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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between high school teacher job satisfaction, using an instrument that measures Herzberg's Two Factor Theory and principal support, using an adapted instrument from House's theory of administrative support. Data were collected by a team of researchers from 34 self-selected public Virginia high schools and consisted of 1276 teacher participants. Correlation and regression analyses were performed to find the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support. The results showed no significant relationship between principal support and high school teacher job satisfaction. This may be explained in part by the weakness of the Professional Job Satisfaction Survey (PJSS). The data on the Principal Support Scale (PSS) revealed two distinct factors of principal support that related back to House's original theory of administrative support (DiPaola, in press). A significant positive correlation was found between the expressive and instrumental dimensions of principal support ($r = .796$, $p < .01$). A significant negative correlation was found between job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers ($r = -.421$, $p < .05$). Based on these findings future researchers should continue to explore this topic with a more reliable measurement of job satisfaction. Future researchers should continue to explore the relevance of Herzberg's two factor theory in education and examine the effect of external forces on both job satisfaction and principal support. Continued use of the PSS for measuring principal support in relationships with other school social variables is also strongly supported by this study.
THE RELATIONSHIP OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS’ JOB SATISFACTION TO PRINCIPAL SUPPORT
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Nearly half of all teachers leave their classrooms within the first five years (Ingersoll, 2001). Thirty percent of new teachers leave teaching within the first three years (Evans-Andris et al., 2006), and most disheartening, one out of every ten new teachers leave after just one year (NCES, 2007). This attrition rate is disturbing, especially since one third of the nation’s teaching force is at retirement age. The teaching profession is losing its most experienced members and few are replacing them. A longitudinal study by the National Center for Educational Statistics (2008) found that after earning their degree in education, only 31 percent of college graduates entered and stayed in the teaching profession consistently for ten years. This has had a devastating impact on students’ education.

Research conducted by the Education Schools Project found that student achievement in math and reading was significantly higher in classes taught by teachers that had ten or more years of teaching experience (Levine & Haselkorn, 2008). Unfortunately, the number of teachers with over ten years of experience is decreasing.

A Nation at Risk came out in the early 1980’s calling for a reform in education. The study predicted a demand for teachers, due to increased student population and a decreasing teaching force. The study showed that many teachers were at retirement age (Ingersol, 2001). Schools feared that the high turnover rate, due to losing those most senior in the field, would leave only unqualified, inexperienced teachers. Thus began the nationwide focus on schools’
teacher recruitment (Ingersoll, 2001). The National Center for Educational Statistics began surveys on school and staffing in the late 1980's. By 1991 a follow up report confirmed the belief that many teachers were leaving due to retirement. However, while that counted for 9.8% of teachers leaving the field, shockingly, another 90% were leaving the field before they were 30 years of age (NCES, 1991). This shifted the focus onto the issue of teacher retention.

The United States continues to face this educational crisis because teachers are not staying in the profession. Schools have been trying to retain teachers by implementing support programs for new teachers, merit pay plans, and other incentives; but without first finding the true source of what motivates teachers to stay, these may be wasted efforts. As a result of this high attrition, retaining teachers has become a strong focus of educational research. Several studies have reported a relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Perrachione et al., 2008; Singh & Billingsley, 1996; Squillini, 2001; Thompson et al., 1997). One study found that job satisfaction is the strongest predictor of intent to stay in teaching (Cross & Billingsley, 1994). By determining variables that have the strongest influence over job satisfaction, schools can begin to address teacher retention by making the necessary organizational changes to promote organizational commitment.

**Significance of Study**

In 1997, the National Center for Educational Statistics released a report; "Job Satisfaction Among American Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation". This report used data from the 1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), which found several factors related to dissatisfaction and turnover. These findings led to the more focused report on Job Satisfaction that analyzed the
job satisfaction of the nation’s teaching force, including public and private schools, ranging from kindergarten to 12th grade teachers (NCES, 1997). Using Herzberg’s Two Factor theory on job satisfaction, this study examined internal and external factors associated with job satisfaction.

The key findings of this study were that “administrative support and leadership, student behavior and school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy are working conditions associated with teacher satisfaction. The more favorable working conditions were, the higher the satisfaction scores were.” (NCES, 1997, p.xi). More specifically, in the category of administrative support and leadership, secondary public school teachers who agreed with “staff members are recognized for a job well done” had high levels of job satisfaction. Over 50 percent of public secondary teachers who disagreed with this statement had low levels of job satisfaction. A large portion of public school elementary teachers who agreed with the statement “teachers participate in making important school decisions” were found to have high levels of job satisfaction (NCES, 1997, p.28). Finally public school teachers across grade levels that agreed with the statement “principal frequently discusses instructional practices with teachers” were also associated with job satisfaction (NCES, 1997, p.26).

Building on this research, several studies continued to take an in-depth look at job satisfaction and administrative support. Administrative support and job satisfaction were strongly correlated in those studies (Balkar, 2009; Blase & Blase, 2006; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994; Ma & McMillan, 1999).

Conceptual Framework

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was traditionally thought of as one continuum, whose endpoints were high and low levels of job satisfaction. Herzberg theorized that there
are actually two continua, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, that can be measured from low to high. They act independently of one another, where the elimination of job dissatisfaction does not influence job satisfaction and vice versa. These continua are affected by two factors, intrinsic and extrinsic (Herzberg, 1959). Intrinsic factors or “motivators” are internal to what a person does. One example of this is when a teacher is recognized for their work. Extrinsic factors or “hygienes” are external to what a person does. One example of this is salary (Maidani, 1991; Perrachione et al., 2008). Herzberg associated motivators with job satisfaction and hygienes with job dissatisfaction (Perrachione et al., 2008). To further clarify, Herzberg saw that the opposite of being satisfied was to have no satisfaction and the opposite of being dissatisfied was to have no dissatisfaction (Silver, 1983).

To illustrate this theory, in 2005, the NCES found that 32 percent of public school teachers and 21 percent of private school teachers rated dissatisfaction of workplace conditions as very important or extremely important in their decision to move from their base school (NCES, 2007). According to Herzberg’s theory, increasing the level of hygiene factors in these schools may decrease job dissatisfaction, which could cause teachers to stay, but will not increase their job satisfaction, which would help motivate them to become better educators.

Job satisfaction has had a long history of being defined and measured in various ways. Various perspectives, such as content theory and process theory, have led to measurements focused on different characteristics of job satisfaction. Concerning education, most studies use general questions asking if teachers are satisfied and are not anchored in any theory (Baker, 2007; Balkar, 2009; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994;
Perrachione et al., 2008). In higher education, a few studies have used Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory of job satisfaction (Bailey, 1997; Blank, 1993; Schroder, 2008).

Blank (1993) adapted a scale to measure Herzberg’s theory in education. He took Herzberg’s original 15 factors, 6 intrinsic or motivators and 9 extrinsic or hygienes. He added one more extrinsic factor, relationships with students, and a clearer picture of job satisfaction in higher education emerged. Research revealed that internal factors such as achievement recognition and advancement are related to job satisfaction (Bailey, 1997; Blank, 1993; Schroder, 2008). External factors such as salary and organizational policy related to dissatisfaction (Bailey, 1997; Schroder, 2008). Perrachione et al. (2008) completed a study on job satisfaction and teacher retention based on the perceptions of three hundred elementary school teachers. Using Herzberg’s Two Factor theory as a conceptual framework, they found that intrinsic and extrinsic factors affect job satisfaction and only extrinsic factors effect job dissatisfaction (Perrachione et al., 2008). These studies show that Herzberg’s Two Factor theory is relevant to determining job satisfaction in education.

**Principal support.** Administrative support affects the engagement of teachers with instruction, camaraderie and optimism, sustained pedagogies in the classroom, and is an important factor in reducing job stress (Blasé & Blasé, 2006; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Klusmann et al., 2008; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994; Veel & Bredhauer, 2009). Unfortunately, administrators do not always provide the type of support that teachers need or want the most (Baker, 2007; Cross & Billingsley, 1994). Administrative support has been discussed in research by broad terms with various categories such as communicating expectations, maintaining order, administrative tasks, supporting teachers’ need for
professional autonomy, and shared decision making (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994; Ma & MacMillian, 1993; Watkins, 2005).

