

Article

The Impact of Job Satisfaction on the Turnover Intent of Executive Level Central Office Administrators in Texas Public School Districts: A Quantitative Study of Work Related Constructs

Johnny O'Connor 

Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX 77705, USA; joconnorjr@lamar.edu; Tel.: +1-409-880-7020

Received: 23 April 2018; Accepted: 7 May 2018; Published: 8 May 2018



Abstract: The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts. For the intent of this study, executive level central office administrators were defined as staff members who serve in one of the following roles in a school district: assistant, associate, area, or deputy superintendent. The data were collected from a random sample of 234 participants in which survey instruments of job satisfaction and turnover intent were used. Each instrument was created on a five-point Likert scale. Based on the results of the study, it was concluded that a moderate inverse relationship exists between job satisfaction and turnover intent and job satisfaction explained 41.3% of an executive level central office administrator's intent for turnover. Research related to this employee group is lacking. Therefore, not much is known regarding how it relates to their attitude towards work-related factors. Learning more about job satisfaction and turnover intention of these individuals could have long term implications since it relates to mitigating the shortage of superintendent candidates available to fill the growing number of vacancies as well as recruitment, retention, and increased work productivity of these staff.

Keywords: school administrator; school staff; educational leader; job satisfaction; turnover intent; superintendent; recruitment; retention; school district; organizational development

1. Introduction

Effective administrative leadership in a school district is vital for school improvement [1–3]. School superintendents who are responsible for leading the day-to-day operations of a school district, on average, remain in their position from three-to-five years [4]. In a nationwide study, it was reported that 55% of superintendents would be unemployed within five years [5]. With this projected outlook, there has become an essential need to take a closer look into the superintendent pipeline to learn more about workers' experiences prior to entering the school superintendency [6], many of which include experiences at the executive level of a school district.

Whether due to retirements or other factors that prompt a superintendent's departure, educational leadership has been faced with a short supply of qualified candidates for the school superintendency [2]. There has been minimal research conducted on the most logical successor for this position known as the executive level central office administrator (i.e., assistant superintendent, associate, deputy) [7,8]. Many of these executive level district leaders [8] hold job titles such as assistant superintendent, associate superintendent for business, assistant/associate superintendent for curriculum/instruction, assistant/associate superintendent for human resources, assistant/associate superintendent for operations, assistant/associate superintendent for personnel [5], and chief executive.

Similarly, Kowalski [9] states that the executive-level central office titles are often associated with positions such as deputy superintendent and associate superintendent.

As rapid superintendent turnover continues to be of great concern, finding ways to cultivate and identify more quality candidates will be vital. This has warranted taking a closer look into the superintendent pipeline [8]. Employment data suggest that there will be challenges in filling the approximate 2000 superintendent vacancies that exist [2,10] since school boards around the nation continue to compete for candidates in a limited pool [11]. Several factors have been identified as potential barriers for increasing the number of candidates entering the superintendent pipeline. These factors include the role of superintendents having the perception of being problematic, too political, and offering less job security [2,12].

Job satisfaction has long been recognized and studied as an important factor across a variety of fields due to its effect on an individual's organizational commitment, performance, and intention to stay within an organization. Actually, it has been stated that ensuring job satisfaction is one of the most important tasks of an organization [13–16]. With executive level district leaders being the logical conduit to the superintendent pipeline [8], it is important to learn more about the work factors related to this employee group such as job satisfaction and turnover intent. The noticeable absence of research related to this often forgotten position could have far-reaching implications not only as it relates to the superintendent pipeline but also the recruitment, retention, and overall work productivity of these employees. Learning more about these professionals will assist organizations in establishing training and development as well as in identifying ways to cultivate sustained interest in their current role and the job of superintendent. Given that job satisfaction has been identified as the primary antecedent to turnover intent [17,18], the aforementioned variables (job satisfaction and turnover intent) were selected as a starting point for this study.

1.1. Theories and Frameworks of Job Satisfaction and Turnover

There is an array of theories and models of job satisfaction and turnover. One of the most widely known theories of job satisfaction is Maslow's hierarchy of needs. In the early 1950s, Abraham Maslow outlined what is known as the Theory of Needs [19]. The researcher suggests that in order for an individual to be satisfied, five basic needs must be met: (a) physiological needs; (b) safety needs; (c) social needs; (d) esteem needs; and (e) self-actualization needs [20,21]. In this theory, Maslow explains that: (a) physiological needs include the need for relief from hunger, thirst, and fatigue; (b) safety needs include the need to be free from bodily harm; (c) social needs include the need for love, affection, and a sense of belonging; (d) esteem needs include the need for individuals to be recognized and to achieve; and (e) self-actualization needs include the need to reach one's full potential in a specific area. Individuals who are genuinely self-actualized accomplish ultimate satisfaction by being dedicated to a specific duty, form of work, or mission with each of these traits serving a higher purpose than that of self-satisfaction [19]. This theory posits that needs are ordered in a hierarchy from most to least and that employees are satisfied only if certain needs are met [22].

