

Fall 12-1-2021

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL SUPPORT AND FIRST-YEAR TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

Beau Hannah

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hannah, Beau, "THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL SUPPORT AND FIRST-YEAR TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION" (2021). *Dissertations*. 1946.
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/1946>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL SUPPORT AND FIRST-YEAR
TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

by

Beau Hannah

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School,
the College of Education and Human Sciences
and the School of Education
at The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by:

Dr. Kyna Shelley, Committee Chair
Dr. David Lee
Dr. Chuck Benigno
Dr. Richard S. Mohn
Dr. Thomas J. Lipscomb

December 2021

COPYRIGHT BY

Beau Hannah

2021

Published by the Graduate School



ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to assess the relationship between the four dimensions of principal support and first-year teacher job satisfaction. First-year teachers responded to an online questionnaire that collected demographic data and information regarding principal support importance and overall job satisfaction, using a Likert scale. This questionnaire was developed to measure principal support and first-year teacher job satisfaction. The researcher used a combination of the Principal Support, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and a collection of items addressing the importance of the principal supports, along with demographics of the respondents.

A multiple linear regression was used to predict to what degree each dimension of support is related to first-year teacher job satisfaction. The results of the research showed that there are no significant relationships between first-year teacher job satisfaction and the importance of receiving emotional support ($p=.114$), Informational Support ($p=.107$), Instrumental Support ($p=.282$), and Appraisal Support ($p=.547$). However, the reported importance of each dimension of support was between 4.3 and 4.9 indicating slight importance amongst the respondents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To begin, I would like to thank Dr. Kyna Shelley for her guidance as my committee chair. Her support and advice were always very truthful and direct which I greatly appreciate. I would also like to thank the remaining committee members for their role and input throughout the dissertation process. I feel like no greater committee could have been assembled.

Furthermore, the collection of instructors that guided me through this process deserve to be acknowledged as well. The knowledge I accumulated throughout the past five years will be very valuable throughout my career as an educator in leadership roles.

DEDICATION

To dedicate this body of work to one person seems unthinkable. So, this body of work will be dedicated to several. First, this work is dedicated to my wife, Erica. She has been faithful and steadfast in providing for our two daughters, Anistyn and Molly-Clark. I have tried and can't find the words to express how appreciative I am for the sacrifices she has made for our family during this process.

Furthermore, this work is also dedicated to my parents and grandparents. Growing up with parents and grandparents who put an emphasis on education is something I hope to pass on to my children and grandchildren. Throughout this process, my goal was to make each of you proud! Thank you for each of the sacrifices each of you have made, so I could accomplish my dreams of earning a Doctorate Degree.

Finally, this whole process would have left me void without knowing my Savior Jesus Christ has a plan for me. That plan is to use this accomplishment to further His kingdom!

Matthew 28:19-20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| ABSTRACT | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | iii |
| DEDICATION | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | ix |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | x |
| CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Teacher Job Satisfaction | 2 |
| Principal Support | 3 |
| First-Year Teachers..... | 5 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 5 |
| Statement of Purpose | 6 |
| Research Questions | 6 |
| Hypotheses | 6 |
| Justification | 7 |
| Theoretical Framework | 8 |
| Assumptions of the Study | 8 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 9 |
| CHAPTER II – LITERATURE REVIEW | 10 |
| Federal Education Acts and Teacher Job Satisfaction | 10 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Theoretical Framework | 13 |
| Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory of Motivation..... | 13 |
| Houses’ 4 Dimensions of Support | 15 |
| Littrell et al..... | 16 |
| Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2015)..... | 18 |
| Teacher Job Satisfaction | 19 |
| Compensation, Class Size, and Climate | 21 |
| Gender..... | 22 |
| Level/Type of School..... | 23 |
| Years of Experience | 23 |
| Leadership Style..... | 24 |
| Principal Support | 25 |
| Summary | 29 |
| CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY | 31 |
| Research Questions..... | 31 |
| Research Design..... | 31 |
| Procedures | 32 |
| Participants..... | 33 |
| Instrumentation | 35 |
| Data Analysis | 39 |

| | |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER IV – RESEARCH RESULTS | 40 |
| Description of Sample..... | 40 |
| Principal Support | 41 |
| Importance of Support | 42 |
| Satisfaction..... | 43 |
| Research Questions..... | 46 |
| Research question 1 | 46 |
| Research question 2 | 47 |
| CHAPTER V – DISCUSSION..... | 49 |
| Summary | 49 |
| Conclusions and Discussion | 50 |
| Hypothesis I | 51 |
| Hypothesis II..... | 51 |
| Limitations | 52 |
| Recommendations for Policy or Practice..... | 52 |
| Recommendation for Future Research..... | 54 |
| APPENDIX A – IRB APPROVAL LETTER | 56 |
| APPENDIX B – PARTICIPANT CONSENT LETTER..... | 57 |
| APPENDIX C –SUPERINTENDENT PERMISSION LETTER | 58 |
| APPENDIX D – SURVEY INSTRUMENT | 59 |

| | |
|------------------|----|
| REFERENCES | 69 |
|------------------|----|

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1 Herzberg's Job Attitude Factors | 14 |
| Table 2 Teacher Job Satisfaction Variables | 20 |
| Table 3 Dimensions of Principal Support | 26 |
| Table 4 Demographics | 34 |
| Table 5 A Two-Factor Varimax Solution for the 16-item PSS | 36 |
| Table 6 School Format | 41 |
| Table 7 Variable Means | 42 |
| Table 8 Job Satisfaction Items | 44 |
| Table 9 Job Satisfaction | 46 |
| Table 10 Principal Support(s): Importance | 47 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------------|--|
| <i>NCLB</i> | No Child Left Behind |
| <i>K-12</i> | Kindergarten – Twelve Grades |
| ESEA | Elementary and Secondary Education Act |
| ESSA | Every Student Succeeds Act |
| ISLLC | Interstate School Leaders' Licensure Consortium |
| PSS | Principal Support Scale |
| MSQ | Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire |

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

“The teacher shortage is real, large and growing, and worse than we thought.” (Garcia and Weiss of the Economic Policy Institute, 2019). Not only has the percentage of college graduates pursuing a teaching license decreased in recent years, but also an alarming 30%-50% of teachers in the United States leaves the teaching profession in the first five years of employment (Halford, 1998). Like elsewhere, this increase in teacher vacancies is also happening in the state of Mississippi. Jackson (2019) reported how Mississippi has issued 2002 fewer teacher licenses in 2018 than it did in 2011. This decrease in teacher licensure and increase in teachers leaving the profession will eventually lead to more teachers leaving the profession than those entering the profession. During the course of the past few decades, the United States government has passed several educational initiatives to address this problem and other challenges for K-12 school systems.

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was passed in 2001, by the national government. No Child Left behind introduced the plan for all teachers to be “highly qualified”. This encouraged school systems to invest in professional development because teachers were being held accountable for student achievement (“No Child Left Behind Act”, n.d.). Therefore, an accountability model was created to measure student success, also known as Adequate Yearly Progress. In many states across the United States, teachers’ jobs were tied to these accountability scores. Many schools began to implement policies and procedures assumed to ensure success within the current accountability system. However, they failed to recognize the relationship these policies and procedures would have with teacher job satisfaction.

Subsequently, school reforms such as Race to the Top and Every Student Succeeds Act offered support to create better learning environments for teachers and students (Fact Sheet -- Race to the Top, 2011). However, these reforms also created overwhelming stress for teachers (Overman, n.d.). Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017) reported that teachers mentioned working conditions, such as support of principals and collaboration with teacher colleagues, as the greatest reason for leaving the teaching profession. Extrinsic factors, such as compensation, elicit interest from the media and the general population; however, multiple studies have discussed how other factors such as leadership style, mentorship, and principal supports have a greater effect on teacher job satisfaction.

In an effort to increase teacher job satisfaction, National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015) suggests that effective educational leaders should strive to improve the practice of all teachers by helping and supporting them. Also, they should attempt to develop supportive, trustworthy, and considerate relationships amongst all faculty and leadership, which would lead a desire for improvement. Similarly, a significant amount of research reveals a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support/behaviors (Ilgan et. Al, 2015). Littrell, Billingsley, and Lawrence, 1994 also confirmed that there is a significant connection between teacher job satisfaction and principal support. In examining this relationship, very few studies focus on first-year teachers.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

There is an agreement among studies that teacher job satisfaction is influenced by many factors. Among these factors are principal support, leadership style, emotional

state, communication, relationships, number of years in profession, achievement, and recognition along with other extrinsic and intrinsic variables (Herzberg et al, 1959; Bovee, 2012; Cerit, 2009; Cansoy, 2019; Olsen and Huang, 2019; Perrachione, Peterson, & Rosser, 2008). Job satisfaction is how employees feel about their jobs, whether it be positive or negative. (Song & Alpaslan, 2015). According to the Washington Post (2013), teacher job satisfaction has descended from 62% to 39% since 2008. Furthermore, Herzberg's Two Factor Theory proposed there were certain motivating factors that influenced job satisfaction in the workplace (Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B., 1959). A factor considered in Herzberg's Two Factor Theory was supervision. Herzberg's theorized that if supervision was poor it would decrease employee job satisfaction.

Principal Support

Principal support has a significant effect and impact on the development and satisfaction of K-12 teachers (Olsen & Huang, 2019; Ilgan et al., 2015; Littrell et al., 1994). House (1981) provided the study with a theoretical framework that considered the multi-dimensional depiction of motivational support. Also, Littrell et al. (1994) discussed the four dimensions of support among K-12 principals.

The first dimension of support discussed by House was emotional support: Principals provide teachers with the opportunities to share their ideas, support them in difficult times, and show teachers that they are trusted professionals (Littrell et al., 1994). Findings have shown that emotional support positively predicts teacher job satisfaction (Littrell et al., 1994)

The second dimension of support is instrumental support, in which principals provide more hands-on support such as with supplies, adequate teaching space, and adequate planning time. The third dimension of support discussed by House (1981) is informational support. Informational support concerns how information is given to teachers, by principals, to improve their teaching practices such as professional trainings and workshops (Littrell et al., 1994). The final dimension of support is appraisal support, which describes how principals provide teachers with constructive feedback and support (Littrell et al., 1994).

Furthermore, the degree to which principals provide support varies based on the style of leadership of the leadership. Across studies there has been demonstrated a significant relationship between styles of leadership and teacher job satisfaction (Cansoy, 2019; Bovee, 2012; Cerit, 2009). For instance, Burns (1978) developed the idea that there are two general forms of leadership across most disciplines: transformational leadership and transactional leadership. According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership is a process where leadership and teachers attempt to improve morale and motivation through collaboration.

In addition, Bass (1985) further developed Burns work by beginning to investigate the specific factors that define transactional leadership. Transactional leadership is leadership focused around completed assigned tasks due to rewards and punishments. Burns (1978) work also included theory describing transformational leadership. Also, Bass and Bass, 2008 developed a list of the elements of transformational leadership 1) individualized consideration 2) intellectual stimulation 3) inspirational motivation 4) idealized influence. Leadership theory studies have found that

transformational leadership has beneficial effects on not only the climate of the school, but on the teacher job satisfaction (Quin, Deris, Bischoff, & Johnson, 2015; Allen, Grigsby, & Peters, 2015).