Littrell and Billingsley (1994) adapted House’s (1981) theoretical framework for support and created their own framework to measure principal support. House’s social framework was designed to measure support in the business setting. Littrell and Billingsley adapted the framework so that it describes four dimensions that apply to education, specifically to principal support. The four dimensions are emotional support, instrumental support, informational support, and appraisal support (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994).

Emotional support is defined as showing appreciation, keeping open lines of communication, encouraging colleague support and recognizing teacher’s ideas. Instrumental support is defined as providing resources that teachers need to perform their duties. Informational support is defined as providing necessary information that is needed to operate effectively and offering professional development opportunities. Appraisal support is defined by providing frequent and constructive feedback (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). Exploring specific types of principal support helps administrators determine how to best support teachers (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994).
Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to assess levels of the dimensions of principal support and analyze their relationship to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in teachers. Few studies look deeply at the specific components of job satisfaction and administrative support. Building upon previous research and using robust theories of administrative support and job satisfaction respectively, can result in a better understanding of teacher satisfaction. Administrators can use this information to support teachers in specific ways that lead to the greatest job satisfaction, thereby increasing teacher retention.

Research using Littrell’s and Billingsley’s theoretical framework of support found that overall, teachers who experience higher levels of principal support are more likely to experience greater job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). Specifically, there was a strong relationship between principals who are emotionally supportive and provide informational support with teachers who are satisfied with their work...
(Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). These types of support directly address Herzberg’s items that affect job satisfaction. Herzberg’s Two Factor theory clearly describes intrinsic, or job satisfiers, and extrinsic, or job dissatisfiers, that affect job satisfaction. Studying what types of principal support directly affect job satisfiers and dissatisfiers will give administrators insight into where to best put their resources when trying to increase overall teacher job satisfaction.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support?

2. What is the relationship between job satisfiers and the dimensions of principal support?
   a. Which dimensions of principal support make an independent contribution to explaining variance in job satisfiers?

3. What is the relationship between job dissatisfiers and the dimensions of principal support?
   b. Which dimensions of principal support make an independent contribution to explaining variance in job dissatisfiers?

4. Which dimension of principal support is the most important in explaining teacher job satisfaction?

Limitations and Delineations

Limitations.

1. This study used a convenience sample of high schools. Researchers made every effort to have a sample that is representative of Virginia’s diverse geographical areas, socio-economic status, and ethnicity, by asking all high schools in the state to participate. Results were based on data from those schools that participated. Generalizing the results to the state’s high schools is somewhat limited.
2. The instruments that measured job satisfaction and administrative support required participants to self-report. There may be factors that affect their responses on the day that they complete their survey, particularly if they had a bad day or an unpleasant encounter with their current administrator. The time of year the survey was completed by participants may also have an impact on their responses. For example, if there are times of the year where teachers feel particularly tired or stressed due to lack of breaks or upcoming grades due. The time frame for this study was May, 2011 to February, 2012.

3. The study is on job satisfaction and principal support. It is understood that other variables that are not being studied could confound the results.

4. This study is a correlation study and it should be noted that correlation does not imply causation between the variables. This study is looked specifically at the strength and direction of the relationship between job satisfaction, principal support, and their respective dimensions. It cannot be determined if one variable caused the other to occur.

**Delimitations.**

1. The Professional Support Survey used to measure job satisfaction was modified to use a single scale continuum between job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, instead of the original dual continuum where job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were on separate scales. The redesign was an attempt to facilitate the ease of response of the participants to increase the validity, altering the format may have impacted the original test reliability.
Key Words Defined

**Intent to Stay:** The desire to continue in the teaching profession.

**Organizational Commitment:** the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1979)

**Job Satisfaction:** The individuals’ affective relations to their work role. It is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceived it is offering (Locke, 1969).

**Job Satisfiers:** Related to Herzberg’s two-factor theory they are “aspects of a job situation that can, when present, fulfill employees’ needs for psychological growth. They tend to be intrinsic to the work associated with the job; they pertain to the content of the job. When present, adequate, and positive in a job situation, these elements cause feelings of satisfaction in employees; when absent, inadequate, or negative, however, they do not generally cause feelings of dissatisfaction” (Silver, 1983, p. 299).

**Job Dissatisfiers:** Related to Herzberg’s two-factor theory they are “aspects of a job situation that can, when present and adequate, fulfill employees’ pain-avoidance needs. They tend to be extrinsic to the work itself; they pertain to the context in which the work is performed. When absent, inadequate, or negative in a job situation, these elements cause feelings of dissatisfaction; but when present, ample and positive they do not generally cause feelings of satisfaction.” (Silver, 1983, p. 299).

**Principal Support:** The perceived amount of support teachers feel is provided by their principal.

**Emotional Support:** Principals show teachers that they are esteemed, trusted professionals and worthy of concern by such practices as maintaining open communication,
showing appreciation, taking an interest in teachers’ work and considering teachers ideas. (Littrell and Billingsley, 1994).

**Instrumental Support:** Principals directly help teachers with work-related tasks such as providing the necessary materials, space, and resources, ensuring adequate time for teaching and non-teaching duties, and helping with managerial-type concerns (Littrell and Billingsley, 1994).

**Professional Support:** Principals provide teachers with useful information that they can use to improve classroom practices. For example, principals provide informational support by authorizing teachers’ attendance at in-service workshops, offering practical information about effective teaching practices and providing suggestions to improve instruction and classroom management (Littrell and Billingsley, 1994).

**Appraisal Support:** As instructional leaders, principals are charged with providing ongoing personnel appraisal, such as frequent and constructive feedback about their work, information about what constitutes effective teaching, and clear guidelines regarding job responsibilities (Littrell and Billingsley, 1994, p. 298).

**Conclusion**

In order to fully understand the impact that principal support has on teacher job satisfaction, the theoretical background of both must be examined. Job satisfaction has been defined several different ways. In this study, job satisfaction will be examined through Herzberg’s two factor theory. The two factor theory, its development, and impact in the educational setting, is further explored in chapter two. Along with an analysis of teacher job satisfaction, the foundation for principal support and the principal support measure will also
be examined in chapter two. Finally, the connection between the two will be solidified based on these two theories and an examination of strong educational research.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

"Work is one of the most absorbing things men can think and talk about. It fills the greater part of the waking day for most of us. For the fortunate it is the source of great satisfactions; for many others it is the cause of grief" (Herzberg, 1959, p. 3).

Teachers are leaving the workforce at an alarming rate. Teacher commitment is the hallmark of organizational success (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). To prevent attrition, it is important to identify factors that are effecting teacher job commitment. Job satisfaction and commitment have been found to be significantly correlated (Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Glisson & Durick, 1988). Dissatisfaction from the workplace can cause teachers to have a higher rate of absenteeism, put forth minimal effort at work and leave the school or profession entirely (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). Satisfaction with teaching is a reliable predictor of positive work behaviors such as an interest in continued professional development, increased effort to solve student or parent issues on their own, and collaboration among colleagues (Perrachione et al., 2008). Even though it has a clear link to teacher commitment, job satisfaction can be difficult to define.

In 1997, Thompson, McNamara, and Hoyle conducted a meta-analysis of job satisfaction in educational organizations. They reviewed the first twenty-six volumes of Educational Administration Quarterly for articles relating to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was defined in several different ways throughout the research. Some definitions included an affective
response to beliefs about the organization or an affective response to beliefs about the work experience. Three frameworks were repeated as themes throughout the studies. Content Theories, focused on explaining job satisfaction in terms of meeting inherent needs described by other theories such as Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory. The Process of Discrepancy Theories of Job Satisfaction explained job satisfaction by the discrepancy between individuals' desires and what they actually receive from an organization. The last framework was Situational Models of Job Satisfaction. This theory explains job satisfaction in relation to different categories of variables, such as characteristics of job tasks, characteristics of organizations, and characteristics of individuals (Thompson et al., 1997). For the purpose of this study, job satisfaction was examined using Content Theory, focusing on motivation as a driving force that influences job satisfaction. Herzberg's two factor theory on job satisfaction is a Content Theory.