Another well-known theory of job satisfaction is Herzberg's Two Factor theory [23]. The focus of this theory is motivation and it emphasizes the higher order of needs within an individual's motivation in organizations [19]. Herzberg et al. [24] maintain that two major factors influence individual motivation at work, which include "hygiene factors" and "motivators." Hygiene factors are preventive [24]. These factors can include salary, benefits, work policy, and work conditions. If hygiene factors are not acknowledged, dissatisfaction can occur. Contrary to hygiene factors, motivators serve as a stimulation source, which inspires employees. Motivators "serve to bring about the kind of satisfaction and the kind of improvement in performance that industry is seeking from its workforce" [24] (p.114). Motivation factors include meaningful work assignments, positive recognition, and sense of importance to an organization. Furthermore, the researcher contends that both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a result of different causes. This means satisfaction relies on motivators while dissatisfaction is a result of hygiene factors [22].

The turnover models of Mobley and March and Simon are also considered foundational throughout turnover literature. Mobley's [25] psychological model of turnover states that when an employee is dissatisfied with a job, he/she then begins to evaluate alternatives and quits if the alternative is anticipated to be more satisfying. Essentially, the process of turnover is a series of decisions that begins with the evaluation of an employee's current job and ends with a subsequent determination of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This decision often leads to the intent to turnover or actual turnover. It is also noteworthy that later iterations of Mobley's model of turnover were extended to include other work-related variables such as organizational commitment [26].

Most theories related to voluntary turnover are derived from the theories of March and Simon [25,27–29]. Based on this theory, the researchers suggest that an employee's decision to depart from a job is influenced by the perceived ease and desirability of movement, which can be triggered by job satisfaction [30]. Furthermore, drawing on field theory, researchers contend that being embedded in an organization and a community reduces both intent to leave and actual leaving [31,32].

1.2. Overview of Literature Related to Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intent

Over the years, job satisfaction has been intensely studied [33–39] in both the social and behavioral sciences [39,40] as well as in education [41]. Job satisfaction has been defined as the extent to which an individual likes a specific job [42]. This construct has also been viewed as a person's overall feelings to the various aspects of a job [43].

To date, literally thousands of studies on job satisfaction have been completed [33,44]. More studies have been completed related to job satisfaction than for any other variable [43]. These studies include the examination of the antecedents of job satisfaction, dimensions of job satisfaction, and the relationship between job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover [45]. Job satisfaction can be related to any aspect of a job and is an important part of organizational effectiveness. However, specifically as it relates to education, there has been more focus on the satisfaction of teachers, principals, and school superintendents with limited research available on executive level central office administrators.

Turnover intent has been defined as an individual's conscious and deliberate willfulness to depart from an organization [38]. Similarly, as with job satisfaction, the turnover of workers has been of interest to many leaders and researchers across disciplines [17,29] and has been well researched. This phenomenon is associated with numerous factors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, career commitment, and turnover intent [45]. Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth [46] state that intent to turnover is the final sequence of withdrawal cognitions.

Both researchers and practitioners have shown interest in better understanding what makes workers leave their job [28]. Managers recognize the personnel cost associated with employees who voluntarily leave [31] while scholars are interested in learning more about this work-related factor because it reflects a motivated behavior that provides insight into a more volitional behavior [47]. High turnover levels have also been linked to significant financial cost for organizations [31,48]. In education, numerous studies exist related to job satisfaction and retention of teachers and principals. However, as it relates to superintendents [6] and their counterparts known as senior executive administrators, research has been very limited.

When considering the interaction and influence of work-related constructs, job satisfaction measures are said to be the most relevant tools for predicting employee behavior [49] and have been found to relate to many work factors [50]. Additionally, turnover intent has been documented to have a significant negative influence on organizational learning [51], perceived organizational support [45,52], and job involvement [45]. In contrast, a positive correlation has been identified between turnover intent, role ambiguity [53], and job tension [45]. As it directly relates to the interest of this study, prior research has documented a negative correlation between job satisfaction and turnover intent [54]. This finding has been supported in many published studies related to turnover [51,55–57].

1.3. Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts. For the intent of this study, executive level central office administrators were defined as staff members who serve in one of the following roles in a school district, which include assistant, associate, area, or deputy superintendent. The aforementioned positions are typically cabinet level positions that report to the superintendent of schools and complete work functions that are similar or identical to that of the superintendent of schools.

The following research question guided this study:

What is the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent for executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts?

H_0 : There is no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts.

H_a : There is a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Population

A research population is often referred to as the target group of which a researcher wants to learn or study in order to make generalizations [58,59]. In this study, executive level school district administrators in Texas public school districts were the target population. For the intent of this study, executive level central office administrators were defined as staff members who serve in one of the following roles in a school district: assistant, associate, area, or deputy superintendent. Each participant in this study met the following criteria: (a) listed in Texas Education Agency (TEA) AskTED database as an assistant superintendent, associate superintendent, area superintendent, or deputy superintendent in an independent school district in Texas and (b) had an email address during the 2016–2017 school year. At the time of this research, there was a total population of $N = 863$ that met this criterion.