First-Year Teachers

According to Menchaca (2003), The United States departments of education will need to hire 200,000 elementary and secondary teachers, each year, to support the rising student enrollments” (p.25). It has been suggested that the relationship principal support has with teacher job satisfaction impacts first-year teacher to a greater degree than it does veteran teachers. Many teachers will exit the profession because of the lack of support from administrators. Being a first-year teacher is difficult and requires a great deal of support to be successful. Supportive principals have been shown to make a difference between success for first year teachers and frustration (Protheroe, 2010).

Otto and Arnold (2005) found when administrative support was present that, teacher job satisfaction increased (Hughes, Matt, & O'Reilly, 2015). Also, according to the Alliance of Excellent Education, 2004, “research demonstrates that principals’ influence on novice teachers is significant.” With the decrease in applications for teaching licenses and increase in teachers leaving the profession, it is becoming more and more important to determine the relationship between principal supports and first-year teacher job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

Providing principal supports to first-year teachers is of vital importance for increasing teacher job satisfaction (Menchaca, 2003). Providing principal supports to teachers creates a constructive working environment that will likely decrease stress and

burnout (Littrell et al., 1994), and increase teacher job satisfaction. A large amount of the research acknowledges how principal supports have a significant relationship on teacher job satisfaction, however little research has been done to determine if those same relationships are present with first-year teachers.

Similarly, many studies assess whether there is a significant relationship between principal leadership styles and teachers as a collective population. Despite the significant amount of research investigating teacher job satisfaction, there is a gap in the literature in the case of first-year teachers' job satisfaction in relationship to principal supports. Also, a gap in the literature is clear when discussing the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal supports in the state of Mississippi.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between the dimensions of principal support and first-year teacher job satisfaction.

Research Questions

1. Among first-year teachers, what is the reported importance of each dimension of support (emotional, instrumental, informational, & appraisal)?
2. To what extent is the importance of each dimension of support related to first-year teacher job satisfaction?

Hypotheses

H₁: There is a significant difference between each dimension of principal support.

H₂: There is a significant correlation between the importance of each dimension of support and first-year teacher job satisfaction.

Justification

Whereas previous research has considered the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support (Bressler, 2012; Ilgan, Parylo, & Sungu, 2015; Berkovich & Eyal, 2018; Monsour, 2003), there is a lack of research that addresses this topic concerning first-year teachers. As school districts across the United States face a decline in teacher retention, first-year teacher job satisfaction is as important now as any time in history. Principals across all grade levels in education have a great influence on the school they lead (Quinn & Andrews, 2004). First-year teacher job satisfaction could be effected by the support these principals provide, or do not provide.

Due to the proliferation of teachers exiting the profession, the information collected in this study could potentially offer an in-depth look into the relationship between principal support and first-year teacher job satisfaction. According to Perrachione, Petersen, and Rosser (2008), “Most teachers exit the teaching profession due to the increase in responsibilities and demands, lack of support financially, and lack of support morally.” Thus, the lack of support from principals could lead to low teacher retention.

The information collected from this study could lead to the development of professional development programs. The professional development programs could provide principals with knowledge of the four principal supports, and how each can increase first-year teacher job satisfaction, thereby increasing teacher retention. Providing the principal supports needed to first-year teachers could potentially increase teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention.

Theoretical Framework

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory (1959) proposed there were certain motivating factors that had an effect on job satisfaction in the workplace. A factor that was proposed by the theorist was supervision. Herzberg theorized that if supervision was poor, job satisfaction would decrease. Numerous studies have been conducted to determine reasons for the increase and decrease of teacher job satisfaction. However, this study will seek to confirm this relationship between principal support and teacher job satisfaction among first year teachers.

According to House (1981), there are four dimensions of support: instrumental, appraisal, informational, emotional. Littrell, Billingsley, and Cross (1994) adapted the four dimensions to apply to K-12 principals. The theorists indicated that principal support seeks to show teachers that they are professionals, provide them with appropriate resources, offer ways to improve instruction, and provide constructive feedback. Furthermore, the principals who provide support have a beneficial effect on the commitment of teachers, job satisfaction, and the ability to retain them (Littrell et al., 1994).

Assumptions of the Study

First, it was assumed that all participants answered truthfully. The participants were volunteers who could end the survey at any time without consequences. Also, it was assumed that the sample chosen was a representative of the population of K-12 teachers. Lastly, it was assumed that the respondent's answers were not manipulated in any way.

Delimitations of the Study

The delimitations for this study are:

1. “First-Year” K-12 Teachers
2. Teacher job satisfaction as opposed to retention, performance, & attitude
3. Data collected during the 2019-2020 School Year

Definition of Terms

1. Teacher Job Satisfaction-The emotional reaction teachers have about their job or roles as instructors. (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011, as cited by Cansoy, 2019).
2. Principal Support-Consists of four dimensions (emotional, instrumental, informational, & appraisal); Also, what feelings teachers have about teaching and how well they teach. (Littrell et al., 1994).
3. Emotional Support-Principals support their teachers by showing teachers they are interested in them and their work, maintain open communication, show appreciation, and being open to their ideas (Littrell et al., 1994).
4. Instrumental Support-Principals support their teachers by helping with tasks, while providing space, time, and resources (Littrell et al., 1994).
5. Informational Support- Principals support their teachers by offering information and suggestions to improve teaching practices and classroom management (Littrell et al., 1994).
6. Appraisal Support- Principals support their teachers by utilizing positive and frequent feedback. (Littrell et al., 1994).

CHAPTER II – LITERATURE REVIEW

“To be satisfied with our work, we typically need a belief in a purpose of what we do.” This quote from Barry Schwartz’s book, *Why We Work*, speaks to our need for job satisfaction. For various reasons, 20% to 30% of beginning teachers exit the profession in five years (American Federation of Teachers, 2001). Federal, state, and district leaders across the educational world have, are, and will need to continue to address the percentage of teachers who feel that their low degree of job satisfaction has overtaken their purpose of teaching.

Moreover, numerous researchers have developed studies looking to discover the underlying factors leading to this reduction in teacher job satisfaction. Although there are many underlying factors that could determine the level of teacher job satisfaction, most studies have focused on gender, grade-level, and leadership style of the administration. Several research studies have addressed the principal support and length of service as factors affecting teacher job satisfactions. This research study examines the relationship between these two factors with length of service concentrating on first-year teachers.

Federal Education Acts and Teacher Job Satisfaction

With the establishment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) by Lyndon B. Johnson, the Federal Government introduced programs meant to address the needs of K-12 schools. These programs were created to provide equal opportunity to all students across the United States. Also, according to Title I of ESEA (1965), the Secretary of Education must provide states with grants for the purpose of school improvement. To improve the standard of primary and secondary education, ESEA provided state educational agencies with federal grants (Brenchley, 2015). As

education across the nation transitioned into what it is today, so did the number of resources made available by this act.

The purpose of the Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was to provide funds for school districts and states agencies in an effort to increase student achievement and improve teacher and principal quality (New Teacher Project, 2010). According to the New Teacher Project (2010), “39% of the funds are devoted to professional development.” Depending on the success of Title II funds increasing student achievement and principal/teacher effectiveness, positive teacher job satisfaction could show an upward trend. For example, in a study developed by Anna Toropova, Myrberg, and Johansson (2020), successful teachers had greater levels of job satisfaction when given opportunity to utilize professional development.

Furthermore, thirty-six years after President Johnson signed ESEA, President George W. Bush reauthorized ESEA as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (Education Policy: A Timeline, n.d.). With the implementation of NCLB, states were required to meet several requirements including entrance qualifications for first-teachers, the assessment of all students, and providing safe schools for students (Ruff, 2019).

Since 2001, a substantial amount of research has sought to assess No Child Left Behinds’ impact on schools. While No Child Left Behind had many positive effects such as better instructional strategies and an increase in school accountability, the act may have created unintended consequences such as increasing teacher stress leading to burnout (Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, & Harrington, 2014).

President Barack Obama authorized the Race To The Top initiative, in 2009. Race To The Top includes four areas of concern (Race To The Top, n.d.):

- Creation of rigorous standards and improved assessments
- Acquisition of improved data systems to provide schools, teachers, and parents with guidance about student progress
- Assistance for teachers and school leadership effectiveness
- Increased significance and resources for the rigorous interventions needed to improve the school performing at the lowest levels

The initiative looked to build on these four levels of reform by providing teachers with strategies and resources they needed to provide every student with what they needed to learn and succeed (Race To The Top, n.d.).

In 2015, President Barack Obama reauthorized Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). President Obama stated “With this bill, we reaffirm that fundamental American ideal that every child, regardless of race, income, background, the ZIP Code where they live, deserves the chance to make out of their lives what they will,” He added that communication between administrators and all other stakeholders would occur, “to make the promise of this law reality.” (Resmovits, 2015). ESSA became entirely functioning in school year 2017-2018. Title II, Part A of ESSA, focused on improving teacher and principal quality. The improvement of teacher and principal quality includes the preparation of teachers, first-year teacher qualifications, recruitment and hiring, induction, professional development, and teacher retention. (Improving Teacher and Principal Quality, n.d.). The state of Mississippi also developed a plan devoted to addressing the requirements of ESSA. Mississippi Succeeds Plan is a five-year strategic plan developed by the Mississippi State Board of Education. One priority the board

focused on was improving professional development and constructive feedback to ensure superior classroom instruction and leadership. (Mississippi Succeeds, 2017).

The United States has sought to resolve these issues throughout its history, including the implementation of Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left Behind, Race To The Top Initiative, and Every Student Succeeds Act. Herzberg's' Two Factor Theory of Motivation, Houses' four dimensions of support, and Littrell, Billingsley, and Cross's' utilization of Houses' dimensions of support will provide a foundation for this study.

Theoretical Framework

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation

In 1959, Frederick Herzberg published his research on job satisfaction in his book titled *Motivation to Work*. Herzberg opened his book with the origin of his study. Herzberg (1959) discussed how "Work is one of the most absorbing things men can think and talk about...For the fortunate it is the source of great satisfaction; for many others it is cause of grief." (p. 3) His research ultimately led to the development of Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation or Herzberg-Hygiene Theory.

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory suggests that there are two factors that affect job satisfaction of employees. The two factors according to his theory are motivating factors and hygiene factors. According to Herzberg (1959), health hazards are removed from our environment by the operation of hygiene factors. A number of hygiene factors were included, such as overseeing, dyadic communication, working conditions, earned income, company strategy and leadership practices, benefits, and secure employment (Herzberg, 1959). He concluded that low job satisfaction and below par job performance derive from

satisfying the needs for hygiene. On the other hand, “motivators look to satisfy the employees need for self-actualization, or self-realization” (Herzberg, 1959, p. 114). Herzberg developed a definition of job-attitude factors, also known as motivators and hygiene factors.

Table 1 *Herzberg’s Job Attitude Factors*

| Motivators | Hygiene Factors |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Achievement | Company Policies |
| Recognition | Supervision |
| The work itself | Relationships |
| Responsibility | Work conditions |
| Advancement | Remuneration |
| Growth | Salary |
| | Security |

Herzberg’s summary included the idea that employees were happiest with their jobs when they were successful in their work and when there was a possibility of professional growth. Also, Herzberg mentioned that employees reported unhappiness based on conditions, and not the job itself (Herzberg, 1959).