**Job Satisfaction and Motivation Theories**

Human needs and motivations are key in determining how workers will behave in organizations. Motivation is the internal state that stimulates, directs, and maintains behavior (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). In education, there is a question as to why some teachers will work through difficult obstacles such as deteriorating facilities, diverse student populations, large class sizes and lack of supplies, while others who have better physical working conditions choose to leave (Marston et al., 2006). Motivation can be defined as intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is defined by the natural tendency, based on needs, interests, curiosity, and enjoyment, to accept challenges and be stimulated to do tasks we do not have to do. Extrinsic motivation is defined by external rewards and punishments that stimulate us to act to either gain a reward or to avoid a grievance (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).
During the Industrial Revolution, motivation in the work place was at first determined to depend on salary and work hours. Companies spent time examining how to get work production by manipulating these resources (Mayo, 1933). Mayo (1933) brought to life the idea that work productivity could not be controlled by economic forces alone. Human social factors were discovered during the Hawthorne Experiment at the Western Electric Company. Researchers set out to measure the effects of illumination on workers. Two groups were compared, one with various light settings and the other remaining at full illumination. The group with less lighting produced no significant difference in measured output. This finding served as a catalyst for additional experiments determined to explore the idea that human factors and social conditions had such an effect on work productivity that it defied logistical changes such as the lighting (Mayo, 1933).

The results of these experiments provided an argument for a shifting focus for managers in industrial factories. Since the start of the Industrial Revolution, there had been no collaboration between administrative and workers’ groups in industry. Working problems were defined by the logic of economics. Increasingly, they were to be defined by human factors and social organization (Mayo, 1933). This began a new era for researchers. Studies began to focus on the workers as biological and social beings and the factors that affected their work productivity rested largely on what motivated them to work.

Maslow. In the 1940’s Abraham Maslow developed a theory of human motivation. Derived mostly from his own clinical experience Maslow created a hierarchy of five levels of these needs. From physiological drives to psychological needs Maslow’s hierarchy was arranged in priority for human survival (Maslow, 1943). Maslow believed that one would have to be at least partially satisfied on one level in order to work to achieve the needs of the
next level (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). At the bottom of the hierarchy, level one, the needs are physiological. These needs are based on satisfying the basic needs for human survival such as hunger, thirst, and sleep. Level two is safety and security, level three is belonging, love and social activities, level four is esteem, and level five is self-actualization. Maslow believed that humans rarely ever reach self-actualization and if they did reach that level they continued to strive and develop; it is more a means to an end, not the end (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). “Maslow argues that for the majority of people, needs at the first three levels are regularly satisfied and no longer have much motivational effect; however, higher-level needs continually motivate” (Hoy & Miskel, 2005, p130).

In education, Maslow’s Hierarchy can easily be applied (Marston et al. 2006). Teachers, who have a level three need to belong, will seek out relationships among students, peers, and supervisors. Teachers, who have administrators that are unpredictable, inconsistent, and discriminatory, create work stress and threaten the teachers’ security in their job, struggle with filling the level two needs of safety and security. Teachers who are seeking needs at the fourth level are looking for esteem and status. They may seek out opportunities to be involved in decision-making or look to protect their autonomy in the classroom (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Maslow’s focus, past the first level, was on psychological needs. His view was that in life our motivation was driven by the needs people have. Maslow (1943) stated, “It is quite true that man lives by bread alone -- when there is no bread. But what happens to man's desires when there is plenty of bread and when his belly is chronically filled?” (p.375). Herzberg expanded this theory of motivation by looking at human needs in the workforce (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).
Herzberg. In the 1950's social psychologists and industrial sociologists began to look at worker attitudes and morale. They raised the questions “What does a worker want from his job?” and “How they can be motivated in the work place?” (Herzberg, 1959). These questions were the foundation for Herzberg’s research on job satisfaction. In 1959 Herzberg published Motivation to Work in which he discussed his research and a new theory on motivation as it relates to job satisfaction.

Herzberg (1959) discovered that there are conditions surrounding the job, not the job itself, which cause unhappiness or a poor attitude. These factors he called hygiene factors because they related to parts of the job that dealt with the cleanliness and organization of an organization. Herzberg stated that hygiene factors were a preventative, not a curative, meaning that controlling these variables may decrease job dissatisfaction but not increase job satisfaction. Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were two separate ideas and the motivation that leads to each is also separate. Improving hygiene factors merely removes impediments to job satisfaction. Factors of hygiene are supervision, interpersonal relationships, physical working conditions, salary, company policies and administrative practices, benefits and salaries (Herzberg, 1959). A worker's job attitude is dependent on hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1959).

Herzberg coined factors that lead to job satisfaction as motivating factors. He theorized that one cannot gain satisfaction by the conditions that surround a job, but that it must come from performing the work itself. Motivating factors can be having autonomy, performing interesting work, and being offered incentives that value the individual’s importance, like opportunities for recognition and achievements. A worker's job performance depends on motivating factors (Herzberg, 1959). The ideal situation for job satisfaction is for
a worker to have a good job attitude and good job performance. By having both, they will be happy and productive. Based on Herzberg’s theory, if a teacher’s job has good hygiene factors, i.e. fair salary and good working conditions, this creates the conditions necessary for the teacher to have a good attitude toward their work. Furthermore, if the job offers autonomy and opportunity for achievements, perhaps by involving that teacher in more school-wide decision making, that teacher will show good job performance and be satisfied.

**Criticisms of Herzberg.** Herzberg’s extensive work on job satisfaction has pioneered the way for research in job satisfaction. However there were several criticisms of Herzberg’s theory. Herzberg’s theory is known as a content theory because it looks at both internal and external factors. Many other theorists, such as Vroom (1964), continued to develop theories on motivation and job satisfaction. Vroom’s theory is known as a process theory, where motivational factors are only internal to a person (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005). Vroom developed the Expectancy Theory, which states that individuals bring expectations and needs to their work organization. These expectations and needs determine how workers react to the work environment and motivate their work decisions (Bailey, 1997). Vroom criticized Herzberg for his data collection method of using a critical incident framework. The critical incident framework asks subjects open-ended questions and relies on the subjects being honest and forthcoming when sharing their experiences (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005). Vroom stated that subjects would not be able to honestly report due to ego defenses interfering with their memories of events (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005).

Other criticisms include the overlap of satisfiers and dissatisfiers. For example, the two-factor theory holds that salary is an external factor that contributes to dissatisfaction. However, if a supervisor gives a worker a bonus, this may be perceived as recognition, which
is a satisfier (Ewen, 1964). Other studies have reported that there have been no differences found between satisfied and dissatisfied employees when placing value on hygiene factors (Ewen, 1965; Maidani, 1991; Nias, 1981). Verifying the factors that affect job satisfaction is a much simpler task than verifying what leads to job dissatisfaction for workers (Nais, 1981). The narrow range of jobs investigated was another concern (Ewen, 1964). Herzberg's sample consisted of only engineers and accountants. In addition to this being a small job selection, the employees themselves were mostly male.

The most prevalent of all criticisms was that Herzberg did not clearly state his theory in an explicit statement. King (1970) stated that there were five distinct versions of the two-factor theory as stated by Herzberg. He analyzed research studies that used these various definitions of the two-factor theory to see which one could be validated (Blank, 1993). King (1970) found the theories were as follows:

I. All motivators combined contribute more to job satisfaction than to job dissatisfaction, and all hygienes combined contribute more to dissatisfaction than to satisfaction.

II. All motivators combined to contribute more to satisfiers than do all hygienes combined, and all hygienes combined contribute more to dissatisfiers than so all motivators combined.

III. Each motivator contributes more to satisfiers than to dissatisfiers, and each hygienes contributes more to dissatisfiers than to satisfiers.

IV. Theory III holds, and in addition, each principal motivator contributes more to satisfaction than does any hygiene, and each principal hygiene contributes more to dissatisfier than does any motivator.
V. Only motivators determine satisfaction and only hygienes determine dissatisfaction. (p.19)

Herzberg himself used models I, II, & III to support his theory in 1966 (Herzberg, 1966). Other research has noted that models IV and V were too rigorous and went beyond Herzberg’s original thoughts (Bailey, 1997, Blank, 1993).

Support for Herzberg. Despite this criticism, Herzberg’s theory is still being used as a basis for studies on job satisfaction today (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005). Research has shown that job satisfaction is driven by factors that are intrinsic and extrinsic in nature and that intrinsic motivation is linked to job satisfaction whereas extrinsic motivation is linked to job dissatisfaction (Bassett-Jones & Llyod, 2005; Nias, 1981; Perrachione et al., 2008). Several studies have supported the staying power of Herzberg’s theory by examining current research (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005). Specifically, it has been used in the field of education to examine teacher job satisfaction (Maidani, 1991; Nias, 1981, Pearson & Moomaw, 2008; Schroder, 2008)

Herzberg’s theory in education. Sergiovanni (1967) was the first to use Herzberg’s theory in the field of Education. He tested the theory with teachers. Two research questions examined were

1. Is there a set of factors that tends to satisfy teachers and another set of factor that tend to dissatisfy teachers, or are the factors arranged on a conceptual continuum with each being a potential satisfier and dissatisfier?