2.2. Sample

Utilizing the TEA AskTED system, a random sample of 234 respondents were identified as being an assistant superintendent, associate superintendent, area superintendent, or deputy superintendent, in an independent school district during the 2016–2017 school year. Sampling procedures based on the total population determined that a sample of 234 would be acceptable for a total population of 863 [60]. By using random sampling, a researcher can “have much greater confidence that their findings are not due to some special characteristic of the sample but rather are truly representative of the whole population” [61] (p. 71). Each participant who met the stated criterion had an equal chance of being selected [58,62].

Demographics Information Related to Study

A review of demographic information related to this study offered further insight into the participants. In this study, 47.9% or 112 of the respondents reported being female while 52.1% or 122 were reported as male. In terms of age, the majority of participants (112) were identified as being between the ages of 45–54, which accounted for 47.9% of all participants. The remaining participants in this study, 55, or 23.5% were between the ages of 55–64 while 51 participants, or 21.8%, were between the ages of 35–44. Additionally, 14 participants, or 6%, were between the ages of 65–74 with the participant age group of 25–34 representing 2 or less than 1% of the sample.

The academic degree obtained by each executive administrator was categorized into three distinct groups for this investigation. These groups were identified as a bachelor’s degree, a master’s degree, and a doctorate degree. Nine (3.8%) of executive level central office staff members indicated their

highest academic credential to be a bachelor's degree. One hundred and forty-three (61.1%) of executive level central office administrators reported acquiring a master's degree while 82 (35%) executive level central office administrators reporting they have earned a doctorate degree. This finding was not surprising since most superintendents are known to have acquired an advanced degree.

Relative to the work location of executive level central office staff surveyed for this study, 53 (22.6%) reported that they work in a small district. In comparison, 130 (55.6%) participants reported working in a mid-size district with 51 (21.8%) participants reporting the district they currently work in is a large district.

2.3. Design and Instrumentation

A quantitative research design was used to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators working in Texas-independent school districts. Specifically, for this study, a Pearson correlation analysis and linear regression were conducted. Data were collected using survey measures related to each construct. All measures were rated based on a five-point Likert scale including the following ratings: 1—Strongly Disagree, 2—Disagree, 3—Neither Agree or Disagree, 4—Agree, and 5—Strongly Agree. Measures used in this study were a 3-item scale of Job Satisfaction by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh [63] and a 3-item Scale of Turnover Intent [64]. Cammann et al. developed the survey of overall job satisfaction as a part of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (OAQ). This instrument is considered an overall indication of worker satisfaction. Questions inquire about an employee's job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as well as whether or not the employees like their place of employment. Similarly, The Scale of Turnover Intent was developed as a standalone scale to assess the turnover intent of executive level school administrators. This instrument seeks to probe an employee's intent to leave by inquiring about the intent to leave a given job, job envy, and the prospect of resignation. All surveys were distributed via electronic mail (email) to participant's email of record in the TEA AsKTED system. Over the years, there has been an increased use of web-based survey instruments by researchers [58,65,66] given the convenience of access, design, and seamless ability to collect and analyze data [58]. All surveys were self-administered by participants.

2.4. Validity and Reliability

2.4.1. Validity

According to Cresswell and Guetterman [58], evidence of validity can include the use and the purpose of an instrument in previous studies. The researchers further posited that validity determines the extent to which an instrument performs since it has been established for use. For this study, a survey instrument developed by Cammann et al. [63] was used to elicit participant responses related to overall job satisfaction. This instrument consisted of three items based on a five-point Likert scale. Previous studies that have used this instrument document a significant negative correlation between the constructs of job satisfaction and turnover intent [67,68]. This documented relationship supports the validity of this instrument. Moreover, this instrument was used for the same purpose in the current study, which was to collect data related to an employee's job satisfaction [68]. In addition, a panel of 20 executive level central office administrators that have held their position for at least three years reviewed the instrument in the context of its original format and agreed that the instrument appeared to be an appropriate measure of job satisfaction for this study.

A three-item scale of turnover intent was also used in this study [64]. This scale was also based on a five-point Likert rating. Previous studies have documented a significant negative correlation between turnover intent and job satisfaction when using this instrument [69]. In addition, a panel of 20 executive level central office administrators that have held their position for at least three years reviewed the instrument. In the initial iteration, modifications were made to accommodate feedback

from the expert panel. Upon final review, all reviewers reported that the instrument appeared to be an appropriate measure of turnover intent for this study.

2.4.2. Reliability

Previous studies have recorded coefficient alpha values for the Cammann et al. [63] instrument of overall job satisfaction ranging from 0.67 to 0.95 [45,69,70]. Specifically, in this study, reliability was noted at 0.820. Similarly, a coefficient alpha was recorded for the Scale of Turnover Intent [64]. The previous coefficient alpha for this instrument was 0.74. In this study, reliability was noted at 0.756 (see Table 1).

Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Results.