According to Herzberg’s model, there is a tetrad of combinations of hygiene factors and motivators. These factors are (House, 1959):

- High Hygiene + High Motivation: Employees have minimal complaints and are highly motivated.

- High Hygiene + Low Motivation: Employees view the job as a source of income. Also, they are not exceedingly motivated, but have few complaints.
- Low Hygiene + High Motivation: Employees are excited and motivated about the challenges of the job, however they still have many complaints due to low salaries and unacceptable working conditions.
- Low Hygiene + Low Motivation: These employees are completely unmotivated which leads to a large number of complaints.

Although Herzberg's theory has been correlated with many disciplines, several criticisms have emerged. These criticisms include not being able to be replicated under any other circumstances, data collection techniques, and the theory merely being over simplified (Bevins, 2018). For example, Evans and Olumide-Aluko, 2010 determined that Herzberg's theory being developed in the western business world does not necessarily translate well across disciplines or geographical lines. Herzberg's theory allowed for researchers to build upon his theory of motivation to determine what motivates first-year teachers.

Houses' 4 Dimensions of Support

Also supporting this study is the theory of social support. In 1981, James House theorized the improvement of health, the reduction of stress, and shielding the impact of stress on humans is lessened by social supports. According to House (1981), there are four categories of social supports: instrumental, appraisal, informational, emotional. Emotional support involves esteem, affect, trust, concern, and listening (House, 1981).

He also mentions that “emotional support seems to be the most important” (p. 24) of the four social supports. Instrumental support includes support for employment, time, salary and the improvement of workers’ environment (House, 1981). Also, “instrumental support is given when people help others do their work, take care of them, or help them pay their bills” (p. 25).

The third type of social support is informational support. Informational support includes guidance, suggestion, instruction, and information (House, 1981). He also discussed how informational support is providing assistance to employees struggling with personal and environmental problems. The final type of social support is appraisal support. Appraisal support includes affirmation, feedback, and social comparison (House, 1981). Workers use appraisal support as forms of data when evaluating themselves (House, 1981, p. 25).

According to House (1981), social supports have an effect on workers’ job satisfaction, which led House to call for an increase in social supports. He stated that, the giving and receiving of social support must become a standard characteristic of the organization. Also, he discussed how simply asking leaders to be more helpful is not enough. They may need to be trained in the four aspects of social support (House, 1981). House’s theory of principal support provides a building block to determine the ramifications school leaders have on employees (teachers) and their job satisfaction.

Littrell et al.

In 1994, Littrell, Billingsley, and Cross utilized Houses’ four dimensions of support to identify teachers’ perceptions of principal support. Also, they investigated the effects of perceived principal support on the mental and physical health of teachers,

satisfaction, dedication to their school, and the desire to continue teaching (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). This research conducted by Littrell et. al on the four dimensions of support was used as a basis for this study. Furthermore, these researchers cited that much of what is written about principal support is explained in comprehensive terms. Through the understanding of the four dimensions of support, leaders would be able to determine how to support teachers and increase job satisfaction (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994).

To understand the importance of the behaviors of support for this study, the adapted definition for “principal supports” are as follows (Littrell et al., 1994):

1. Emotional Support – School leadership express to teachers that they are valuable, trusted, and important by open communication, expressions of appreciation, and considering their ideas while taking interest in how they are teaching.
2. Instrumental Support – School leadership expresses instrumental support by helping teachers with managerial tasks and non-teaching tasks, such as classroom materials, space, and other resources they may need.
3. Informational Support – School leadership expresses informational support by sharing important and useful informational with teachers that will lead to improvements in the classroom. For example, school leaders could provide teachers will opportunities to attend work-shops, professional developments, and others useful seminars. Furthermore, school leaders offer suggestions to improve their teaching practice.
4. Appraisal Support – As instructional leaders, school leaders will provide constructive feedback, throughout the year.

To determine how these principal supports affected teacher job satisfaction, the researchers used a questionnaire containing forty principal support items along the four dimensions (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). The researchers asked the teachers to describe the importance of each support. According to the results of the study, emotional support was reported as the most important form of support. The second most important support was appraisal support with instrumental and then informational following. The researchers discussed how principal support effects teachers' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and retention. First, the researchers concluded that principal support likely decreases stress and burnout (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). Second, they concluded that principal support is likely to have a productive effect on the dedication of the teacher, job satisfaction, and desire to return (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). Last, they evaluated how an educator's health may be affected by non-supportive behavior on the part of the principal (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994).

Furthermore, many of the general educators and special educators in the study felt that the support being provided by their principals was not helpful (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). Although the study conducted by Littrell et.al was used as a basis for this study, the results may not be representative of first-year teacher job satisfactions and their relationship to principal support. (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994) has allowed researchers to take what House theorized and apply it to principals perceived effect on first-year teachers.

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2015)

A set of professional standards was developed in 1996 (ISLLC) to promote student success. These standards were developed to increase leader's knowledge of what

it takes to be a successful leader. A component of these standards addresses what supports faculty and staff need from the leadership at their school. A total of eleven standards were written to provide guidance for administrators across the country. Standard 6 states that an educational leader promotes a professional culture for teacher and staff. Standard 8 states that an educational leader promotes effective management of the school, and standard 11 states that an educational leader promotes continuous school improvement. These standards are meant to provide guidance to leaders as they provide support to school employees. For first-year teachers, this support can be what determines how successful they are as educators.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

Teacher job satisfaction has been known to be linked to teacher attrition. Each year teachers left the profession for a wide variety of reasons. Twenty percent of these teachers chose to leave because they wanted to investigate other professions, they wanted higher pay, they were dissatisfied with their job, or a combination of all these (Perie & Baker, 1997). In an article written by Kicker and Loadman (1998), the researchers discussed how teacher job satisfaction had been widely researched. Using a collection of 1,175 articles, they identified twelve variables correlated to teacher job satisfaction. The twelve variables were as follows:

Table 2 *Teacher Job Satisfaction Variables*

| Variables | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Salary (Compensation) | Interaction (Leadership Style) |
| Table 2 (continued). | |
| Interaction with students | Class size |
| School Climate | Professional achievement |
| Age (Years of Experience) | Self-motivation |
| Principal Support | Self-evaluation |
| Level/Types of School | Professional Development |
| Gender | Principal Support |

Various other studies have been conducted to determine if certain factors had an influence on teacher job satisfaction. In each of these research studies a definition of job satisfaction was developed or taken from a previous study. Many researchers utilized the definition composed by Edwin Locke in 1976. Locke (1976) stated that job satisfaction results from the constructive feedback of one's job, leading to a pleasing emotional state. The positive emotional state defined by Locke has been investigated by various researchers throughout the past few decades.

The National Center of Education Statistics stated that both extrinsic and intrinsic factors influence teacher job satisfaction (Perie & Baker, 1997). These factors have been examined to explore what effect(s) they have on teacher job satisfaction including leadership style, grade-level, subject taught, age of teacher, gender of teacher, number of years taught, and principal support.

Teacher job satisfaction can be dependent on many factors. These factors vary on how much or little effect they have on satisfaction. Also, a decrease or increase in job satisfaction could be due to a collection of these factors. The factors included in this study were compensation class size, school climate, leadership style, level/type of school, years of experience, and principal support.

Compensation, Class Size, and Climate

The topic of teacher compensation is vital when looking to determine teacher job satisfaction. A limited number of studies have been associated with determining this relationship.

In a study conducted in 2008, the researchers determined that as teacher compensation went up, teacher job satisfaction also went up (Zhang, Verstegen, & Kim, 2008). Also, other factors such as gender, age, and teaching experience had little to no effect in altering how compensation effected job satisfaction (Zhang, Verstegen, & Kim, 2008).

However, a research study conducted by Perie and Baker (1997) showed a weak relationship between teacher satisfaction and salary/benefits. The researchers did clarify stating that while salary is important to teachers, it is not the most important variable when discussing job satisfaction.

Class size has also been determined to be an important factor when discussing variables of teacher job satisfaction. Researchers have conducted studies to determine the effects class size has on student learning and success, yet the effect class size has on teacher job satisfaction has not been studied as in depth. In a study conducted by Price and Terry (2008), the researchers hypothesized that teachers with smaller class sizes

would have greater levels of job satisfaction. This mixed methods study determined in focus groups that class size was a determining factor in increasing or decreasing teacher job satisfaction. Furthermore, Taiwo and Ogunlade (2020) conducted a study to determine teacher job satisfaction in a secondary school. The researchers determined that along with other variables, class size influenced teacher job satisfaction.

School climate has been shown to be a predictor determining the success of a school and teacher job satisfaction. According to Aldridge, J. and Fraser, B., 2016, School Climate encompasses the quality of life, including the expectations and values, a school expects from all stakeholders. Developing a school climate is important to the achievement of a school. Developing school climate includes the principal being approachable and supportive, which contributes to teacher job satisfaction (Aldridge & Fraser, 2016).

Bogler (2001) stated that factors that contribute to dissatisfaction include the working conditions, organizational supervision, and mutual relationships (Polatcan & Cansoy, 2019). According to a recent study conducted by Polatcan and Cansoy (2019), certain characteristics contributed to teacher job satisfaction. These characteristics were ensuring that teachers and leadership worked together, through communication and simply interacting with each other, which directly affected school climate. Thus, improving school climate would in turn increase teacher job satisfaction.

Gender

Another factor associated with teacher job satisfaction in various research studies was the gender of the teacher (Singh & Kumar, 2016; Shaukat, Vishnumolakala & Bustami, 2019; Sak, 2018). According to Sak (2018), male teachers reported lower job

satisfaction. However, the researcher did discuss the results could be a combination of multiple factors associated with the study. The results of this study were consistent with the results for Vishnumolakala and Bustami, (2019). The researchers reported there was a significant difference associated with males having greater levels of job satisfaction. On the other hand, often studies report there was not a significant difference between participants of either gender. For example, Singh and Kumar, (2016) reported job satisfaction was not dependent on gender of the teacher. Furthermore, according to Perie and Baker, (1997), female teachers have a higher degree of job satisfaction than males teachers. According to this data set, a greater number of females are in the high satisfaction category while a greater number of males are in the low satisfaction category.

Level/Type of School

Grade-level and school sector has been used as a variable in research studies investigating teacher job satisfaction. Studies have examined whether there was an effect on teacher job satisfaction across school types: elementary, middle, and high schools and school sectors: public and private. According to multiple studies (Landers, Alter, & Servilio, 2008; Morgan & O’Leary, 2004), there were no significant difference among teachers’ job satisfaction at different school types. This conclusion is consistent with most studies that used demographics as a variable in determining teacher job satisfaction. However, in a study by the U.S. Department of Education, private school teachers report being more content than public school teachers, and elementary school teachers report being more content than secondary school teachers (Perie & Baker, 1997)

Years of Experience

According to the research study by the U.S. Department of Education, as years of experience increase, teacher job satisfaction decreases. Klassen and Chiu, (2010) stated teachers in the middle and later years of their careers have challenges that influence their satisfaction. These challenges could include changes in leadership, curriculum, and increased roles and responsibilities. However, a study conducted by Klecker (1998) stated that only one difference was found by years of teaching experience. Her study determined that teacher with twenty-six years or more teaching experience rated their satisfaction lower than the other groups represented in this study. Although years of teaching experience could possibly be related to teacher job satisfaction, Klecker stated that planning teams should look more into the lower-rated aspects of her study including salary, autonomy, and working conditions to address teacher job satisfaction.