2. Will the distribution of factors vary for sub groups of teachers? (sub-groups include: (1) male v. female teachers, (2) tenure v. non tenure teachers, and (3) elementary school v. secondary school teachers) (p. iv).
After analyzing the results from 127 teachers from suburban New York, Segiovanni found that achievement, recognition, and responsibility were factors associated with job satisfaction. Interpersonal relations with subordinates and superiors, status, and unfairness were factors associated with dissatisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1967). In addition, the satisfaction factors on which teachers focused were related to the work itself, whereas the dissatisfiers they focused on concerned the work conditions. He concluded that Herzberg's theory was supported when studying teacher job satisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1967).

Educational research has continued to use Herzberg's theory to look at job satisfaction in the teacher profession (Nias, 1981; Nussell et al., 1988; Parrachione et al., 2008; Schroder, 2008; Smerek 2007). Intrinsic and extrinsic factors in job satisfaction have been examined. Research has shown that teachers are exposed to hygiene and motivating factors that affect their job satisfaction (Nias, 1981; Nussell et al., 1988). It reveals that job satisfiers or motivators include interest in children, camaraderie of the staff, and enjoying autonomy (Nias, 1981). Job dissatisfiers or hygiene factors in teaching are inefficient administration, poor communication, absence of clear goals and structure to obtain goals (Nias, 1981).

**Teacher Job Satisfaction**

In addition to the theories of job satisfaction, several researchers have looked at the impact other factors have had on job satisfaction. In 1935, Hoppock conducted a study on job satisfaction in New Hope, Pennsylvania. This was one of the first looks at job satisfaction in America and five hundred of the participants were teachers. Job satisfaction was analyzed and compared with worker demographics. The results showed that two-thirds of the population was satisfied and the remaining one third was, to varying degrees, dissatisfied.
(Hoppock, 1935). Current research has also analyzed worker characteristics and job satisfaction. The factors examined were mostly demographic such as gender, age, and experience (Bolin, 2007; Evans & Johnson, 1990; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Parrachione et al., 2008; Schroder, 2008). Educational research also examined other factors such as job role-related characteristics, work conditions, and various factors involving leadership (Billingsley & Littrell, 1994; Bolin, 2007; Evans & Johnson, 1990; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Klusmann et al., 2008; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Parrachione et al., 2008; Schroder, 2008).

**Demographics.** Several researchers have attempted to isolate the specific factors that affect job satisfaction for teachers. There is little research to suggest that an individual’s personal characteristics determine job satisfaction (Glisson & Durrick, 1988). Demographic factors examined in educational research were gender, age, and length of service (Bolin, 2007; Evans & Johnson, 1990; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Parrachione et al., 2008; Schroder, 2008). Gender and age were two characteristics proven to have an impact in human service workers (Glisson & Durrick, 1988).

**Gender.** The results of research on gender’s effect on teacher job satisfaction have been inconsistent. Studies have examined teachers at elementary, middle, and high schools, as well as teachers in higher education (Bilingley & Cross, 1992; Perrachione et al., 2008, Schroder, 2008). From these studies no consistent trends have emerged. There are studies that have reported no relationship between job satisfaction and gender in elementary school (Perrachione et al., 2008). There are studies that found significant relationships between job satisfaction and gender (Ma & MacMillian, 1999; Bolin 1996). Some research suggested that males were more satisfied than females (Bolin, 1996; Fuming & Jiliang, 2008). Other
research found that females were more satisfied than males (Ma & MacMillian, 1999). These inconsistent results do not support gender as a factor that affects job satisfaction across the profession.

**Age and Length of Service.** Age and length of service factors have had more consistent results. Most studies found as age and length of service increased, job satisfaction increased (Bolin, 1996; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Ma & MacMillian, 1999). Explanations given for this were that with increased length of service comes increased knowledge of teaching. More experienced teachers have increased their pedagogy, learned how to effectively handle classroom management, and have established themselves as professionals in the building (Fuming & Jiliang, 2007). In human service professions, research has shown that the older a person is, the more satisfied they are with their job (Glisson & Durick, 1988). Research in the field of education supports these findings (Evans & Johnson, 1990; Fuming & Jiliang, 2008; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Schroder, 2008). Teachers that are older may have increased salaries and benefits. As a teacher nears retirement, their job satisfaction increases because the teacher is coming to the end of his or her career and know that retirement is a imminent option should job satisfaction decrease (Schroder, 2008). With both age and length of service comes tenure. Tenure brings job security, which also leads to job satisfaction (Parrachione et al., 2008).

Another explanation for increased job satisfaction with age and length of service is that lack of new teacher retention is affecting the means in these studies. In the 1991 Teacher Follow-up Survey it showed that 9% of teachers under 30 were leaving the profession. If many of the young teachers leave a school, it could skew the results of these studies that
examine who is still teaching. Research is showing that when teachers are dissatisfied, they are leaving the profession (NCES, 1997).

A small number of studies found a 'U' shaped effect for age on job satisfaction (Evans & Johnson, 1990; Schroder, 2008). These researchers found that as age increased, job satisfaction increased, however the highest aged groups showed less job satisfaction. This was explained by attributing decreased satisfaction to other variables such as the relationship between teachers and their leaders or administration (Evans & Johnson, 1990). For new teachers, lack of job satisfaction has been found in all levels of education, resulting in teacher attrition (Ingersol, 2001).

**Role tension.** Researchers also examined other factors such as job role-related characteristics, work conditions, and various factors involving leadership (Billingsley & Littrell, 1994; Bolin, 2007; Evans & Johnson, 1990; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Klusmann et al., 2008; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Parrachione et al., 2008; Schroder, 2008). In a meta analysis of job satisfaction, Glisson and Durick (1988) found that the most significant effect was caused by role tension. Role tension is defined by a combination of role ambiguity and role conflict. Role ambiguity is the confusion about responsibilities that workers may experience while completing work tasks. This can occur when there are unclear expectations and low standards. One study showed that role ambiguity was a stronger predictor in secondary schools than elementary schools, which could be explained by the level of autonomy in each setting. Role conflict is defined by having different expectations than the organization about the job task (Glisson & Durick, 1988). For example, first year special education teachers are trained through teacher preparation programs to work collaboratively with others. When they enter classrooms ready
to collaborate, they may encounter a teacher who does not want to work with them. At this time their task shifts from an expected focus on student learning to an unexpected focus on relationship building with adults (Bozonelos, 2008; Thompson et al., 1997).

**Workplace conditions.** School climate has an enormous impact retaining teachers (Ingersoll, 2001). School climate is defined by Hoy and Miskel (2001) as "...a relatively enduring quality of the school environment that is experienced by participant, affects their behavior, and is based on their collective perceptions of behavior in school" (p. 190). The school environment involves working conditions that can be either physical or human. Physical factors include working conditions related to building maintenance, technology, and the operating budget of the school. Human factors involve working conditions related to interactions with students, peers and administrative support (Wynn et al., 2007). In this section, school climate will be discussed in terms of physical working conditions for teachers.

In 2005, the NCES found that thirty two percent of public school teachers and twenty one percent of private school teachers rated dissatisfaction of workplace conditions as very important or extremely important in their decision to move from their base school (NCES, 2007). Higher rates of attrition are found in high-poverty locations verses more affluent schools (Ingersoll, 2001). The condition of the school building is one factor that causes teachers to leave. High levels of frustration occur when lessons cannot be given due to lack of materials, broken equipment, and over-crowded classrooms (Viadero, 2008).

Teachers report being overwhelmed at different points throughout the year due to unexpected working conditions (Evans-Andris et al., 2006). Specifically, new teachers often do not fully understand the reality of working in a school building and become disillusioned
when confronted by working conditions that interrupt their instruction (Evans-Andris et al., 2006). Poor working conditions such as broken technology can impede a lesson that teachers may have been excited about (Wynn et al., 2007). Lack of money for supplies, updating teaching materials, or enrichment activities is an obstacle often found in poor urban settings. These experiences can leave teachers disenchanted (Viadero, 2008). As teachers’ perceptions of their working conditions improve, they are more likely to report that they will stay in their current position (Wynn et al., 2007). Therefore, improving working conditions may be an effective strategy for increasing job satisfaction and retaining teachers (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009).