Measure	# of Items	α (Present Study)	α (Previous Study)
Job Satisfaction	3	0.820	0.67–0.95
Turnover Intent	3	0.756	0.75

2.5. Data Collection

Data collection for this study occurred during the 2016–2017 school year. Instruments utilized allowed the researcher to collect quantitative data for each variable. All surveys were distributed via electronic mail (e-mail) to each participant's email of record in the TEA AsKTED database. The use of web-based survey instruments by researchers has increased [58,65,66] given the convenience of access, design, and seamless ability to collect and analyze data [58]. All surveys were self-administered by participants.

2.6. Data Analysis

Once the data were collected, it was imported in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 24 for coding and analysis. SPSS is a statistical software program that allows users to conduct both basic and advanced statistical analysis. This study utilized inferential statistics including the Pearson Moment Correlation and Linear Regression as well as descriptive analysis, which included frequency counts for demographic information. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs [71], the Pearson Product Moment Correlation is a statistical procedure that allows a researcher to determine the relationship between two quantitative variables. Similarly, Linear (Bivariate) regression is a statistical technique that examines the relationship between two variables as well as predicts scores on one variable based upon information regarding the other variable [71,72]. The research question and hypothesis formulated for this study were tested at the 0.05 levels or better.

3. Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas independent public school districts. This study was considered quantitative, which was previously noted by the use of inferential and descriptive statistical techniques. Participant responses were collected using two surveys based on a five-point Likert scale. Analysis included correlation analysis, linear regression analysis, and descriptive statistics. Results for the primary analysis are discussed below.

3.1. Descriptive Analysis of Independent and Dependent Variables

The mean and standard deviation results of the independent and dependent variables are presented in Table 2. The variable turnover intention was used to determine the turnover intent of executive level central office administrators. It was measured by three items from the turnover intent scale developed by O'Connor [64]. This variable was scored on the basis of five-point Likert scale responses with the highest score representing a high intent of finding another job and the lowest

score representing a low intent of finding another job. A mean score of 6.89 ($SD = 2.54$) was calculated for this variable. This suggests an overall low intent for turnover among this group.

Table 2. Means and standard deviation of study variables.

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Job Satisfaction	13.30	1.80
Turnover Intent	6.89	2.54

Additionally, the variable job satisfaction was used to determine how satisfied an executive level central office administrator was with his/her job. It was measured by three items from the job satisfaction measure developed by Camman et al. [63]. These items were scored on a five-point Likert scale with the high score representing a high degree of job satisfaction and a low score representing a low degree of job satisfaction. A mean score of 13.30 ($SD = 1.80$) was computed for this scale. As a result of this analysis, it appears that executive level central office administrators, overall, have high job satisfaction.

3.2. Hypothesis Testing and Analysis Related to Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intent

Correlation analyses were conducted to determine the relationship between both variables in this study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to describe the relationships between variables. This statistical technique assessed the inter-correlation coefficients between two variables. The variables included in this analysis were job satisfaction and turnover intent. Table 3 shows the relationships between all variables in this study. Specifically, a significant negative relationship was found to be present between job satisfaction and turnover intent ($r = -0.642$). From this finding, it was concluded that, as job satisfaction among executive level central office staff increases, their intent to turnover decreases.

Table 3. Variable correlations.

Variables	(1)	(2)
(1) JS	1.00	-0.642 ***
(2) TI	-0.642 ***	1.00

Notes: (***) Denotes correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed: $p < 0.001$), Scale: (TI) = turnover intent, (JS) = job satisfaction.

A regression equation was estimated to test the linear relationship formulated in the null hypotheses. The following is a discussion of the results relating to the null hypothesis.

H_0 : There is no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts.

H_a : There is a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts.

A linear regression analysis (see Table 4) was computed to determine the relationship between the predictor variable job satisfaction and the criterion variable turnover intent. The predictor variable for job satisfaction resulted in a linear correlation coefficient (r) of 0.642. This variable accounted for 41.3% of the variance in turnover intent. A statistically significant negative relationship was found between job satisfaction and turnover intent at the $p < 0.001$ level. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was rejected and the alternative, H_a , was accepted. With regard to executive level central office staff, job satisfaction explains more than 40% of an executive level central office administrators' intent to turnover.

Table 4. Linear regression results for the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent.

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	18.93	0.951			
Job Satisfaction	−0.905	0.071	−0.642	−12.76	0.000

Notes: Bi-variate $r = 0.642$, r square = 0.413, Standard Error = 1.95, $df = 1/232$, $F = 163.04$, $p = 0.000$ ***, *** $p < 0.001$.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas public school districts. For the intent of this study, executive level central office administrators were defined as staff members who serve in one of the following roles in a school district: assistant, associate, area, or deputy superintendent. Based on the selected research design, this study was quantitative. Two survey instruments were used to collect data: (1) Job Satisfaction developed by Cammann et al. [63] and (2) Scale of Turnover Intent by O'Connor [64]. Data for this study were collected via electronic survey. Once collected, all data were properly coded and analyzed using SPSS 24. Statistical analysis included descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, standard deviation, and frequencies) and inferential statistics (i.e., correlation, regression analysis).