Furthermore, a study conducted by Bolin (1996), showed that as years of experience increased, teacher job satisfaction increased. Yet certain factors had been associated with this increase in job satisfaction as teaching experience increases such as increased salary, tenure, nearness to retirement, and simply being “better” at their jobs (classroom management, teaching effectiveness, etc.). Lastly, according to Perie and Baker, (1997), the number of respondents in the high satisfaction category decreased when years of experience rose. Meanwhile, the number of respondents in the low satisfaction category increased as years of experience rose.

Leadership Style

A significant amount of research concerning teacher job satisfaction has included leadership style as a variable affecting the level of teacher job satisfaction (Baptiste, 2019; Bogler, 2001; Shaw & Newton, 2014). In 2019, Baptiste discussed how school

leaders and their behaviors had a large effect on the experiences and performance of their teachers. Also, leaders must recognize what factors are important to their faculty and develop strategies to improve teacher job satisfaction (Baptiste, 2019).

Moreover, Bogler (2001) developed a study to determine teacher job satisfaction and how different leadership styles (transformational and autocratic) effected it. Bogler's findings demonstrated that there was a positive relationship between the use of transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaction. Also, the researcher called for future studies to investigate the theory of teacher job satisfaction.

Furthermore, Shaw and Newton (2014) discussed the effects of servant leadership on teacher job satisfaction. Their results showed a significant positive correlation between teachers' perception of their principals' level of servant leadership and teacher job satisfaction. Also, the researchers discussed the importance of developing better relationships with teachers. Principals could create better relationships with teachers through encouragement, support, and development (Shaw & Newton, 2014).

Principal Support

Principal support should also be a variable when determining the level of teacher job satisfaction. According to Littrell, Billingsley, and Cross (1994), the commitment of teachers, willingness to stay at the school, and job satisfaction is effected by principal support. Several articles associate principal support with teacher job satisfaction (Brown & Wynn, 2009; Olsen & Huang, 2019; & Bressler, 2012). By focusing on House (1976) and Littrell et al. (1994), there is a basis for most of the studies on how principal support influences teacher job satisfaction. Many researchers developed studies based on the four

dimensions of support developed by House and directed to K-12 principals by Littrell et al (1994).

Table 3 *Dimensions of Principal Support*

| Factors | |
|---------------|--------------|
| Emotional | Instrumental |
| Informational | Appraisal |

Each of these supports affects teachers' job satisfaction in various ways.

Emotional support was defined school leadership expressing to teachers that they are valuable, trusted, and important by open communication, expressions of appreciation, and considering their ideas while taking interest in how they are teaching. (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). Emotional support is provided when administrators give teachers the opportunity to share their ideas with the group, as valued stakeholders. (Bressler, 2012). Providing these teachers with this kind of relationship, provides the opportunity for teachers and administrators to build a trusting relationship. According to Leithwood et al., (2006) "These trusting relationships allow principals to improve teaching and learning indirectly and most powerfully through their influence on staff motivation, commitment, and working conditions" (p.3).

Additionally, Leithwood et al. (2006) supported the claim that emotional support influences teacher job satisfaction. The researchers discussed a recent four-year mixed-methods national study. The study focused on the work, lives, and effectiveness of teachers in English schools that confirmed the impact leaders have on teachers'

commitment to the school, resilience and effectiveness, and the the idea that leadership understands the benefits of emotional support.(Day et. al, 2006).

Instrumental support is apparent when a principal directly helps teachers with work-related tasks. These tasks may include materials, classroom resources, classroom space, enough time to prepare, and non-teaching concerns. (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). Instrumental support may look different for teachers across the discipline. Some teachers' ideas of instrumental support will include having the necessary materials and space, while others may view other managerial type concerns as most important to their growth and success as teachers.

A lack of instrumental support has been reported to overwhelm teachers. According to Emma Garcia of the Economic Policy Institute (2019), nine out of ten teachers have spent their own money to purchase classroom supplies, knowing they will not be reimbursed for what they spent. An average of \$459 per teacher is spent on school supplies for their classroom each year. Although many teachers will do what it takes to provide for their students, teachers spending their own money may have a negative impact on their perception of teaching as a profession, and whether or not they will continue to teach. (Garcia, 2019).

Informational support is defined school leadership expressing informational support by sharing important and useful informational with teachers that will lead to improvements in the classroom. For example, school leaders could provide teachers will opportunities to attend work-shops, professional developments, and others useful seminars. Furthermore, school leaders offer suggestions to improve their teaching practice. (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). Providing teachers with training

opportunities and professional development based on their teaching areas revealed higher teacher job satisfaction (Silva, Amante, & Morgado, 2017).

Recent studies such as Baker, (2010) and Jehanzeb and Bashir, (2013) have demonstrated positive correlation between professional development and job satisfaction (Els, 2017). However, in the research conducted by Els (2017), after attending professional developments, stated that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Appraisal support is when school leaders provide constructive feedback throughout the year. Also, school leaders provide teachers with training on what effective teaching looks like, and go over clear guidelines regarding what they are supposed to do. (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994). Providing effective feedback to teachers is vital to improving teachers, which will increase their job satisfaction (Balyer & Ozcan, 2020). However, according to Balyer and Ozcan (2020), principal feedback can cause anxiety and stress in teachers, ultimately decreasing teacher job satisfaction.

First-Year

The first-year of teaching is a difficult and challenging year. According to the Education Policy Institute (2019), “From the 2008–2009 to 2015–2016 school years, there was a 15.4 percent drop in the number of education degrees awarded and a 27.4 percent drop in the number of people who completed a teacher preparation program.” This drop in first-year teachers is a concern when discussing K-12 education policy. Effective principal support can determine teacher effectiveness and overall job satisfaction. Womack-Wynne, Dees, Leech, LaPlant, Brockmeier, and Gibson (2011) cited that providing these supports to first-year teachers would address the issues that lead to a lower degree of job satisfaction. As mentioned previously, numerous studies

have been developed to determine the relationship between years of experience, gender, grade-level, and leadership style; however this study looked to bridge the gap pertaining to first-year teachers and their relationship with principal support.

Administrative support is very important to the success of first-year teachers. (Womack-Wynne et. al, 2011). The relationship between first-year teachers and principal support could potentially improve by increasing first-year teacher job satisfaction and teacher attrition. Womack-Wynne et al. stated that an examination of first-year teachers' relationship with principal supports would be beneficial in understanding the best approach to instruct first-year teachers and ensure retention.

Summary

Due to the considerable number of teachers exiting the teaching profession each year, especially within the first five years, the topic of teacher job satisfaction is an important subject for school leadership across the country. To determine the effectiveness of certain variables on teacher job satisfaction, the federal government has implemented various federal acts and initiatives with rewards tied to them for states who participate or accomplish the requirements/goals set forth. A few of these federal acts and initiatives include Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left Behind, Race To The Top Initiative, and Every Student Succeeds Act. Several extrinsic and intrinsic variables determine whether teacher job satisfaction increases or decreases. Over the past century, several studies have been conducted to determine how leaders can apply these variables to school settings.

Principal support has changed significantly over the past few decades. School, district, and state leadership have begun to research how, and which variables of principal

support create a positive environment for teachers, which in turn increases teacher job satisfaction and hopefully student achievement. (Asif, Fahhra, Tahir, & Shabbir, 2016). Teacher job satisfaction and its relationship with principal support has become increasingly more important over the years. As more demands were put on principals and teachers to increase student achievement, improvement of principal supports needed to follow.

Many variables have been studied to determine their relationship and effect on teacher job satisfaction. The list of variables includes compensation, class size, leadership style, gender, level/type of school, years of experience, and principal support along with other variables. The four principal supports, emotional, informational, instrumental, and appraisal, developed by House (1981) and adapted by (Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994) (1994), were used during this study.

In addition, the first-year of teaching can be especially difficult for new teachers. Teacher job satisfaction and principal support can have a direct impact on student achievement and teacher retention. The typical first-year teacher, unlike the veteran teachers, has not been trained to understand what expectations and responsibilities are expected of them. (Ward, 2015). However, they have the same requirements as veteran teachers, sometimes with little to no support. Although the demand for principal support is needed for all teachers, this study investigated this gap and determined the relationship between principal supports and first-year teacher job satisfaction.

CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between the dimensions of principal supports and first-year teacher job satisfaction. The study collected data through the use of a questionnaire developed by previous researchers.

First-year teachers from multiple school districts throughout Mississippi were asked to participate in the study voluntarily. The questionnaires were collected during the summer semester of the 2020-2021 school year. The data were analyzed by means of SPSS to address the following research questions:

Research Questions

1. What is the reported importance of each dimension of support (emotional, instrumental, informational, & appraisal)?
2. To what extent is the importance of each dimension of support related to first-year teacher job satisfaction?

Research Design

The researcher used a quantitative correlational research design to analyze the data collected. This research design was appropriate because the researcher was seeking to determine the relationship between different variables (principal support & job satisfaction among 1st year teachers). Lappe (2000) stated, “The aim of correlational research is to describe the relationship among variables rather than to infer cause and effect relationships.” (p.81). The independent variables in this study included four types of principal support (appraisal, emotional, instrumental, and informational) and other demographic factors (gender, grade-level, etc.). Furthermore, the dependent variable for

this research study was first-year teacher job satisfaction. The researcher used Cronbach's alpha to determine the internal consistency of the variables.

Procedures

Once the project was approved by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board and the dissertation committee, the researcher obtained permission from multiple superintendents to contact first-year teachers in their districts. The researcher contacted superintendents by email or phone, depending on the information presented on district websites.

Once permission was granted, the researcher sent a mass email out to each school district's first-year teachers. In some cases, the superintendent forwarded the email. To accomplish this task, the researcher needed help from the district office to identify first-year teachers, however no identifying information, such as name, school, or email, was collected by the researcher. The potential participants were emailed an explanation of the study. This email included an invitation for them to participate with instructions for participation along with the statement of informed consent. To ensure that the statement of informed consent was read, the potential participant was directed to the informed consent letter before given access to the questionnaire. The participants remained anonymous and unidentifiable other than demographic information such as gender, age, grade-level, etc. Also, the informed consent letter contained a statement explaining that no identifiable data would be collected such as name, email, phone number, etc. The results collected throughout this study were reported collectively, as opposed to individually, so individual schools and participants would also not be identifiable. The

questionnaire was accessible by the Qualtrics hyperlink attached to the email and only accessible at various locations with access to the internet.

The responses were collected using Qualtrics for the analytics portion of the research study. Although the questionnaire was designed to be completed in fifteen to twenty minutes, it was made available for four weeks. The time taken to complete the questionnaire depended on the individuals understanding of the process of completing the questionnaire. Subsequent to the four weeks of availability, participation was closed, and the data was analyzed thru SPSS. The data, both on Qualtrics and the researcher's computer were kept confidential, as each source was password protected.