**Leadership.** Leadership is another factor that affects job satisfaction. Several aspects of leadership have been studied such as leadership structure, leadership behavior, administrative support, and principal support (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Bolin, 1996; Evans & Johnson, 1990; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Klusmann et al., 2008; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Parrachione et al., 2008). Leadership structure has been examined in several studies from China (Bolin, 2007; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007). They found that democratic administrative practices that value teacher input into decision making lead to higher levels of job satisfaction (Bolin, 2007; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Hongying, 2007). Other studies found that leadership behaviors that value teachers in the schools’ decision-making process increased job satisfaction for those teachers (Balkar, 2009; Evans & Johnson, 1990; Klusmann et al., 2008). Leadership behavior and teachers’ perceptions of leadership behaviors have also been linked to job satisfaction (Balkar, 2009; Evans & Johnson, 1990; Klusmann et al., 2008).
Administrative support. Administrative support has also been shown to have a strong effect on job satisfaction (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). Several studies have shown administrative support to be the leading factor that affects job satisfaction (Baker, 2007; Ma & MacMillan, 1999). Researchers have stated that job satisfaction, specifically in new teacher populations, must be more closely examined and call for additional research on this relationship (Bolin, 1996; Fuming & Jiliang, 2007; Ma & MacMillan, 1999). If new teachers do not obtain a measure of job satisfaction early on, they may leave the teaching profession. The key to solving this problem is by increasing administrative support. One study found that after poor salary, lack of administrative support was the primary reason teachers left the profession (Ingersoll, 2001). Another study, focusing on new music teachers, found that forty-one percent of the new teachers identified lack of administrative support as their most significant reason for leaving (Baker, 2007). Conversely, new teachers who stay in the profession note the administrative support they receive as part of decision to stay. Arnold-Rogers et al. (2008) found that eighty-two percent of new teachers, who decided to continue teaching, reported that the one reason why they chose to stay was because of the support they received from their principal. Previous research is clear: administrative support is pivotal to retaining new teachers by keeping them satisfied.

Somewhat less researched has been the effect that principal support has on job satisfaction. In looking more closely at this relationship, researchers have found that principals do have an effect on job satisfaction even if they are not always in direct contact with teachers (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). “When individual teacher factors were controlled, schools with a more supportive principal had more engaged teachers” (Klussmann et al., 2008, p.145). Principal support has also been found to have a significant role in
reducing stress at work and embedding sustainable pedagogies in the classroom (Blasé & Blasé, 2006; Van Dick & Wagner, 2001). Using J. J. House’s (1981) framework, Littrell and Billingsley (1994) conducted a study of 385 Virginia special education teachers and 313 general education teachers representing an array of ages. They examined the effects that principal support had on emotional stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and the intent to stay in teaching. The findings in both special education and general education teachers were that those who experienced high levels of administrative support were more likely to experience greater job satisfaction, school commitment and fewer personal health problems. Emotional support was found to be the most important type of support. Although, direct contact with teachers was not necessary for principals to foster this support: some form of support was necessary in increasing job satisfaction (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994).

**Principal Support**

*House’s framework.* In the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, corporations closely examined how they could manage their workers in order to create working conditions that would lead to job satisfaction and increased productivity. House (1981) was one sociologist who focused on the role that social support had in reducing work stress and improving health. Implications from this research could be readily applied in the workforce by managers who could learn how to apply practical efforts to reduce stress and enhance the “quality of working life” for employees (House, 1981, p.xi).

House created a framework for social support that included four types of support; emotional, instrumental, informational, and appraisal (House, 1981). House considered emotional support, which involves “empathy, caring, love, and trust”, to be the most important kind of support (House, 1981, p.24). Instrumental support involved “instrumental
behaviors that directly help the person in need” (House, 1981, p.25). An example of instrumental support is helping others with their work when providing them with resources such as tools or time. House viewed emotional and instrumental support, as having a stronger affective connection with the individual (1981). These two types of support involved a connection between the individual providing the support and the individual receiving the support. The other two types, informational and appraisal support, were viewed as devoid of affect; providing employees with purely objective information (House, 1981). Informational support “means providing a person with information that the person can use in coping with personal and environmental problems” (House, 1981, p.25). Informational support involves building an employee’s skill level or providing other information that can help them perform better at their job. It also provides information about the benefits of the job such as health care policies and sick leave information. Finally, appraisal support provides information to help individuals self-evaluate. It provides information directly associated with a workers performance so that the worker may reflect on their progress at their job (House, 1981).

Using this framework, House found that social support had a significant effect on worker job satisfaction (House, 1981). He called for supervisors to think about what they advocate, value, and reward in the workplace and he suggested that they include groups of workers when planning and organizing work activities (House, 1981).

**Littrell and Billingsley’s framework.** Littrell and Billingsley (1994) used House’s social support framework to study administrator support in education. They adapted his four types of support to apply specifically to school principals. In their study, emotional support was defined as showing appreciation, keeping open lines of communication, encouraging colleague support and recognizing teacher’s ideas. Instrumental support was defined as
providing resources that teachers need to perform their duties. Informational support was defined as providing necessary information that is needed to operate effectively and offering professional development opportunities. Appraisal support was defined by providing frequent and constructive feedback (Bonzonelos, 2008).

Littrell and Billingsley (1994) focused on how these types of administrative support affected teacher job stress, satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching. Their results supported House’s original framework and research in the field of education. Specifically, their results showed that emotional support was the most significant predictor of job satisfaction, school commitment and teacher’s health. Appraisal support was the second most important type of support for teachers. Instrumental support significantly contributed to school commitment. Informational support was the third most important type of support and significantly affected job satisfaction (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). These four types of administrative support continue to be relevant in the field of education.

**Affects of principal support.** Emotional support. Being an appreciative administrator is the principal behavior that increases job satisfaction the most (Balkar, 2009). Principals who show abusive behaviors towards teachers by impairing decision making, lowering teacher morale, and increasing their absenteeism, turnover, and attrition, decrease teacher job satisfaction (Blasé & Blasé, 2006). Forty-eight percent of new music teachers indicated administrative support as one of the top five reasons they were staying in the profession (Baker, 2007). These teachers felt supported when administrators attended their concerts, allowed a schedule that would maximize their class enrollments, were accessible and supportive with parent conflicts, and allowed teachers to make decisions by not micromanaging them (Baker, 2007). Emotional support is provided when administrators
allow teachers to express their thoughts, ideas, and opinions as valued contributors. Principals who are successful at retaining teachers place importance on involving them in meaningful decision making (Wynn et al., 2007).

Interestingly, some administrators who are willing to provide support do not fully understand the needs of teachers. Principals do not have time to research the needs of all teachers and this could lead to a disconnect between the two groups’ perceptions (Arnold-Rogers et al., 2008). One study found that new teachers’ perceptions of support and administrators’ perceptions of support were not the same (Baker, 2007). When rating a list of 18 types of administrative assistance, teachers judged only eight of them helpful, yet administrators believed all 18 of them were helpful. In addition, there was a low level of agreement between administrators and new teachers as to which types of assistance were most beneficial (Baker, 2007). It is important for administrators to understand how to effectively support teachers. By not receiving the support they need, teachers may experience frustration and discouragement, which could lead to low levels of job satisfaction and ultimately leaving the teaching profession (Baker, 2007).

*Instrumental support.* Administrators can provide instrumental support by helping teachers with work-related tasks such as providing the necessary materials, space, and resources, ensuring adequate time for teaching and nonteaching duties, and helping with managerial-type concerns (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). However administrators must keep in mind that instrumental support must be provided in different ways for new and experienced teachers (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990; Wynn et al., 2007).
For experienced teachers, administrators must recognize that assigning the same duties, the same classes to teach, and the same schedule year after year could lead to monotony and boredom (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). Administrators must provide instrumental support to experienced teachers by continuously evaluating their role and providing new opportunities to keep them from professional stagnation (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). Allowing experienced teachers to assist in selecting materials they need in the classroom, such as new textbooks or manipulatives, is important in helping them maintain autonomy (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). Handling managerial concerns such as crowded hallways or lunch rooms, heating and air conditioning, and minimizing paperwork allows teachers to focus on their classroom instruction, which is a top priority for experienced teachers (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990).

