position. The following year after their interview, two of the principals became central
office administrators, one moved to a similar position in another state, and the other took a year's leave of absence.

The content of their remarks were analyzed based on Herzberg et al.'s (1959) Motivation and Hygiene theory. The responses of the principals consisted of positive and negative attitudes. All four principals could identify sources of job satisfaction and overwhelming job dissatisfaction simultaneously. According to Duke (1988), there are four general categories that can be identified as the reasons that prompted the principals to leave their principalships.

First, fatigue was experienced by all the principals because of the long hours spent in school with countless interactions, the pressure to meet deadlines, and the heavy demands of problem solving within all sections of the school. In addition, many evenings were taken up with meetings and paperwork.

Second, it was possible that these principals were beginning to realize that certain aspects of their personalities may not be suitable to being principals in the long run. All four of the principals declared themselves to be perfectionists and had often times found that their perfectionism came between their jobs and their families' needs.
Also, all of them agreed that they could not continue performing as principals with the demands imposed upon them at the time of this study.

Third, some expressed career concerns such as not wanting to be place bound. They realized that achieving success in any one position is a short term experience and that problems will start setting in eventually. Consequently, they would like to move on before the latter happens.

Fourth, the reality that their principalships could bring a sense of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction at the same time came as a shock. Although they found it rewarding to interact with teachers, students, and parents, they realized their desire to care for others is time consuming and emotionally draining.

The results of this study provided a different perspective on principal satisfaction and dissatisfaction because it indicated that the principals expressed confusion about their role rather than clarity (Duke, 1988). Sources of job satisfaction included the job itself because of the variety of tasks that had to be undertaken. Among them are the different opportunities to solve complex problems, the self-learning that took place regarding
their own attitudes and beliefs, recognition, personal relationships, building a new staff, and creating changes. This implies that the principals' job satisfaction were intrinsically motivated. Concurrently, major sources of job dissatisfaction were found to be within the job itself. The principals were frustrated with issues of policy and administration, lack of achievement, lack of growth personalities, sacrifices in personal life, relationships with subordinates, and limited job autonomy.

There seems to be similar concerns regarding principalships around the world as evidenced in the studies that have consistently taken place in different countries such as Canada (Friesen et al., 1983; Gunn & Holdaway, 1986) and the United Kingdom (Draper & McMichael, 1996; Hill, 1994).

In Canada, Friesen et al. (1983) studied the overall job satisfaction and overall job dissatisfaction among principals in relation to Herzberg's two-factor Motivation and Hygiene theory. A random sample of 327 principals' responses to questionnaires in Alberta were analyzed. First, this study found that principals with more than 20 years
experience in the job chose maintenance factors such as salary, fringe benefits, working conditions, and attitudes and policies of the administration as contributing factors to job satisfaction more frequently than their counterparts with less years of principalship experience. Second, male principals attributed maintenance factors as sources of dissatisfaction more frequently than female principals. Third, urban principals chose maintenance factors as less influential sources of dissatisfaction than town and rural school principals. However, these findings were not explored further due to the focus of the study which was to determine the relationship of the responses to Herzberg's Motivation and Hygiene theory.

In conclusion, this study claimed that job satisfaction among principals is related to different job facets where the primary factors are interpersonal relationships, achievement, responsibility, and autonomy. Secondary factors include job challenge, recognition and status, job importance, and student attitudes and performance. However, Friesen et al. point out that it is difficult to separate clearly the facets of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.
Hill (1994) surveyed 278 primary headteachers/principals to determine sources of job satisfaction and career aspirations for their future. This study was conducted in Bristol, England. Approximately 72% of this population had been principals for less than ten years and about 86.4% had been assistant principals. Hill (1994) found that relationships with children, relationships with teachers, and relationships with parents are the three highly ranked sources of job satisfaction.

The overall conclusion of the study indicated that principals' main source of job satisfaction lies in relationships with different groups, especially children or students. In addition, job autonomy was identified as another source of satisfaction. However, many of the principals indicated that the breadth of their job autonomy may reduce as the power of central government, governing bodies, and parents increase. Hence, they anticipate that tighter organizational structure and processes may reduce their job autonomy. The sources of job dissatisfaction include the amount of paperwork, perceived work overload, and the low status of their job. The principals feel that these negative sources will not reduce in the future.
Summary

The research conducted by the above authors imply that there are multiple sources of principals’ job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Bacharach and Mitchell (1983), and Derlin and Schneider (1994) found that specific aspects of the principalship relate to job satisfaction. Oberman (1996) reported that change created by central office personnel can cause job satisfaction if the principals perceive that they do not have the skills to implement the change. Avant and Miller (1992) discovered that role dissonance is another source of job satisfaction. Duke (1988) and Hill (1994) pointed out that principals who had positive relationships with different groups found satisfaction in their jobs.