The data will be stored in the aforementioned platforms for three years. Lastly, the data analysis was shared with the superintendents of each of the participating school districts subject to their request.

Participants

The research study ultimately targeted first-year K-12 teachers throughout the State of Mississippi. The researcher requested permission to distribute the questionnaires from district superintendents using the districts email platforms. The participants were provided with an introduction email and hyperlink to the questionnaire. By clicking on the hyperlink, the participant consented to taking the questionnaire. However, the introduction email explained that the questionnaire was to be completed voluntarily and could be discontinued at any time without fear of penalty. The researcher used convenience sampling as a means of collecting data. A representativeness of the population is an important characteristic of simple random sampling (Sharma, 2017). The participants were located across multiple school districts in central Mississippi. However,

the researcher used the sample as a representative of the population of all first-year teachers in public schools across the state of Mississippi.

Many characteristics made the participants eligible to participate, including teaching status, number of years teaching, gender, grade-level, and their willingness to participate. Characteristics that made them ineligible is the unwillingness to participate and being a non-first-year teacher. With a population of just above 32,000 public school teachers in Mississippi, 4.7 % are first-year teachers according to an article published by Economic Policy Institute, 2019. With a population size of 1750 first-year teachers, a sample size of 316 first-year teachers was effective in generalizing the findings of the study. Before the collection of any data, participation was requested by contacting the superintendents of the school district where potential participants are under contract.

Table 4 *Demographics*

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Age | | |
| 18-24 years old | 25 | 51 |
| 25-34 years old | 18 | 36.7 |
| 35-44 years old | 6 | 12.2 |
| Ethnicities | | |
| White | 34 | 69.4 |
| African American | 14 | 28.6 |
| Asian American | 1 | 2.0 |

Table 4 (continued).

| | | |
|--------|----|------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 22 | 44.9 |
| Female | 47 | 55.1 |

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was titled Principal Support Scale. The Principal Support Scale was created by Michael F. Dipaola and published by Information Age Publishing in *Contemporary Challenges Confronting School Leaders*. The questionnaire consists of sixteen questions. To analyze the participants, the researcher incorporated a demographic section. The instrument was later adapted by P. C. Littrell, from House's four dimensions of administrative support theory (Dipaola, 2012).

The original instrument consisted of forty items, ten items to address each principal support (instrumental, appraisal, informational, emotional). Both versions of the Principal Support Scale were field tested. The reliability of the measures of each dimension of support, for the updated sixteen questions questionnaire, was high: Cronbach's Alpha was .94 for emotional support, .93 for appraisal support, .88 for instrumental support, and .87 for informational support (Dipaola, 2012).

A six-point scale was used for this survey with anchors from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). According to Dipaola (2012), two school dimensions, expressive support and instrumental support, contain the four aspects of the social support of the principal.

Table 5 A Two-Factor Varimax Solution for the 16-item PSS

| | Factor I | Factor II |
|--|----------|-----------|
| Emotional Items | | |
| Gives me a sense of importance that I make a difference. | .822 | |
| Supports my decisions. | .825 | |
| Trusts my judgement in making classroom decisions. | .694 | |
| Shows confidence in my actions. | .735 | |
| Professional Items | | |
| Gives me undivided attention when I am talking | .774 | |
| Is honest and straightforward with the staff. | .848 | |
| Provides opportunities for me to grow professionally. | .700 | |
| Encourages professional growth. | .893 | |
| Instrumental Support | | |
| Provides adequate planning time. | | .811 |
| Provides time for various nonteaching responsibilities. | | .809 |
| Provides extra assistance when I become overloaded. | | .720 |
| Equally distributes resources and unpopular chores. | | .683 |

Table 5 (continued).

Appraisal Items

| | | |
|--|------|------|
| Provides data for me to reflect on following classroom observations. | | .652 |
| Provides frequent feedback about my performance. | | .735 |
| Helps me evaluate my needs. | | .755 |
| Provides suggestions for me to improve instruction | | .574 |
| Eigenvalue | 11.3 | 1.47 |
| Cumulative Variance | 70.7 | 79.9 |
| Alpha Coefficient of Reliability | .954 | .955 |

The researcher used the questionnaire to address the previously mentioned research questions. Each of the sixteen items were used to determine the importance of each dimension of support (Research Question 1). Also, all sixteen items were used to determine what extent each dimension of support was related to first-year teacher job satisfaction (Research Question 2). To address the research question more effectively, the researcher added two questions (1B and 1C), following each of the sixteen original questions (1A). The first question (1B) was: indicate the importance of receiving this support as a first-year teacher. The second question (1C) was: indicate the degree of job satisfaction this support provides. Dipaola (2012), stated that principals are an integral part of schools, and their roles are an important part of effective schools. (Bossert, 1988)

Edmonds, 1979, Purkey & Smith, 1983; Stedman, 1987). This questionnaire enabled us to ascertain the role of principal support for first-year teachers.

After adding question 1B and 1C to the instrument, the researcher completed a pilot study to demonstrate validity and reliability of the instrument. Fifteen first-year teachers were sent the questionnaire to pilot the instrument. “Samples with Ns between ten and thirty have many practical advantages including simplicity, easy calculation, and the ability to test hypotheses, yet overlook weak treatment effects (Isaac & Michael, 1995).

The researcher also used the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Dawis, England, Lofquist, and Weiss, 1967) to determine job satisfaction among the first-year teachers who responded to this survey. The questionnaire consisted of nineteen items using a five-point Likert Scale (1-Very Dissatisfied to 6-Very Satisfied). Raw scores were then converted to percentile scores. A percentile score of 75 or higher was represented by a high degree of job satisfaction while a percentile score of 25 and below represented a low degree of job satisfaction. The percentile scores in the range of 26-74 represented an average degree of job satisfaction.

The reliability of the instrument was then determined by Cronbach’s Alpha. The scale responses resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of 0.785, which indicated an admissible level of internal consistency. Furthermore, all VIF values were between 1 and 5 indicating moderate correlation between the predictor variables. Also, the plot of standardized residuals versus predicted values shows that points were equally distributed across all values of the independent variables. After running the descriptives, the variable job satisfaction showed a skewness of -1.126 and a kurtosis of 3.622. Also, the variable

emotional improves job satisfaction had a skewness of -1.982 and a kurtosis of 6.179.

However, these statistics could be due to the sample size (N=49). It was determined that this independent variables relationship was linearly dependent.

Data Analysis

The IBM software platform SPSS was used to collect and analyze the data collected from the questionnaires sent out to the first-year teachers. The researcher used descriptive statistics during the data analysis including frequency (to determine frequency of responses), mean (to determine central tendency), standard deviations (to determine variation), and percentile ranks (to determine position of supports). One-Way ANOVA test and t-tests were used to assess the data collected. An alpha level of .05 was used to support and/or reject the hypotheses. The research questions developed prior to the collection of data were:

1. What is the reported importance of each dimension of support (instrumental, emotional, informational, & appraisal)?
2. To what extent is the importance of each dimension of support related to first-year teacher job satisfaction?

CHAPTER IV – RESEARCH RESULTS

The purpose of this research study was to determine the relationship between first-year teacher job satisfaction and principal support. Specifically, the focus was the correlation between the respondents' job satisfaction and each of the four principal supports. An online questionnaire was sent to first-year teachers throughout Mississippi. This questionnaire included the principal support scale, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and other demographic questions. Forty-nine respondents from nine school districts participated in the research study.

Description of Sample

The first five questions in the research study collected data on the demographic information of the respondents. A total of seventy-six teachers responded to the survey. However, only forty-nine of the respondents were first-year teachers. The data from respondents who were not first-year teachers were deleted. Of the forty-nine responses, twenty-two (45%) of the respondents were male and twenty-seven (55%) of the respondents were female. Fourteen (29%) of the respondents were African American, one (2%) Asian, and thirty-four (69%) of the respondents were white.

Furthermore, question three of the research instrument included the ages of the respondents. Of the forty-nine respondents, twenty-five (51%) were in the age range 18-24, eighteen (37%) were in the age range of 25-34, and sic (12%) were in the age range of 35-44. The final question concerning demographics was the format(s) their school used during the 2020-2021 school year. twelve (24%) of the respondents stated that their school used only the traditional format, one (.02%) stated that their school used virtual,

and six (.06%) responded with hybrid. The other thirty-three (67%) used a combination of traditional (3), hybrid (1), and virtual (2).

Table 6 *School Format*

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Valid | 1 | 3 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| | 1,2 | 2 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 10.2 |
| | 1,2,3 | 15 | 30.6 | 30.6 | 40.8 |
| | 1,3 | 13 | 26.5 | 26.5 | 67.3 |
| | 2 | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 69.4 |
| | 2,3 | 3 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 75.5 |
| | 3 | 12 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 100 |
| | Total | 49 | 100 | 100 | |

Note. 1=hybrid, 2=virtual, 3=traditional

Principal Support

The second section of this study focused on the respondent's report of supportive behaviors given by their principals, using the Principal Support Scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the questions in this section was .90. The next section of this study concentrated on the importance the first-year teacher placed on each of the supportive behaviors. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the questions in this section was .925. The fourth section of this study included the belief that the respondent had on whether the supportive behaviors improved job satisfaction. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the questions in this section was .908. The final section concentrated on overall job satisfaction of the respondent, using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Descriptive statistics address the means of each of the principal supports. The researcher utilized a Likert scale to determine whether or not the first-year teachers

agree or disagree with each statement from the Principal Support Scale. A six-point scale was used for this survey with anchors from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Table 7 *Variable Means*

| | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------------|----|------|-----------------------|
| Emotional Support | 49 | 4.73 | .769 |
| Informational Support | 49 | 4.58 | .806 |
| Instrumental Support | 49 | 4.19 | .885 |
| Appraisal Support | 49 | 4.17 | 1.15 |
| Job Satisfaction | 49 | 3.85 | .393 |

Concerning Appraisal Support, the mean for the forty-nine participants was 4.17, with a standard deviation of 1.15. Regarding Instrumental Support, the mean for the forty-nine participants was 4.19, with a standard deviation. of .885. According to these results, the collection of respondents slightly agreed with the statements that concerned Instrumental Support. Considering Informational Support, the mean for the forty-nine participants was 4.58, with a standard deviation. of .806. According to these results, the collection of respondents slightly agreed with the statements that concerned Informational Support. Observing Emotional Support, the mean for the forty-nine participants was 4.73, with a standard deviation. of .769. According to these results, the collection of respondents slightly agreed with the statements that concerned Emotional Support.

Importance of Support

Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha was run for each subscale (appraisal improves job satisfaction, informational improves job satisfaction, instrumental improves job satisfaction, and emotional improves job satisfaction) to determine if Cronbach's Alpha would show a significant increase if a certain item was deleted. By deleting item 203_12, Cronbach's Alpha increased to .904 from .888. No other items showed a significant increase to Cronbach's Alpha when deleted.