The results of this study highlight the significant influence job satisfaction has on the turnover intent of executive level central office administrators in Texas school districts. Specifically, a moderate negative relationship was observed between the two work constructs. Job satisfaction explained 41.3% of an executive central office administrator's intent to turnover. The findings of this study are consistent with prior research, which has documented this relationship throughout the literature of research studies [17,53,73]. Despite this, few studies have examined these work constructs in the context of executive level central office administrators. Research completed to date has been dedicated to professionals external to education with most education-related studies focused on job satisfaction or turnover of teachers, principals, and school superintendents. This study extends the limited research base in this area and offers implications as it relates to the decreasing superintendent pipeline as well as the recruitment, retention, and increased work productivity of this employee group.

In terms of the theoretical models of Maslow and Herzberg, job satisfaction is a function of a variety of needs being met [19,21,24]. Essentially, as specific needs are met, organizations can expect that employees will experience high levels of job satisfaction. A review of the data from this study found that executive level central office administrators reported high levels of job satisfaction. Based on this, it appears that most organizations that hire these professionals are meeting their needs at a high level. Exploring specific factors that contribute to the satisfaction of these employees can further extend research related to this population.

The turnover model of March and Simon establishes the basis that an employee's decision to depart from a job is influenced by the perceived ease and desirability to move, which can be triggered by job satisfaction [30]. Similar to this, Mobley's model of turnover displays that when an employee is dissatisfied with a job, he/she then quits if the new job is expected to be more satisfying [25]. This study validates both models since a negative relationship was found between job satisfaction and turnover intent. This further strengthens the case for exploring specific factors, which contribute to an employee's satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the workplace.

Superintendent candidate pools continue to dwindle as board members scramble to find and hire qualified candidates [28]. This is a trend that is predicted to continue into the foreseeable future. As a result, there is an immediate need for more research related to this work group that will result in the development of research-based strategies that increase the number of prospects for the job of superintendent. This study offers at least a starting point in this direction. Executive level central office staffs are the most logical predecessors to the superintendency. Due to this, board members and search firms alike should be compelled to learn more about the work-related factors of this group and

how they interact or influence work related to decision-making. The findings of this study support the idea that dissatisfied executive level central office administrators are likely to leave their job. While improving the satisfaction of these workers does not guarantee automatic transition or interest in the school superintendency, the prevention of turnover is certain to mitigate further diminishing effects on the current candidate pool while presenting opportunities to increase a candidate's interest in the superintendent job. Based on this, it is recommended that this foundational knowledge be used as a basis for further exploring and identifying specific recruitment strategies that lead to the superintendent pipeline.

Furthermore, as school districts continue to face budget challenges, overall work efficiency and performance will become paramount to the financial solvency and sustainability of these organizations. Researchers have reported that minimizing turnover in an organization can improve organizational performance and reduce costs associated with hiring and training a replacement [51]. In fact, costs related to turnover are said to represent 25% to more than 100% of an employee's compensation [74]. This information is of great importance to school board members, superintendents, chief financial officers, and human resources directors. Many of these professionals are considered decision-makers with the most influence or impact on budgetary decisions. These leaders will need to become more cognizant of employee retention and its effects on the organization especially executive personnel, which are typically the highest earners in the organization. Given the lack of research related to this group [7,8], this study offers information to school districts that can serve as a starting point to establishing a more granular focus on the retention of executive staff members. Specifically, the researcher in this study found that job satisfaction explained more than 40% of an employee's intent to turnover, which is significant. This position's districts are more equipped to handle any of the financial ills or complexities that may present. In addition, efficient organizations consistently look at ways to improve the work environment at all levels.

5. Conclusions

Workers who feel undervalued and dissatisfied decrease the overall productivity and effectiveness of an organization [75]. In contrast, superintendents who are satisfied believe in their ability to impact the positive outcomes of all stakeholders [76]. This type of commitment and belief is required to build sustainable organizations especially when cultivating the interests and skills of those executive school leaders that are next in line (i.e., assistant superintendents, associate superintendents, etc.).

The findings of this study should be of importance to public agencies where retaining quality workers can be problematic [77–81]. Employers in school districts should focus on developing and improving both extrinsic and intrinsic work-related factors, which will increase job satisfaction, and as a by-product reduce an employee's intent to leave an organization. Increased job satisfaction of executive level central office administrators can yield long tenure. However, many of these employees will have the intent to turnover if dissatisfaction manifests for extended periods. Additionally, superintendents and board members should consider the impact job dissatisfaction might have on an employee's aspiration to become a school superintendent. Given the relationship of job satisfaction and turnover intent among this work group, it is also vital that superintendents who have determined that they have quality executive level central administrators be keen in understanding what specific situations, factors, and circumstances cause discontentment on the job. This not only assists in increasing talent within the superintendent pipeline, but may also prove to assist in overall organizational development in terms of recruitment, retention, and performance.

6. Recommendations for Future Research

Due to the limited literature available related to executive level central office administrators, many opportunities are available to extend the research as it relates to this population. The following are a few recommendations for future research related to the population studied.