In addition, the results of the studies discussed reflect the complexity of the principalship due to different variables that influence the demands of such positions. However, it is possible to identify some common findings that influence principals’ job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

First, the job itself is a source of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among some principals. Principals are expected to be leaders of the schools they manage. Consequently, they often
spend a lot of time interacting with different groups such as teachers, students, parents, and the communities to find a common consensus in many decision making situations. Achieving success in building good relationships among the various groups is usually a source of job satisfaction. However, the long hours spent interacting with people, solving problems, working late into the evening, and doing paperwork are related factors of job dissatisfaction.

Second, the work expectations of principals and the relationship to the outcome of their work is another source of principal satisfaction. Principals who perceive their work role as instructional leaders but were spending more time managing the school were dissatisfied with their jobs.

Third, contextual differences such as the location of the school district either in the urban or suburban areas affect job satisfaction among principals. Urban principals seem to find satisfaction from external motivators such as salary. Conversely, suburban principals’ job satisfaction is affected by internal motivators such as the immediate working environment.
Finally, principal autonomy or the lack of it may be another source of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Principals who anticipated tighter organizational structure and processes from central administration feel that their job autonomy may be reduced.

Although there are common findings among the studies, there are many areas of principals' job satisfaction that need to be given more attention in the research of educational administration. Consequently, the significance of this area of study is still at the awareness stage of many researchers.

Conclusion

Organizational studies have long looked into the relationship between job satisfaction and work performance. Different theoretical models such as Maslow's (1954) and Herzberg et. al.'s (1959) have been formulated in an attempt to understand this relationship.

The results of some studies such as Derlin and Schneider's (1994) identified pay, security, and advancement as factors that influence job satisfaction among principals. These factors are related to Maslow's (1954) Need Hierarchy Theory where lower order needs such as pay and security have to be
fulfilled before higher order needs such as advancement can be attained.

The study by Avant and Miller (1992) revealed that the relationship between work expectation and work outcomes influences job dissatisfaction. This supports the notion of Equity Theory because the perceptions of the principals regarding their jobs determined their job satisfaction.

Friesen et al. (1983) discovered that a primary source of job satisfaction was the job itself that requires relationship building with different people. This result relates to Herzberg et al.'s (1959) theory that identified “work itself” as one of the motivational factors that lead to job satisfaction. However, Duke's study (1988) revealed that the principalship itself can be a source of job dissatisfaction and this does not support Herzberg et al.'s Motivation and Hygiene theory.

There are limitations to the above theories because principals as individuals are constantly affected by the internal environment and the external environment. Issues such as changing values and individual's perceptions are difficult to measure but these variables affect job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.
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The is no single theory that can account to the understanding of job satisfaction among principals because of the complexity of the nature of this job and the dynamics of interaction among different groups that frequently affects one’s values and perceptions.

Recommendations for Educational Administration

Understanding that different variables affect principals as school administrators is important to the future of educational administration. The results of the studies discussed indicate certain concerns regarding training programs for school administrators, the supervision of principals, the relationship between principals and the central offices, and job expectations and the nature of the principalship.

Principals are often times perceived as instructional leaders of their schools. In addition, principals are considered as managers because they have to make sure that the financial needs of their schools are met through appropriations from the Federal and State governments. Also, principals’ roles are changing due to the demands of the job and this creates the need for them to acquire specific skills in order to be effective leaders. Consequently, it is important for those who are involved in the training of future school
administrators to realize that the content of training programs should reflect the changes that are taking place in the actual working environment in schools (Oberman, 1996). Graham (1997) pointed out that training programs lack the learning of specific skill areas such as class scheduling and discipline. Similarly, Johnson and Holdaway (1991) suggested that training programs should include issues such as decision making, instructional direction, and staff evaluation in its curriculum.

One of the important concerns among researchers relates to issues of organizational structure and its influence on the relationships between personnel at the central office and principals. The supervision of principals by personnel from central offices such as superintendents and school board members can be facilitated if the latter have an understanding of the factors that lead to principals' job satisfaction. Such knowledge can be used to provide principals with the right incentives to stay motivated with the profession of school administration (Avant & Miller, 1992).
Principals are responsible for making sure that changes mandated by state governments are implemented in their schools. Hence, principals have to abide by many rules and regulations codified by the central offices at the possible loss of a certain degree of job autonomy. Bureaucratic issues appear to influence job satisfaction among principals (Hill, 1994). This implies that there is a need to revisit the functions of the central offices and their roles in helping principals fulfill their roles as school leaders and mediators of change (Gross & Furey, 1987).

The perception of principals regarding their roles affect their level of job satisfaction. If principals’ work outcomes do not concur with their job expectations, job dissatisfaction takes place (Avant & Miller, 1992). This implies that it is important for future principals to realize the nature of the complexity of the principalship because it is important to determine the relationship between principals’ thoughts, feelings, and their perceptions of their jobs (Gunn & Holdaway, 1986).

Similar concerns regarding the future of educational administration among principals through further research are echoed around the globe. According to Holdaway and Johnson (1990), thorough
research regarding principals' job satisfaction is important because many proposals for school-based management in the United States, England/Wales, New Zealand, and Australia have been or are being proposed. Although research has been done on various aspects of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among school administrators, more work has to be done because their roles continue to change.
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