New teachers are focused more on survival in the classroom (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990; Wynn et al., 2007). Common phrases that explain how new teachers are treated as they enter into the profession are "eats its young", "sink or swim.", or "do or die." (Wynn et al., 2007, p. 212). These phrases depict an image of new teachers having all the pressures of teachers who have been in the field for ten years, but with none of the experiences or skills to help them deal with their situations. It is beneficial for new teachers to have a lighter workload that includes excusing them from extra duties such as hall supervising or being on committees (Arnold-Rogers et al., 2008). New teachers should not be expected to have all the duties of experienced teachers because they are still learning how to be effective educators. Consideration of class sizes and types of classes taught, allows a new teacher to become comfortable with their new surroundings before assuming ancillary responsibilities (Arnold-Rogers et al., 2008). When new teachers have fewer time
commitments, they are more likely to spend their own time getting involved with school social activities. Evans et al. (2006) found that new teachers were able to participate in more activities such as being club sponsors or participating on curriculum committees when their workloads were reduced. This helped to create a sense that those new teachers “belonged” to the school. Developing that sense of loyalty is another important factor to retaining new teachers (Evan et al., 2006).

Professional support. Schools cannot focus solely on keeping teachers. They also must provide continuing support to help quality teachers evolve (Wynn et al. (2007). Professional support involves the communication of information and expectations through several channels within the school. Information involving effective teacher practices is an important part of this communication. This can be achieved by creating meaningful professional development activities (Bozonelos, 2008). Administrators can support professional development of teachers by focusing on lesson planning, school rules, and classroom management (Wynn et al., 2007). Through professional development on these instructional related sessions, teachers will build on school specific procedures that are necessary for their success (Wynn et al., 2007). Lack of learning opportunities for professional growth can lead to dissatisfaction in teachers, high absenteeism, and attrition (Blase & Blase, 2006; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). By providing meaningful professional development administrators can help teachers avoid becoming burnt out. Professional development can help teachers of all levels enhance their skill set and increase self-efficacy (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990).

Developing the appropriate type of professional development for each teacher is equally as important. Often schools require attendance at specific professional development
topics that may or may not be relevant to all teachers (Arnold-Rogers et al., 2008). Due to the time constraints teachers confront, administrators must look for other ways of disseminating important information. For example, new teacher meetings, designed to fill a need, can become a waste of very valuable time. After evaluating current delivery of professional development and information for new teachers, schools in Tennessee remodeled their communication structure and removed their after-school new teacher meetings (Arnold-Rogers et al., 2008). Data from new teachers showed that this time was not seen as effect and administrators acted on this research (Arnold-Rogers et al., 2008). Administrators must be careful to examine how they communicate important information and provide professional development. Teachers’ time is a valuable resource and they must not feel it is being wasted by something that could be sent via email or being involved in professional development that does not apply to their teaching assignment (Arnold-Rogers et al., 2008).

Appraisal support. Administrators provide appraisal support by giving teachers meaningful feedback on their job performance (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). Teacher interactions with administrators must be perceived as supportive. When teachers do not feel supportive they are more likely to shut down instead of taking risks necessary to grow as an educator (Bozonelos, 2008). Administrators can accomplish this by providing evaluative methods that involve inquiry and self-assessment (Bozonelos, 2008). Among the top reasons why teachers were satisfied with their principal’s leadership were the effectiveness of their principal’s ability to communicate expectations, and the effectiveness of principals providing regular feedback regarding their performance (Wynn et al., 2007). Teachers find clear expectations beneficial when developing instruction (Wynn et al., 2007). By establishing clear expectations, administrators set a clear tone for teachers, who also appreciate knowing
their role in the school building (Glisson & Durick, 1988). Experienced teachers, who establish a relationship with their administrator where constructive feedback is provided on a regular basis, are more satisfied with their work (Otto & Arnold, 2005). An administrator can help improve a teacher’s quality of teaching by assisting with development of lessons and selecting curriculum materials. However, they must also take it beyond this by encouraging teachers to be reflective practitioners. Reflecting on current practice is instrumental for the self-growth of teachers (Coronado, 2009).

Evans-Andris, Kyle, and Carini (2006) found that many new teachers experience disconnect between their ability to write a well-planned lesson and their ability to deliver a well-planned lesson. New teachers are trained to write effective lesson plans. However when implementing these plans, they often do not realize how student behavior can disrupt the implementation of those plans (Evans-Andris et al., 2006). In schools where observations are very infrequent, the lack of feedback limits new teachers’ opportunity to improve their craft. Evaluations leave them feeling inadequate, discouraged, and depressed about their career choice (Evans-Andris et al., 2006).

Experienced teachers often do not take time in planning for effective instruction, when administrators do not hold them accountable for lesson planning or provide clear expectations about the use of instructional time (Klusmann et al., 2008). After tenure, administrators still need to take a serious approach to teacher evaluations, using the opportunity to continue to support and challenge tenured teachers (Otto & Arnold, 2005). In addition, with the absence of feedback comes the lack of self-congratulatory moments that encourage a teacher to keep building their skills, trying new things which lead to them feeling satisfied with their work (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990).
Job Satisfaction and Teacher Retention

Research shows that administrative support is strongly correlated to teacher job satisfaction (Balkar, 2009; Blase & Blase, 2006; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994; Ma & McMillan, 1999). The four dimensions of principal support describe specific ways principals can affect the job satisfaction of beginning and experienced teachers (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). Having job satisfaction is strongly correlated to organizational commitment (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Perrachione et al., 2008; Singh & Billingsley, 1996; Squillini, 2001; Thompson et al., 1997). Organizational commitment has been highly correlated to teacher retention (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1990). Ultimately, principal support is related to teachers being more satisfied with their job and their job satisfaction is related to them staying in the teaching profession.

There are several other factors that influence a teacher’s decision to leave the profession such as staying home with children, retirement, and pursuing another career (Ingersol, 2001). These are personal items over which school administrators have no control. However, they can control what causes teachers to be dissatisfied with their job. Inadequate administrative support was the number one cause of job dissatisfaction and accounted for 30% of the teachers leaving the profession in 1998 (Ingersol, 2001).

Instead of relying on quick fixes to staffing problems such as “Teacher for America” or financial assistance that locks college graduates into teaching for only a certain number of years, administrators must be cognoscente of what keeps teachers satisfied (Ingersol, 2001). This current research study hopes to add to the literature and provide practical information on
what types of principal support are most highly correlated to teacher job satisfaction.
Through true job satisfaction highly skilled, effective teachers may be retained.
CHAPTER 3

Methods

Research has shown a relationship between principal support and teacher job satisfaction (Baker, 2007; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Perrachione et al., 2008). Studies vary in examining this relationship. In order to more clearly understand the relationship between these two variables, each one must be examined in depth. For example, previous educational research has often measured job satisfaction using basic, one dimensional questions such as “How satisfied are you with your job?” (Billingsley & Cross, 1992, p. 458). Teachers have also been asked to rate themselves on statements such as, “I find my professional role satisfying” (Ma & McMillan, 1993, p. 46). By using Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory on job satisfaction, which has been proven effective in educational research, the dimensions of job satisfaction can provide more detailed information on its relationship to principal support (Nias, 1981; Nussell et al., 1988; Perrachione et al., 2008; Schroder, 2008; Sergiovani, 1967; Smerek 2007).

Similarly, in studies where job satisfaction is the larger focus there may be just one or two questions concerning principal support, measuring it in a broad sense. For example, teachers are asked to rate the perception of principal support on a Likert scale (Baker, 2007; Ma & McMillan, 1993). By using Littrell and Bilingsley’s (1994) theory of principal support, adapted from House’s theory of administrative support, principal support can be analyzed through four different dimensions. Their theory has been proven effective in the
field of education and brings more insight as to exactly how principals can be more supportive to teachers (Bozonelos, 2008; Littrell & Billingsley). This also could help the current research become more meaningful for administrators.