- Replication studies that utilize a sample from other states

- Studies that examine job satisfaction and turnover intent based on gender, type of district, and other demographic variables
- Studies that examine other work-related factors such as organizational commitment, work home conflict, role overload, etc.
- Studies that research specific factors that increase job satisfaction or dissatisfaction
- Studies that research specific factors that decrease turnover intent
- National studies that explore work constructs related to this employee group
- Quantitative research studies that explore work-related constructs related to this employee group

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Dunlap, J.; Li, J.; Kladienko, R. Competencies for effective school leadership: To what extent are they included in Ed.D. leadership programs? *Educ. Leadersh. Admin. Teach. Prog. Dev.* **2015**, *26*, 14–26.
2. Kersten, T. Selecting a superintendent in a tight market: How the current superintendent can help. *Int. J. Educ. Leadersh. Prep.* **2009**, *4*, 1–4.
3. Leithwood, K.; Seashore, L.K.; Anderson, S.; Wahlstrom, K. *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*; The Wallace Foundation: New York, NY, USA, 2004.
4. Grissom, J.A.; Anderson, S. Why superintendents turn over. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* **2012**, *49*, 1146–1160. [CrossRef]
5. Glass, T.E.; Franceschini, L.A. *The State of the American Superintendency: A Mid-Decade Study*; Rowman & Littlefield Education: Lanham, MD, USA, 2007; ISBN 978-1578866373.
6. Grissom, J.A.; Mitani, H. Salary, performance, and superintendent. *Educ. Admin. Q.* **2016**, *52*, 351–391. [CrossRef]
7. Conley, S.; Cooper, B.S. Assistant Superintendents Moving to the Superintendency. In *Finding, Preparing, and Supporting School Leaders: Critical Issues, Useful Solutions*; Leach, D.F., Cooper, B.S., Eds.; Rowman & Littlefield Education: Lanham, MD, USA, 2010; pp. 41–64. ISBN 9781607098379.
8. Leach, D. The assistant superintendent's dilemma too happy, too old, and too late for the top job. *Educ. Week* **2009**, *29*, 1. Available online: <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/09/23/05leach.h29.html> (accessed on 16 April 2018).
9. Kowalski, T.J. *Contemporary School Administration: An Introduction*, 2nd ed.; Allyn and Bacon: Boston, MA, USA, 2003; ISBN 978-0801308321.
10. Kamler, E. Make me a match. *Am. Sch. Board J.* **2007**, *194*, 37–39.
11. Samuels, C.A. State-chief turnovers squeezing talent pool. *Educ. Week* **2008**, *27*, 13. Available online: <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/08/13/45turnover.h27.html> (accessed on 16 April 2018).
12. Kamrath, B. Power disconnections: A multiple case study of staff members and superintendents in small rural school districts with high superintendent turnover. *J. Ethnogr. Qual. Res.* **2015**, *10*, 104–119.
13. Aydin, A.; Sarier, Y.; Uysal, S. The effect of school principal's leadership styles on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educ. Sci. Theory Pract.* **2013**, *13*, 806–811.
14. Glick, N.L. Job satisfaction among academic administrators. *Res. High. Educ.* **1992**, *33*, 625–639. [CrossRef]
15. Hagedorn, L.S. *What Contributes to Job Satisfaction among Faculty and Staff: New Directions for Institutional Research*; Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2000; ISBN 9780787954383.
16. Smerek, R.E.; Peterson, M. Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Res. High. Educ.* **2007**, *48*, 229–250. [CrossRef]
17. Lambert, E.G.; Hogan, N.L.; Barton, S.M. The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: A test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *Soc. Sci. J.* **2001**, *38*, 233–250. [CrossRef]
18. Zopiatis, A.; Constanti, P.; Theocharous, A.L. Job involvement, commitment, satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. *Tour. Manag.* **2014**, *41*, 129–140. [CrossRef]
19. Golembiewski, R.T. *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*; Marcel Dekker: New York, NY, USA, 2001; ISBN 0824790588 9780824790585.