A multiple linear regression, developed using SPSS, was utilized to predict the relationship between importance of all four dimensions of support (informational, emotional, instrumental, and appraisal) and first-year teacher job satisfaction. A significant regression equation was found ($F=1.441$, $p=.05$, with an R^2 of .116) with several statistically significant predictor variables associated with job satisfaction. The largest positive correlation with first-year teacher job satisfaction is appraisal support (.297). informational support (.293), instrumental support (.274), emotional support (.214). follow up closely as a positive correlation. There are no significant differences in first-year teacher job satisfaction when receiving emotional support ($p=.070$). However, there are significant differences for informational support (.020), instrumental support (.028), and appraisal support (.019).

Satisfaction

Moreover, means, percentiles, standards deviations were calculated to quantify first-year teachers overall job satisfaction. The researcher used an agreement Scale to determine how dissatisfied or satisfied the respondents were with their job. A horizontal numeric scale was used for this survey with anchors from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 6 (*very*

satisfied). The averages were calculated for each question, as well as a whole, with the overall average being 3.85.

All but seven of the nineteen job satisfaction questions had a mean between 3.0-3.99, which means the respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The other seven questions had a mean between 4.0-4.99, which shows that they were satisfied with the statements about job satisfaction.

Table 8 *Job Satisfaction Items*

| | | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|----|------|----------------|
| Keeping busy all the time | 49 | 3.63 | .809 |
| The chance to work alone | 49 | 3.61 | .909 |
| The chance to do different things | 49 | 3.82 | .727 |
| The chance to be somebody in the community | 49 | 4.06 | .556 |
| The chance to use my methods of student engagement | 49 | 4.08 | .672 |
| The way my coworkers get along with each other | 49 | 3.86 | .866 |
| Encouragement from administration | 49 | 3.65 | .879 |
| The feeling of accomplishment | 49 | 4.18 | .667 |

Table 8 (continued).

| | | | |
|---|----|------|-------|
| The competence of my supervisor in making decisions | 49 | 3.92 | .838 |
| Doing things that don't go against my conscience | 49 | 4.10 | .895 |
| Leadership opportunities | 49 | 3.73 | .811 |
| Use my strengths/abilities | 49 | 3.92 | .702 |
| The way company policies are put into practice | 49 | 3.53 | .844 |
| Compensation versus workload | 49 | 3.16 | 1.143 |
| Chances for advancement | 49 | 3.71 | .842 |
| The freedom to use my own judgement | 49 | 4.10 | .621 |
| The working conditions | 49 | .408 | .702 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 49 | | |

Moreover, according to Weiss et. al, (1967), percentiles scores are most appropriate when interpreting the MSQ. According to Table 8, 75% of the respondents had a mean of 3.61, this means 75% of respondents responded as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, satisfied, or very satisfied. Also, 25% of the respondents responded satisfied or very satisfied with their current jobs as first-year teachers.

Table 9 *Job Satisfaction*

| | | |
|----------------|---------|------|
| n | Valid | 49 |
| | Missing | 0 |
| Std. Deviation | | .393 |
| Percentiles | 25 | 3.61 |
| | 50 | 3.89 |
| | 75 | 4.11 |

Research Questions

Research question 1

Among 1st year teachers, what is the reported importance of each dimension of support (appraisal, instrumental, informational, emotional)? The researcher used a six-point Likert Scale to collect data from the respondents. A six-point scale was used for this survey with anchors from 1 (*not at all important*) to 6 (*extremely important*). Means were calculated to determine the reported importance of each dimension of principals' support. Each dimension of support fell into the range of 4.00-4.99, which highlights that the each of the supportive behaviors is Moderately Important to the respondents. Furthermore, as seen in table, Emotional Behavior has the highest level of importance with a mean of 4.9609. This level of importance is approaching Very Important on the scale. The lowest level of importance for the respondents was Appraisal Behavior at 4.31, approaching slightly important on the Likert Scale.

Table 10 *Principal Support(s): Importance*

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------|----|------|----------------|
| Emotional Behavior | 49 | 4.96 | .795 |
| Informational Behavior | 49 | 4.72 | .693 |
| Instrumental Behavior | 49 | 4.21 | .999 |
| Appraisal Behavior | 49 | 4.31 | .981 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 49 | | |

Research question 2

To what extent is the importance of each dimension of support related to first-year teacher job satisfaction? A six-point scale was used for this survey with anchors from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Means were calculated to determine to what extent the respondent believes that each support improves job satisfaction. Three dimensions of support fell into the range of 4.00-4.99 (emotional, instrumental, and appraisal), which highlights that the respondents slightly agree that each of these three supportive behaviors improves job satisfaction. Furthermore, instrumental support has the highest level of importance with a mean of 5.15. This level of importance is approaching moderately agree on the scale. The lowest level of importance for the respondents was emotional support at 4.65. A multiple linear regression was used to predict the relationship between importance of each dimension of support (appraisal, informational, instrumental, and emotional) and first-year teacher job satisfaction. A significant regression model was not found ($F=1.138$, $p=.05$, with a significance of .352). Due to the

p value ($p=.352$) being greater than .05, the researcher has determined that it is not statistically significant and indicates strong evidence for the null hypotheses. Therefore, the researcher was unable to provide evidence that the effect exists.

CHAPTER V – DISCUSSION

Summary

In 1994, Littrell et al. reported that there was a relationship of significance between teacher job satisfaction and principal support. Moreover, Race to the Top was an initiative authorized by President Barack Obama in 2009. An area of concern that Race to the Top looked to address was support for teachers (Race To The Top, n.d.). In 2015, President Obama reauthorized ESSA. ESSA was operational in during the 2018-2018 school year. Title II, Part A of ESSA, focused on improving teacher and principal quality. This included preparing and meeting qualification standards for first- teachers. Also, professional development, retention, and recruitment were important topics of consideration. (Improving Teacher and Principal Quality, n.d.).

The research study was a quantitative study to assess the relationship between the dimensions of principal support (instrumental, informational, appraisal, and emotional) and first-year teacher job satisfaction. However, this study was unable to find a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support, as it relates to first-year teachers. The researcher used the Principal Support Scale developed by Littrell and Billingsley, 1994 and was later modified by Dipaola, 2012.

The researcher also used the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (developed in 1997) to determine job satisfaction for the first-year teachers. Using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Principal Support Scale, the researcher developed an online questionnaire from the first-year teachers. The researcher received permission from multiple school districts superintendents to collect responses from their first-year teachers. Once permission was received, the superintendents distributed the participant

letters to the principals in their district, with the questionnaire link attached. Then, the principals distributed the link to the questionnaire to their first-year teachers.

The questionnaire consisted of seventy-four items. The first section of the questionnaire collected basic demographic data on gender, age, years of experience, ethnicity, and school format (traditional, hybrid, virtual). The average respondent was a white female in the twenty-five to thirty-four age range. Also, most respondents indicated they had a mixture of school formats (traditional, hybrid, and virtual) their first school year.

The second section consisted of the principal support scale. The next two sections collected data on the importance of the dimensions of principal support and whether they affect job satisfaction of first-year teachers. The final section collected information on the job satisfaction of first-year teachers using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

The researcher utilized a convenience sampling method to gather participants for this study. The participants were first-year teachers from multiple school districts. Once the questionnaires were distributed, a total of seventy-two questionnaires were completed. A total of forty-nine responses were analyzed due to incomplete responses and others not falling into the parameters of the study.

Conclusions and Discussion

The research study tested two hypotheses on the relationship between first-year teacher job satisfaction and principal supports. These hypotheses include the difference in support levels for each dimension of principal support and whether or not there is a relationship between each dimension of support and first-year teacher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I suggested that there is a significant difference in support levels for each dimension of principal support. The results of the research revealed that there is not a significant difference between each dimension of principal support. Each dimension of support fell into the range of 4.00-4.99, which highlights that the each of the supportive behaviors is Moderately Important to the respondents. Furthermore, the difference between Emotional Behavior Support (4.96) and Appraisal Behavior Support (4.31) is substantial, warranting consideration. It appears first-year teachers may place a higher-level of importance on validation from leaderships (emotional support), as opposed to constructive feedback (appraisal support). Although there was not a significant difference in the types of support reported by the respondent, this may indicate these supports are of equal, but critical contributors to things other than job satisfaction, such as job performance.

Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II suggested that there is a significant correlation between the importance of each dimension of support and first-year teacher job satisfaction. The results of the research showed that there are no significant relationships between first-year teacher job satisfaction and the importance of receiving emotional support ($p=.114$), Informational Support ($p=.107$), Instrumental Support ($p=.282$), and Appraisal Support ($p=.547$). Despite learning that for this sample, there was no relationship between any of the principal supports and teacher job satisfaction, it may be that other factors related to the school leader contribute other than those measured in this study, such as job expectations. The results of this survey are consistent with the research of Bressler, 2012.

Limitations

Limitations in this study include the inability to know how many schools are represented. First, participants in this study were limited to elementary, middle, and high schools in the state of Mississippi. Also, several of the superintendents chose to forward the participant letter to their principals. A possible reason for this may have been to protect the identity of their principals and teachers. This decision makes it difficult to know how many schools have a part in the research study.

Also, the more supportive administrators are more likely to distribute the questionnaire as opposed to the administrators who offer little support to their first-year teachers. Last the timeline of the questionnaire being sent out could be a possible limitation. There is a possibility that distributing the questionnaire during the summer could influence the responses. The size of the participant sample could also be considered a limitation.

There are several barriers that could have limited the number of participants. The small number of first-year teachers makes it difficult to reach these respondents. Also, as a way of protecting first-year teachers many school districts may not allow access to this population. Therefore, generalizing the results of this study as a representative of all first-year teachers is limited. When analyzing the data, these limitations should be considered.

Recommendations for Policy or Practice

For many teachers, the first-year presents several problems and challenges. New curriculum, student behavior, and parental support are a few that cause teachers to reconsider whether they made a wise career choice. Also, principal support or lack of principal support can determine the overall culture of the school. School districts could

continue to build upon the foundation of this study to monitor young teachers job satisfactions as it relates to principal supports. Often, young teachers are left alone to figure things out when a line of support is not available for them from curriculum departments, administration, and other district support staff (Wynn, Carboni, and Patall, 2007).

Although the results found no relationship between principal supports and first-year teacher job satisfaction, school districts may consider providing training for principals in each of the principal support areas to increase their knowledge of what types of support first-year teachers may need to be successful. According to the questionnaire, the respondents indicated that dimensions of support were moderately important to them. Also, these principals supports could have an effect on other variables such as veteran teacher job satisfaction and teacher performance.

First, principals could learn techniques to support all teachers emotionally. A few emotional supports include sharing their ideas, supporting them in difficult times, and principals showing teachers that they are trusted professionals. Next, principals may provide informational support. This includes providing teachers with information to improve their teaching practices such as professional trainings and workshops.

Third, principals may need to understand how to provide instrumental support. This incorporates principals providing more hands-on support such as with supplies, adequate teaching space, and adequate planning time. Finally, principals may offer appraisal support. This includes principals providing teachers with constructive feedback and support

Recommendation for Future Research

In a time when 30-50% of teachers exit the profession within the first five years, the researchers' purpose for this study was to examine the relationship between first-year teacher job satisfaction and principal support. A teacher's relationship with principals can be challenging even in a "successful" school. The relationship between teachers and principals can be easily affected due to several reasons. The results of this research study provide a foundation for researchers to collection information on the relationships between first-year teachers and principals. Future research could include a qualitative study to deepen the understanding of how principal supports affects first-year teacher job satisfaction. Researchers could collect data from first-year teachers nationally. Another recommendation for future research is how do the demographics of teachers correlate or affect a teachers' perception of principal support? Also, other external factors should be examined to determine their relationship with teacher job satisfaction.