Statement of Purpose

Principal support is one of the strongest predictors of teacher job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). Teacher job satisfaction is directly related to teacher retention (Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Glisson & Durick, 1988). The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction, using an instrument that measures Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory and principal support, using an adapted instrument from Littrell and Billingsley’s theory of administrative support. By examining this relationship with a conceptual framework that is grounded in theories proven effective for use in the field of education, the current research hoped to provide a higher level of insight into the relationship between principal support and job satisfaction. The dimensions of each variable were examined to see how they interact and effect teachers. The research questions below were designed to help give future administrators a clear understanding as to how their actions effect teacher job satisfaction, which ultimately would lead to overcoming their greatest challenge, retaining teachers (Ingersol, 2001).

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support?
2. What is the relationship between job satisfiers and the dimensions of principal support?
   a. Which dimensions of principal support make an independent contribution to explaining variance in job satisfiers?
3. What is the relationship between job dissatisfiers and the dimensions of principal support?
b. Which dimensions of principal support make an independent contribution to explain variance in job dissatisfiers?

4. Which dimension of principal support is the most important in explaining teacher job satisfaction?

**Research Design**

The research design was a quantitative correlation study. The purpose was to explore the relationship between principal support and teacher job satisfaction and the respective dimensions of each construct. The relationship between job satisfiers, job dissatisfiers and the four dimensions of principal support; emotional, instrumental, professional, and appraisal were examined to determine their respective relationships. In addition, the research was designed to determine which dimension of principal support is most vital to teacher job satisfaction.

**Population and Sample**

Virginia public high schools were the target population for this study. High schools were the unit of analysis. Public high schools across the state of Virginia were asked to participate in the study via mailing a letter requesting their participation. When required, permission was requested from the central offices of the school district. The school’s participation was based on the principal’s willingness to be a part of the study. A total sample of 34 high schools from across the state of Virginia participated. From these self-selected schools, teachers were asked to participate in the study. One thousand, two hundred and seventy-six teachers participated in this study. The aim was to have a sample that could be representative of all the public high schools in the state of Virginia, in order to make results generalizable to the high schools in the state. School demographics must be taken into
consideration when generalizing the results. The Virginia Department of Education breaks the state down by geographical regions. Schools in seven of the eight regions participated in the study. To further compare the sample with the state, detailed demographic information is provided in Table 3.1. Here the means of each school were aggregated and the sample’s means were compared to the means of all public high schools in Virginia. Virginia high schools are defined as being composed of the traditional grades of 9-12. No individual demographic variables were obtained from the sample.

Table 3.1

Student Population of Sample Schools and Virginia Public High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Schools in Sample</th>
<th>Virginia Public High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>8,496</td>
<td>24.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>11.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Sample in Sample</th>
<th>Virginia Public High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>21,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7,125</td>
<td>92,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>37,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23,233</td>
<td>212,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or More</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>13,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 34 schools that participated ranged in size from 177 to 2083 high school students. The average mean size for our sample’s total student population was 1019 students just slightly below the state mean of 1212 students. The sample’s Asian and Hispanic mean populations were slightly less than the state averages. Consequently, the Black and White mean populations were slightly above the state means. Students who are economically disadvantage were also represented slightly less in the sample population as compared to the state’s mean. The representation of students with disabilities in the sample was pretty accurate, being under the state’s mean by about 1%. Overall the sample was fairly similar to the state demographically.

**Instrumentation**

**Job satisfaction.** The Professional Satisfaction Scale (PSS) was created by Blank (1993) to measure job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in higher education. The instrument is composed of 16 items, six items relating toward job satisfaction and ten items relating to job dissatisfaction (Blank, 1993). These items represent the 15 original descriptions by Herzberg to measure job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as part of his two-factor theory (Blank, 1993). One additional item was added, assessing “relationships with students”. Blank added this item because teachers spend most of their time with students. Herzberg’s items that concern relationships with others were originally broken down to “with peers”, “with supervisors” and “with subordinates” (Herzberg, 1959). Blank stated that students are separate than subordinates, as subordinates were defined as workers in the organization that are underneath an individual in the organization’s hierarchy. Students are not workers for the organization. (Blank, 1993). An example of a subordinate to a teacher in schools may be a teacher’s assistant or aide.
The PSS used a dual continuum, asking participants to rate each item on either the satisfaction scale or the dissatisfaction scale. This enabled Blank to determine if Herzberg's theory was still relevant when measuring job satisfaction in higher education (Blank, 1993). Blank conducted a reliability test, using a pilot of 30 participants from two different colleges. This produced an alpha coefficient of reliability of .90. His full study produced a coefficient alpha of .83 (Blank, 1993). “Tests that yield scores with a reliability of .80 or higher are sufficiently reliable for most research purposes.” (Gall et al., 2007, p.200).

Several other researchers have used these items from Herzberg to measure job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Nussell, 1988; Shroder, 2008). The findings supported Herzberg’s theory that the six factors related to job satisfaction are: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. The ten items relating to job dissatisfaction are: organizational policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relations with superiors, peers, subordinates and students, working conditions, salary, status, and job security (Blank, 1993; Nussell, 1988; Shroder, 2008). Herzberg’s theory of job satisfaction theory has been applied most often when examining job satisfaction in educational research. Similar to Sergiovanni’s study of job satisfaction in education in the 1960’s, an alternate measure was used. The PSS seemed like a good compromise, as it was based on, and used, Herzberg’s original factors and was only 16 questions long. PSS had never before used on a high-school sample. However, it was used successfully in higher education studies.

For the purpose of this study, the PSS was modified in two ways. First, responses were placed on a single scale. This, of course, is controversial, as Herzberg’s theory shows satisfiers and dissatisfiers on different scales. However, Schroder (2008) altered the PSS to a
5 point Likert scale in order to make the scale more familiar to participants and hopefully increase the response rate. That scale ranged from highly dissatisfied (1) to highly satisfied (5). The single scale was found to produce consistent results from previous job satisfaction studies in Schroder's higher education study on job satisfaction. In order to create consistency with the other measurements used in this study, a 6 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) was used with hopes of resulting in greater score variability. Items were identified as causing job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction.

Table 3.2 illustrates the modifications to the original Professional Satisfaction Survey. The modified measure was not subjected to a field test or a pilot test to examine whether the measure was valid given the changes made.

Table 3.2
Example of Professional Support Survey Question Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original (PSS) Directions: For each statement please circle either the satisfaction scale value or the dissatisfaction scale value that best describe how you feel about each of these aspects of your work life.</th>
<th>Growth: defined by changes in the work situation such that advancement is more or less likely; increase or decrease in chances to learn. Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altered (PJSS) Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your school from STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) to STRONGLY AGREE (6) by filling in the appropriate circle.</td>
<td>Growth, defined by changes in the work situation such that advancement is more or less likely; increase or decrease in chances to learn, causes me to be satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Herzberg’s theory has held up across time and in the educational setting (Nias, 1981; Nussell et al., 1988; Parrachione et al., 2008; Schroder, 2008; Smerek 2007). The purpose of this study was to use the theory in order to look at the relationship between job satisfaction and administrative support. Prior studies indicated that the integrity of the construct would be maintained by designating which items were associated with satisfaction and which were associated with dissatisfaction. The measure was renamed the Professional Job Satisfaction Survey (PJSS). Sample items are included on Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Dimensions and Items of PJSS

Job Satisfiers

1. Achievements
2. Recognition
3. Work itself
4. Responsibility
5. Advancement
6. Growth

Job Dissatisfiers

1. Organizational policy and administration
2. Supervision
3. Interpersonal relations with superiors
4. Interpersonal relations with peers
5. Interpersonal relations with subordinates
6. Interpersonal relations with students
7. Working conditions
8. Salary
9. Status
10. Job security

Principal support. Littrell and Billingsley (1994) developed a Principal Support Questionnaire to measure the four dimensions of administrative support adapted from House’s (1981) social support theory. The instrument contained 40 items, ten items for each
dimension of administrative support; emotional support, instrumental support, informational support, and appraisal support. Participants were asked to rate statements related to the various types of support, using a 6 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). Unfortunately, this measure had weaknesses -- it did not have strong reliability and factor analyses were not completed to determine whether the 40 items actually represented House’s original four components.

The survey was then adapted by DiPaola (in press) to provide a clearer representation of principal support. A pilot study (n=118) was conducted on the original 40-item measure. Virginia public school teachers voluntarily participated and completed the 40-item questionnaire. A factor analysis was performed on the data and the number of items was reduced to from 40 to 16, four items for each of the original dimensions of support as conceived by House. The pilot study revealed the following results: Cronbach’s Alpha was .94 for emotional support, .93 for appraisal support, .88 for instrumental support, and .87 for professional support. Overall, the instrument had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .86, demonstrating high internal consistency.