20. Ross, L.S. The influence of the student mobility rate on the graduation rate in the state of New Jersey. *AASA J. Sch. Pract.* **2016**, *13*, 40–55.
21. Maslow, A.H. *Motivation and Personality*; Harper & Row: New York, NY, USA, 1954.
22. Rynes, S.L. Recruitment, job choice, and positive consequences. In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd ed.; Borman, W.C., Ilgen, D.R., Klimoski, R.J., Eds.; Sage: Palo Alto, CA, USA, 1991; pp. 399–444.
23. Islam, S.; Ali, N. Motivation-hygiene theory: Applicability on teachers. *J. Manag. Sci.* **2013**, *7*, 87–104.
24. Herzberg, F.; Mausner, B.; Snyderman, B. *The Motivation to Work*, 2nd ed; Wiley: New York, NY, USA, 1959; ISBN 0471373893.
25. Mobley, W.H. Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1977**, *62*, 237–240. [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Kim, S.W.; Price, J.L.; Mueller, C.W.; Watson, T.W. The determinants of career intent among physicians at a U.S. air force hospital. *Hum. Relat.* **1996**, *49*, 947–975. [[CrossRef](#)]
27. Lee, T.W.; Mitchell, T.R.; Holtom, B.C.; McDaniel, L.S.; Hill, J.W. The unfolding model of voluntary turnover: A replication and extension. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1999**, *42*, 450–462.
28. Hom, P.W.; Lee, T.W.; Shaw, J.D.; Hausknecht, J.P. One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2017**, *102*, 530–545. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
29. Li, J.; Lee, T.W.; Mitchell, T.R.; Hom, P.W. The effects of proximal withdrawal states on job attitudes, job searching, intent to leave, and employee turnover. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2016**, *101*, 1436–1456. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
30. Morrell, K.; Loan-Clarke, J.; Wilkinson, A. Unweaving leaving: The use of models in the management of employee turnover. *Int. J. Manag. Rev.* **2001**, *3*, 219–244. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Mitchell, T.R.; Holtom, B.C.; Lee, T.W.; Sablinski, C.J.; Erez, M. Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2001**, *44*, 1102–1121.
32. Ng, T.W.H.; Feldman, D.C. The effects of organizational and community embeddedness on work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2012**, *97*, 1233–1251. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
33. Agarwal, P.; Sajid, S.M. A study of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention among public and private sector employees. *J. Manag. Res.* **2017**, *17*, 123–136.
34. Bolliger, D.U.; Wasilik, O. Factors influencing faculty satisfaction with online teaching and learning in higher education. *Dis. Educ.* **2009**, *30*, 103–116. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Cranny, C.J.; Smith, P.C.; Stone, E.F. *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel about Their Jobs and How it Affects Their Performance*; Lexington Books: New York, NY, USA, 1992; ISBN 066921289X 9780669212891.
36. Green, T.; Alejandro, J.; Brown, A. The retention of experienced faculty in online distance education programs: Understanding factors that impact their involvement. *Int. Rev. Res. Open Dis.* **2009**, *10*. [[CrossRef](#)]
37. Sirin, H.; Sirin, E.F. Research on the organizational commitment of the instructors in terms of job satisfaction, and organizational alienation: School of physical education and sports sample. *Int. J. Acad. Res.* **2013**, *5*, 176–183. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Tett, R.P.; Meyer, J.P. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Pers. Psychol.* **1993**, *46*, 259–293. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. Vroom, V.H. *Work and Motivation*; Wiley: New York, NY, USA, 1964.
40. Pezzeri, C.; Oratio, A.R. A multivariate analysis of the job satisfaction of public school speech-language pathologists. *Lang. Speech Hear. Serv. Sch.* **1991**, *22*, 139–146. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Thompson, D.P.; McNamara, J.F.; Hoyle, J.R. Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. *Educ. Admin. Q.* **1997**, *33*, 7–37. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Agho, A.O.; Mueller, C.W.; Price, J.L. Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. *Hum. Relat.* **1993**, *46*, 1007–1027. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Spector, P.E. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1997; ISBN 9780761989226.
44. Quarstein, V.A.; McAfee, R.B.; Glassman, M. The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. *Hum. Relat.* **1992**, *45*, 859–873. [[CrossRef](#)]
45. Fields, D. *Taking the Measure of Work*; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2002; ISBN 9780761924258.
46. Mobley, W.; Horner, W.; Hollingsworth, A. An evaluation of the precursors of hospital employee turnover. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1978**, *63*, 408–414. [[PubMed](#)]