Likewise, further research, possibly from first-year teachers across the nation, would provide researchers with information to confirm the findings of this study. This would increase the sample size and could influence the results from these variables. Furthermore, due to the covid-19 pandemic, it is a possibility that the information received from the respondents was different than their peers from previous years. Collecting responses from first-year teachers outside of pandemic year could provide researchers with different results.

As indicated by the respondents of the questionnaire, each of the four dimensions of principal support (informational, instrumental, appraisal, and emotional) was moderately important to them. Although the researcher found no relationship between

first-year teachers job satisfaction and principal supports, it is evident by the previous statement that principal support is important to them. Furthermore, during this period of education where “The teacher shortage is real, large and growing, and worse than we thought” (Garcia and Weiss of the Economic Policy Institute, 2019), it is important to continue to assess the needs of all teachers, so they may have the tools and support to lead a successful classroom.

APPENDIX A – IRB APPROVAL LETTER

Office of Research Integrity



118 COLLEGE DRIVE #5125 • HATTIESBURG, MS | 601.266.6576 | USM.EDU/ORI

NOTICE OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ACTION

The project below has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services regulations (45 CFR Part 46), and University Policy to ensure:

- The risks to subjects are minimized and reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered involving risks to subjects must be reported immediately. Problems should be reported to ORI via the Incident template on Cayuse IRB.
- The period of approval is twelve months. An application for renewal must be submitted for projects exceeding twelve months.
- Face-to-Face data collection may not commence without prior approval from the Vice President for Research's Office.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: IRB-21-62

PROJECT TITLE: The Relationship between Principal Supports and First-Year Teacher Job Satisfaction

SCHOOL/PROGRAM: School of Education, Educational Research and Admin

RESEARCHER(S): Beau Hannah, Kyna Shelley

IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Approved

CATEGORY: Expedited

7. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

PERIOD OF APPROVAL: March 23, 2021

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Donald Sacco".

Donald Sacco, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board Chairperson

APPENDIX B – PARTICIPANT CONSENT LETTER

Dear Prospective Survey Participant,

I am a doctoral student from The University of Southern Mississippi, and I am conducting a research study as part of my doctoral degree requirements. My study is entitled, *The relationship between Principal Supports and First-year teacher job satisfaction*. The purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between the dimensions of principal supports and first-year teacher job satisfaction.

By agreeing to participate in the study, you will be giving your consent for the researcher to include your responses in his data analysis. Your participation in this research study is strictly voluntary, and you may choose not to participate without fear of penalty or any negative consequences. You will be able to withdraw from the survey at any time and all survey responses will be deleted, including the informed consent agreement.

An informed consent agreement will appear on the first screen page of the survey. There will be no individually identifiable information, remarks, comments, or other identification of you as an individual participant. The survey will last no more than 20 minutes. If you have any questions, please contact the researcher at beau.hannah@usm.edu. This study has been approved by The University of Southern Mississippi's Institutional Review Board (#21-62).

If you decide to participate after reading this letter, you can access the survey from a link at:

https://usmep.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_cTFSiSnWtKyM9Ux

Thank you for your time,

Beau Hannah

APPENDIX C –SUPERINTENDENT PERMISSION LETTER

Dear Superintendent,

I am currently enrolled as a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership program at The University of Southern Mississippi. The goal of my dissertation research is to determine whether there is a relationship between Principal Supports and FIRST-YEAR Teacher Job Satisfaction.

I am requesting permission to solicit voluntary responses for my study from the teachers in your district. The study uses a survey that your teachers will complete by anonymous online link. It is my intention for this study to benefit administrators and superintendents by providing them valuable information about principal supports and first-year teacher job satisfaction.

For your convenience, I have created a Google Form (<https://forms.gle/EnV8TKMCVRVpEaHk6>) to be completed in order to grant permission to survey the FIRST-YEAR teachers in your district. If you have questions regarding this study, please contact me directly at (601) 668-0203 or email me at beau.hannah@usm.edu. You may also contact the chairperson of my committee, Dr. Kyna Shelley at The University of Southern Mississippi, at (601) 266-5841 or at kyna.shelley@usm.edu. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Beau Hannah
Doctoral Candidate
The University of Southern Mississippi
Department of Educational Leadership

APPENDIX D – SURVEY INSTRUMENT

How many years of experience will you have at the end of the 2020-2021 school year?

| | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| 0-1 | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2-5 | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6-10 | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11-15 | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16-20 | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21+ | <input type="radio"/> |

What gender do you identify as?

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Male | <input type="radio"/> |
| Female | <input type="radio"/> |
| Prefer not to answer | <input type="radio"/> |

What is your age?

Under 18

☐

18 - 24

☐

25 - 34

☐

35 - 44

☐

45 - 54

☐

55 - 64

☐

65+

☐

Please specify your ethnicity.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| White | <input type="radio"/> |
| Black or African American | <input type="radio"/> |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | <input type="radio"/> |
| Asian | <input type="radio"/> |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | <input type="radio"/> |
| Other | <input type="radio"/> |

Please specify which format(s) your school used to educate students during the 2020-2021 school year.

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------|
| Hybrid | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Virtual | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Traditional | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Principal Support Survey

Directions:

The following statements are about your perceptions of supportive behaviors given by your principal. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements along a scale from STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) to STRONGLY AGREE (6) by filling in the appropriate circle.

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 1. Gives me undivided attention when I am talking. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 2. Is honest and straightforward with the staff. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 3. Gives me a sense of importance - that I make a difference. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 4. Supports my decisions. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 5. Provides data for me to reflect on following classroom observations of my teaching. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 6. Provides frequent feedback about my performance. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 7. Helps me evaluate my needs. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 8. Trusts my judgment in making classroom decisions. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 9. Shows confidence in my actions. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 10. Provides opportunities for me to grow professionally. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 11. Encourages professional growth. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 12. Provides suggestions for me to improve my instruction. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 13. Provides time for various non-teaching responsibilities (e.g. IEPs, conferences, test students) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 14. Provides adequate planning time. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 15. Provides extra assistance when I become overloaded. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 16. Equally distributes resources and unpopular chores. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |

This supportive behavior is very important to me.

| | Not At All Important 1 | Low Importance 2 | Slightly Important 3 | Moderately Important 4 | Very Important 5 | Extremely Important 6 |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Gives me undivided attention when I am talking. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Is honest and straightforward with the staff. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Gives me a sense of importance - that I make a difference. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Supports my decisions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides data for me to reflect on following classroom observations of my teaching. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides frequent feedback about my performance. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helps me evaluate my needs. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Trusts my judgment in making classroom decisions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Shows confidence in my actions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides opportunities for me to grow professionally. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Encourages professional growth. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides suggestions for me to improve my instruction. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides time for various non-teaching responsibilities (e.g. IEPs, conferences, test students.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides adequate planning time. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides extra assistance when I become overloaded. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Equally distributes resources and unpopular chores.amongst all faculty | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

This supportive behavior ***improves job satisfaction.***

| | Strongly Disagree 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly Agree 6 |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Gives me undivided attention when I am talking. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Is honest and straightforward with the staff. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Gives me a sense of importance - that I make a difference. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Supports my decisions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides data for me to reflect on following classroom observations of my teaching. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides frequent feedback about my performance. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Helps me evaluate my needs. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Trusts my judgment in making classroom decisions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Shows confidence in my actions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides opportunities for me to grow professionally. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Encourages professional growth. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides suggestions for me to improve my instruction. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides time for various non-teaching responsibilities (e.g. IEPs, conferences, test students.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides adequate planning time. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provides extra assistance when I become overloaded. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Equally distributes resources and unpopular chores amongst all faculty | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

☐ Q60

The following statements are about your job satisfaction as a teacher. Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with each of the following statements along a scale from Very dissatisfied to Very Satisfied by choosing the appropriate circle.

☐ Q59

iQ x→ ...

Keeping busy all the time (Additional tasks required by administration)

Very dissatisfied
○

Dissatisfied
○

Neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied
○

Satisfied
○

Very Satisfied
○

+ Add page break

Q145

iQ ★ x→

I get the chance to work alone on the job (versus required team planning)

Very dissatisfied
○

Dissatisfied
○

Neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied
○

Satisfied
○

Very Satisfied
○

Q146

iQ ★ x→

I get the chance to do different things from time to time (Given permission to make adjustments/changes when needed)

Very dissatisfied
○

Dissatisfied
○

Neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied
○

Satisfied
○

Very Satisfied
○

Q147

iQ ★ x→

I get the chance to be somebody in the community (Respect from members of the community)

Very dissatisfied
○

Dissatisfied
○

Neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied
○

Satisfied
○

Very Satisfied
○

Q148

iQ

★

x→

The way my boss handles his/her workers

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

○

○

○

○

○

+ Add page break

Q149

iQ

★

x→

The competence of my supervisor in making decisions

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

○

○

○

○

○

Q150

iQ

★

x→

Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

○

○

○

○

○

+

□

Q151

iQ

★

x→

...

The way my job provides for steady employment

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

○

○

○

○

○

+

○

+

Q153

iQ

★

x→

I get the chance to tell people what to do (Leadership Opportunities)

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

○

○

○

○

○

+

□

Q154

iQ

★

x→

...

I get the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities/strengths

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

○

○

○

○

○

+

○

+

+ Add page break

My pay compared to the amount of work I do (Compensation versus Workload)

Q155

iQ * x→

The way company policies are put into practice

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

+

-

+

Q156

iQ * x→ ...

My pay compared to the amount of work I do (Compensation versus Workload)

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

+ Add page break

Q157

iQ * x→

I am given chances for advancement on this job

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

Q158

iQ * x→ ...

The freedom to use my own judgement (Classroom/Teacher Daily Decisions)

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

Q159

iQ * x→

I get the chance to try my own methods of doing the job (Method of Student Engagement)

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

Q160

iQ * x→ ...

The working conditions

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

+ Add page break

Q162

iQ * x→

The way my co-workers get along with each other

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

Q163

iQ * x→ ...

The praise I get for doing a good job (Encouragement from administration)

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

+ Add page break

Q164

iQ * x→

The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job

Very dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very Satisfied

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

REFERENCES

- Aldridge, J., and Fraser, B. (2016). Teachers' views of their school climate and its relationship with teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Learning Environments Research*, 19(2), 291–307. <https://doi-org.lynx.lib.usm.edu/10.1007/s10984-015-9198-x>
- Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does Leadership Matter? Examining the Relationship among Transformational Leadership, School Climate, and Student Achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 10(2), 1–22.
- Alliance for Excellent Education. (2004). Tapping the potential: Retaining and developing high-quality new teachers. (Report). Washington, DC. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/TappingThePotential/TappingThePotential.pdf>
- American Federation of Teachers. (2001). Beginning teacher induction: The essential bridge. Educational Issues Policy Brief (13). Retrieved March 17, 2004 from <http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/downloads/teachers/policy13.pdf>
- Asif, I., Fakhra, A., Tahir, F., and Shabbir, A. (2016). Relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and students' academic performance. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 335-344 <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.65.19>
- Balyer, A., and Özcan, K. (2020). School Principals' Instructional Feedback to Teachers: Teachers' Views. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 12, 295–312.

- Baptiste, M., 2. (2019). No Teacher Left Behind: The Impact of Principal Leadership Styles On Teacher Job Satisfaction and Student Success. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 9(1), 1–11.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
- Bass & Bass (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Berkovich, I., & Eyal, O. (2018). Principals’ emotional support and teachers’ emotional reframing: The mediating role of principals’ supportive communication strategies. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55(7), 867–879. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22130>
- Bevins, D. T. (2018). Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory of Motivation: A Generational Study. 53.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131610121969460>
- Bovee, J. A. (2012). School leadership retention: A study of servant leadership and school leader satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).
- Brenchley, C., (2015, April 8). What is ESEA?. Homeroom. <https://blog.ed.gov/2015/04/what-is-esea/>

- Bressler, Kathleen M., "The relationship of high school teacher job satisfaction to principal support" (2012). Dissertations, Theses, and master's Projects. Paper 1539618847.
<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-q5e5-d202>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership* (1st ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Cansoy, R. (2019). The Relationship between School Principals' Leadership Behaviours and Teacher job satisfaction: A Systematic Review. *International Education Studies*, 12(1), 37–52.
- Carver-Thomas, D. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it* (brief). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviours of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(5), 600-623.
- DiPaola, M . F. (2018). Conceptualizing and validating a measure of principal support. Michael F . DiPaola & Patrick B. Forsyth (eds.) *Contemporary Challenges Confronting School Leaders*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Els, J. J. (2017). The relationship between professional development and employee satisfaction at a higher education institution (Order No. 10902412). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (2059249055). Retrieved from <http://lynx.lib.usm.edu/docview/2059249055?accountid=13946>
- Evans, L., and Olumide-Aluko, F. (2010). Teacher Job Satisfaction in Developing Countries: A Critique of Herzberg's Two- Factor Theory Applied to the Nigerian Context. *International Studies in Educational Administration* (Commonwealth

- Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM)), 38(2), 73–85.
- Fact Sheet -- Race to the Top. (2011, August 8). [Pamphlets]. Retrieved November 30, 2019, from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/factsheet.html>
- Garcie, E., & Weiss, W. (2019). The teacher shortage is real, large, and growing, and worse than we thought. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/the-teacher-shortage-is-real-large-and-growing-and-worse-than-we-thought-the-first-report-in-the-perfect-storm-in-the-teacher-labor-market-series/>.
- Grissom, J. A., Nicholson-Crotty, S., and Harrington, J. R. (2014). Estimating the Effects of No Child Left Behind on Teachers' Work Environments and Job Attitudes. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 36(4), 417–436. <https://doi-org.lynx.lib.usm.edu/10.3102/0162373714533817>
- Halford, J. M. (1998). Strengthening the teaching profession: Easing the way for new teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5), 33–36.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley.
- Hughes, A. L., Matt, J. J., & O'Reilly, F. L. (2015). Principal Support Is Imperative to the Retention of Teachers in Hard-to-Staff Schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(1), 129–134.
- Ilgan, A., Parylo, O., & Sungu, H. (2015). Predicting teacher job satisfaction based on principals' instructional supervision behaviours: a study of Turkish teachers. *Irish*

Educational Studies, 34(1), 69–

88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2015.1005393>

Improving Teacher and Principal Quality (Title II Part A). (n.d.). Retrieved from
[https://www.k12.wa.us/policy-funding/grants-grant-management/improving-
teacher-and-principal-quality-title-ii-part](https://www.k12.wa.us/policy-funding/grants-grant-management/improving-teacher-and-principal-quality-title-ii-part)

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in the planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral sciences. San Diego, CA: EdITS.

Jackson, C. A. (n.d.). Mississippi launching first teacher residency program. Retrieved October 30, 2019, from [https://www.wlox.com/2019/05/02/mississippi-launching-
first-teacher-residency-program/](https://www.wlox.com/2019/05/02/mississippi-launching-first-teacher-residency-program/)

Klassen, R. M., and Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction: Teacher Gender, Years of Experience, and Job Stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741–756.

Klecker, B. M., and Loadman, W. E. (1999). Male Elementary School Teachers' Ratings of Job Satisfaction by Years of Teaching Experience. *Education*, 119(3), 504.

Landers, E., Alter, P., and Servilio, K. (2008). Students' Challenging Behavior and Teacher job satisfaction. *Beyond Behavior*, 18(1), 26–33.

Lappe, J., M. (2000). Taking the mystery out of research: Descriptive correlational design. *Jannetti Publications*, 19(2), 81.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., and Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 27–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430701800060>

- Littrell, P. C., Billingsley, B. S., & Cross, L. H. (1994). The effects of principal support on special and general educators' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial & Special Education, 15*, 297–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259401500505>
- Locke, E.A. (1976) The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In: Dunnette, M.D., Ed., *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 1, 1297-1343.
- Menchaca, V. D. (2003). A Wake-Up Call for Principals: Are Your Novice Teachers Leaving? *Catalyst for Change, 33*(1), 25–27.
- Monsour, F. (2003). Mentoring to Develop and Retain New Teachers. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 39*(3), 134–135.
- Morgan, M., and O'Leary, M. (2004). A Study of Factors Associated with the Job Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers. *Irish Journal of Education, 35*, 73–86.
- (*Msq*) *minnesota satisfaction questionnaire*. (MSQ) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire | Vocational Psychology Research. (n.d.). <https://vpr.psych.umn.edu/msq-minnesota-satisfaction-questionnaire>.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). Professional standards for educational leaders 2015. http://npbea.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/06/Professional-Standards-for-EducationalLeaders_2015.pdf
- New Teacher Project. (2010). How Federal Education Policy Can Reverse the Widget Effect: Transforming ESEA Title II to Improve Teacher Effectiveness and Student Outcomes. Policy Brief. In New Teacher Project. New Teacher Project.

- No Child Left Behind Act and Teacher Accountability. (n.d.). Retrieved November 4, 2019, from <https://education.findlaw.com/curriculum-standards-school-funding/no-child-left-behind-act-and-teacher-accountability.html>
- Olsen, A., & Huang, F. (2019). Teacher job satisfaction by principal support and teacher cooperation: Results from the Schools and Staffing Survey. *education policy analysis archives*, 27, 11. doi:<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.4174>
- Otto, S. J. & Arnold, M., (2005). A study of experiences special education teachers' perceptions of administrative support. *College Student Journal*, 39(2), 253-259.
- Overman, S. (n.d.). Fighting the Stress of Teaching to the Test. Retrieved December 3, 2019, from <http://www.nea.org/tools/fighting-stress-teaching-to-Test.html>
- Perie, M., and Baker, D. P. (1997). Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation. 144.
- Perrachione, B. A., Petersen, G. J., & Rosser, V. J. (2008). Why Do They Stay? Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction and Retention. *Professional Educator*, 32(2), 25–41.
- Polatcan, M., and Cansoy, R. (2019). Examining Studies on the Factors Predicting Teacher job satisfaction: A Systematic Review. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 6(1), 115–134.
- Protheroe, N. (2006). The Principal's Role in Supporting New Teachers. *Principal*, 86(2), 34–38.

- Quinn, R. J., & Andrews, B. D. (2004). The Struggles of First-Year Teachers: Investigating Support Mechanisms. *Clearing House*, 77(4), 164–168. <https://doi.org/10.3200/TCHS.77.4.164-168>
- Quin, J. L., Deris, A. R., Bischoff, G., & Johnson, J. T. (2015). The correlation between leadership, culture, and student achievement. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 5(2), 55-62.
- Race to the top. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/issues/education/k-12/race-to-the-top>
- Resmovits, J. (2015, December 10). Obama signs Every Student Succeeds Act, marking the end of an era. Retrieved June 6, 2020, from <https://www.latimes.com/local/education/standardized-testing/la-me-edu-essa-obama-signs-end-no-child-left-behind-20151210-story.html>
- Sak, R. (2018). Gender Differences in Turkish Early Childhood Teacher job satisfaction, Job Burnout and Organizational Cynicism. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 46(6), 643–653. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-018-0895-9>
- Sharma, G. (2017). Pros and cons of different sampling techniques. *International Journal of Applied research*, 3(7), 749-752. Retrieved from <http://www.allresearchjournal.com/archives/2017/vol3issue7/PartK/3-7-69-542.pdf>
- Shaukat, S., Vishnumolakala, V. R., and Al Bustami, G. (2019). The Impact of Teachers' Characteristics on Their Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction: A Perspective from Teachers Engaging Students with Disabilities. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19(1), 68–76.

- Shaw, J., and Newton, J. (2014). Teacher Retention and Satisfaction with a Servant Leader as Principal. *Education*, 135(1), 101–106.
- Singh, B. (2016). Effect of Emotional Intelligence and Gender on Job Satisfaction of Primary School Teacher. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 5(1), 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.5.1.1>
- Song, S. C. & Alpaslan, M. M. (2015). Factors Impacting on Teacher job satisfaction related to Science Teaching: A Mixed Methods Study. *Science Education International*, 26(3), 358–375.
- Taiwo, A. E., and Ogunlade, L. A. (2020). Teachers’ Decisional Participation and Job Satisfaction in Secondary Schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(1), 1–11.
- Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., and Johansson, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247>
- United States. (1965). Elementary and secondary education act of 1965 : H. R. 2362, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Public law 89-10. Reports, bills, debate, and act. [Washington] :[U.S. Govt. Print. Off.]
- U.S. schools struggle to hire and retain teachers: The second report in “The Perfect Storm in the Teacher Labor Market” series. (n.d.). Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved April 3, 2020, from <https://www.epi.org/publication/u-s-schools-struggle-to-hire-and-retain-teachers-the-second-report-in-the-perfect-storm-in-the-teacher-labor-market-series/>

- Ward, V. J. (2015). A study of the perceptions of first-year teachers as prepared classroom teachers (Order No. 10027088). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (1771637089). Retrieved from <http://lynx.lib.usm.edu/docview/1771637089?accountid=13946>
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, 22, 120.
- Womack-Wynne, C., Dees, E., Leech, D., LaPlant, J., Brockmeier, L., and Gibson, N. (2011). Teacher's Perceptions of the First-Year Experience and Mentoring. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(4).
- Wood, A. L. (2005). The Importance of Principals: Site Administrators' Roles in Novice Teacher Induction. *American Secondary Education*, 33(2), 39–62.
- Wynn, S. R., Carboni, L. W., & Patall, E. A. (2007). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentoring, climate, and leadership: Promoting retention through a learning communities perspective. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, 6(3), 209-229.
- Zhang, Z., Verstegen, D. A., and Kim, H. R. (2008). Teacher Compensation and School Quality: New Findings from National and International Data. *Educational Considerations*, 35(2), 19–28.