47. Barrick, M.R.; Zimmerman, R.D. Reducing voluntary, avoidable turnover through selection. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2005**, *90*, 159–166. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
48. Johansen, M. The impact of managerial quality on employee turnover. *Public Manag. Rev.* **2013**, *15*, 858–877. [CrossRef]
49. Rozmowski, M. The scientific merit of valid measures of general constructs with special reference to job satisfaction and job withdrawal. In *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel about Their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance*; Cranny, C., Smith, P., Stone, E., Eds.; Lexington Books: New York, NY, USA, 1992; pp. 123–163. ISBN 066921289X 978-0669212891.
50. Halter, M.; Boiko, O.; Pelone, F.; Beighton, C.; Harris, R.; Gale, J.; Gourlay, S.; Drennan, V. The determinants and consequences of adult nursing staff turnover: A systemic review of systemic reviews. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* **2017**, *17*, 824. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
51. Egan, T.M.; Yang, B.; Bartlett, K. The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* **2004**, *15*, 279–301. [CrossRef]
52. Eisenberger, R.; Fasolo, P.; Davis, L.V. Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1990**, *75*, 51–59. [CrossRef]
53. O'Driscoll, M.P.; Beehr, T.A. Supervisor behaviors, role stressors and uncertainty as predictors of personal outcomes for subordinates. *J. Organ. Behav.* **1994**, *15*, 141–155. [CrossRef]
54. Trevor, C.O. Interactions among actual ease-of-movement determinants and job satisfaction in the prediction of voluntary turnover. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2001**, *44*, 621–638.
55. Kacmar, K.M.; Bozeman, D.P.; Carlson, D.S.; Anthony, W.P. An examination of the perceptions of organizational politics model: Replication and extension. *Hum. Relat.* **1999**, *52*, 383–416. [CrossRef]
56. Muchinsky, P.M.; Morrow, P.C. A multidisciplinary model of voluntary employee turnover. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **1980**, *17*, 263–290. [CrossRef]
57. Pitt, J.S.; Leahy, M.J.; Lewis, A.N. Turnover intent predictors among state vocational rehabilitation counselors. *J. Rehab. Admin.* **2013**, *37*, 5–17.
58. Creswell, J.W.; Guetterman, T.C. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative Research*, 6th ed.; Pearson: Saddle River, NJ, USA, 2019; ISBN 13 978-0-13-451936-4.
59. McClave, J.T.; Benson, P.G.; Sincich, T. *Statistics for Business and Economics*, 8th ed.; Upper Prentice Hall: Saddle River, NJ, USA, 2001.
60. Survey Size Calculator. Available online: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/> (accessed on 10 April 2018).
61. Swanson, R.; Holton, E. *Foundations of Human Resource Development*; Berrett-Koehler: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2001.
62. Cohen, L.; Manion, L. *Research Methods in Education*; Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA, 1994.
63. Cammann, C.; Fichman, M.; Jenkins, D.; Klesh, J. *Assessing the Attitudes and Perceptions of Organizational Members*; Wiley: New York, NY, USA, 1983.
64. O'Connor, J. Exploring the Turnover Intention of School District Administrators. Unpublished manuscript, manuscript in preparation.
65. Daley, E.M.; McDermott, R.J.; Brown, K.R.M.; Kittleson, M.J. Conducting web-based survey research: A lesson in internet design. *Am. J. Health Behav.* **2003**, *27*, 116–124. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
66. Gall, M.D.; Gall, J.P.; Borg, W.R. *Educational Research: An Introduction*, 7th ed.; Allyn and Bacon: Boston, MA, USA, 2003.
67. Chen, G.; Plohart, R.E.; Thomas, H.C.; Anderson, N.; Bliese, P.D. The power of momentum: A new model of dynamic relationships between job satisfaction change and turnover intentions. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2011**, *54*, 159–181. [CrossRef]
68. Siegall, M.; McDonald, T. Focus of attention and employee reactions to job change. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1995**, *25*, 1121–1141.
69. O'Connor, J.; Vaughn, V. Examining superintendent turnover intent: A quantitative analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent of public school superintendent in Texas. In Proceedings of the TCPEA Midwinter Conference, Austin, TX, USA, 28–31 January 2018.
70. Namayandeh, H.; Juhari, R.; Yaacob, S.N. The effect of job satisfaction and family satisfaction on work-family conflict (W-FC) and family-work conflict (F-WC) among married female nurses in Shiraz-Iran. *Asian Soc. Sci.* **2011**, *7*, 88–95. [CrossRef]

71. Hinkle, W.; Jurs, S.G. *Applied Statistics for Behavioral Sciences*, 5th ed.; Houghton Mifflin Company, College Division: Boston, MA, USA, 2003; ISBN 978-0618277537.
72. Rodriguez-Barranco, M.; Tobias, A.; Redeondo, D.; Monila-Portillo, E.; Jose-Sanchez, M. Standardizing effect size from linear regression models with log-transformed variable for met-analysis. *BMC Med. Res. Meth.* **2017**, *17*, 44. [[CrossRef](#)]
73. Schwepker, C.H. Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the salesforce. *J. Bus. Res.* **2001**, *54*, 39–52. [[CrossRef](#)]
74. Ballinger, G.; Craig, E.; Cross, R.; Gray, P. A stitch in time saves nine: Leveraging networks to reduce the costs of turnover. *Calif. Manag. Rev.* **2011**, *53*, 111–133. [[CrossRef](#)]
75. Mottaz, C.J. The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *Soc. Q.* **1985**, *26*, 365–385. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Kassebaum, Z.G. Satisfied Superintendents: A Case Study. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, St, Lincoln, NE, USA, 8 June 2011.
77. Cho, Y.J.; Lewis, G.B. Turnover intention and turnover behavior: Implications for retaining federal employees. *Rev. Public Pers. Admin.* **2012**, *32*, 4–23. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Pynes, J.E. *Human Resources Management for Public and Non-Profit Organizations: A Strategic Approach*, 3rd ed.; Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA, USA, 2009; ISBN 978-1-118-39862-3.
79. Selden, S.C. *Human Capital: Tools and Strategies for the Public Sector*; CQ Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2009; ISBN 13 978-1568025506.
80. Igbaria, M.; Greenhaus, J. Determinants of MIS employees' turnover intentions: A structural equation model. *Commun. ACM* **1992**, *35*, 34–49. [[CrossRef](#)]
81. Steel, R.; Ovalle, N. A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1984**, *69*, 673–686. [[CrossRef](#)]



© 2018 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).