These 16 items were then examined to make sure the wording in the questions was current and relevant. For example, the item, “The principal provides opportunity for me to attend workshops, conference, and to take courses” was changed to “The principal provides opportunities for me to grow professionally.” Littrell and Billingsley had originally designed this survey to compare general education teachers with special education teachers’ perceptions of support. Due to this, some of the items were special ed oriented and had a low component loading. For example, the item, “The principal participates in child study/eligibility/ IEP meetings/ parent conferences” was dropped as it had a much lower component loading
In the new measure (PSS), the dimension termed “informational support” by House was changed to “professional support” to better describe that kind of support in schools. This dimension did not simply mean for administrators to provide information such as announcements and memos on current events in schools, this support included professional development provided to teachers to help them grow within the profession. Professional development was considered by researchers a large part of this dimension (Bozonelos, 2008; Littrell and Billingsley, 1994). Bozonelos (2008) used Littrell and Billingsley’s Principal Support Questionnaire and discussed how the availability of professional development to teachers is key to keeping teachers informed of current best practices and skills they can readily use in the classroom. Therefore, professional support, through professional development, as well as administrators encouraging teachers to join professional organizations and pursue advanced degrees, is a more appropriate name for this dimension.

Table 3.4

*Dimensions and Items of the PSS*

**Emotional Support**

1. My principal gives me a sense of importance that I make a difference
2. My principal supports my decisions.
3. My principal trusts my judgment in making classroom decisions.
4. My principal shows confidence in my actions.

**Instrumental Support**

1. My principal provides adequate planning time.
2. My principal provides time for various nonteaching responsibilities.
3. My principal provides extra assistance with I become overloaded.
4. My principal equally distributes resources and unpopular chores.
Professional Support

1. My principal gives me undivided attention when I am talking.
2. My principal is honest and straightforward with the staff.
3. My principal provides opportunities for me to grow professionally.

Appraisal Support

1. My principal offers constructive feedback after observing my teaching.
2. My principal provides frequent feedback about my performance.
3. My principal helps me evaluate my needs.
4. My principal provides suggestions for me to improve instruction.

Research Design

The researcher worked with three other researchers from the College of William and Mary to collect data. The timeline for this study was one year. Researchers began collecting data mid May 2011 and continued to collect it through February 2012. The Professional Job Satisfaction Survey and the Principal Support Survey were combined with three other surveys. It was then broken down into an “A” and “B” paper pencil form, the PJSS on one form and the PSS on the other. Forms were divided and participants were asked to complete either an “A” or “B” form. The school was the unit of analysis. Researchers took combined data from each school and then entered their own data set into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, SPSS, for data analysis.

Consent forms and survey samples were distributed to appropriate school personnel. Researchers arranged a time with the accepting schools where they could come to a faculty meeting and collect the data. Schools that were geographically distant were sent a survey packet. The packet consisted of “Form A” and “Form B” surveys, specific directions for the
teacher designee to read to the participating teachers, and a self-addressed stamped envelope to return the completed surveys. A cover letter was also provided to participants, along with the survey, discussing key aspects of the study and reminding them that their responses were completely voluntary would remain anonymous. See appendixes A-D for letters and forms.

Data Analysis Techniques

Statistical analyses were used to determine results. Descriptive statistics concerning both principal support, job satisfaction, and their respective dimensions includes means and standard deviations. To determine the strength and direction of the relationship between job satisfaction and principal support, a correlation coefficient, or Pearson’s $r$, was computed. To determine the relationship between the four dimensions of principal support and job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, a correlation analysis was used. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine which dimension of principal support is most important to job satisfaction. See Table 3.5 for research questions and corresponding data analysis.
Table 3.5

*Data Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support?</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the relationship between job satisfiers and the dimensions of principal support?</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Which dimensions of principal support make an independent contribution to explaining variance in job satisfiers?</td>
<td>Regression Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the relationship between job dissatisfiers and the dimensions of principal support?</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Which dimensions of principal support make an independent contribution to explain variance in job dissatisfiers?</td>
<td>Regression Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which dimension of principal support is the most important in explaining teacher job satisfaction?</td>
<td>Regression Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ethical Safeguards and Considerations*

Permission from William and Mary's Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects was requested and approved before the study began. Permission from the high school's central offices was requested where required. Participants were allowed to opt out of the study at any time. Results of the Professional Job Satisfaction Survey and the Principal Support Scale were made available and shared with the principals of each participating school upon request. Individual participants were not identifiable to school administrators. The results of this study were reported collectively so that individual schools would not be identifiable.
CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Results

Data from 34 Virginia public high schools were collected and analyzed. Researchers went to self-selected schools and gave faculties either an “A” or “B” form that included a combination of instruments. Job satisfaction was measured by the Professional Job Satisfaction Survey. Principal support was measured by the Principal Support Scale. These two instruments were on different survey forms, individual teachers of a high school only responded to one of the surveys. Teachers’ participation was voluntary and they could opt out at any time. A total of 1276 teachers in 34 high schools participated. The analyses were completed on factors of jobs satisfaction and principal support with the school as the unit of analysis.

Research has shown that administrative support has a strong relationship to teacher job satisfaction (Balkar, 2009; Blase & Blase, 2006; Cross & Billingsley, 1994). For job satisfaction, based on Herzberg’s two-factor theory, job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers were analyzed along with their relationship to the four dimensions of principal support, emotional, professional, appraisal, and instrumental. This study was designed to build upon the findings of previous research that found a relationship between job satisfaction and principal support. In addition, it looked to find if any of the four dimensions of principal support made an independent contribution to explaining variance in job satisfiers and/or job dissatisfiers.
Findings for Job Satisfaction

Using SPSS, Statistical package for Social Sciences, the data for job satisfaction and the data for principal support were first analyzed separately to determine the reliability of each instrument. Both survey's had been modified from their original form. The PJSS was modified in two ways. First it was changed from a dual scale to a single scale in order to be more consistent with the other survey formats that were administered at the same time. This alteration was also done by Schroder in a 2008 study of higher education faculty members (Schroder, 2008). The second modification was identifying which items caused satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This change was made to allow it to be given with a more uniform set of directions.

A principal axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation was completed on the job satisfaction data with the school as the unit of analysis. The items loaded into two factors, one composed of job dissatisfiers and one of job satisfiers. The reliability of job dissatisfiers was high, with a Cronbach’s alpha .939. However, the reliability of job satisfiers was a disappointing Cronbach’s alpha of .728, since “Tests that yield scores with a reliability of .80 or higher are sufficiently reliable for most research purposes.” (Gall et al., 2007, p.200). In addition, to achieve the .728, item 10 regarding recognition, was eliminated because did not sufficiently load on that factor. The cumulative variance of satisfaction explained by job dissatisfiers was 47.78%, while the cumulative variance explained by the job satisfiers was only 12.71%. Further discussion on how the results and their impact on this study’s results are found in chapter 5. See Table 4.1 for details of the factor analysis on the PJSS.
Table 4.1

*A Two-Factor Varimax Solution for the 16-item PJSS, N=34*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB DISSATISFIERS</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations with subordinates</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations with peers</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations with students</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations with superiors</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Policy and Administration</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB SATISIFIERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue                                             | 7.65     | 2.03      |
| Cumulative Variance                                    | 47.79    | 12.71     |
| Alpha Coefficient of Reliability                       | .939     | .728      |

*Recognition was dropped because it did not load sufficiently on the factor and was not calculated into the Alpha Coefficient of Reliability*

Findings for Principal Support

The Principal Support Scale’s 16 items were edited to ensure that the language in the question was current and relevant to the principal support. To examine the reliability of this new instrument, a principal axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation was completed. The
results yielded two solid factors of principal support, in which the original four dimensions aligned into two new dimensions. The eight items of emotional and professional support all load strongly on factor I, which was called expressive support. The eight items of instrumental and appraisal support all load on factor II, which was called instrumental support. DiPaola (in press) explained that these finding were not a surprise and that they are consistent with general research on leadership. These general factors were named expressive support, encompassing emotional and professional support, and instrumental support, encompassing appraisal and instrumental support. Expressive and Instrumental support are two factors that have been identified in other research as dimensions of leadership and were selected as names of the two new factors accordingly (DiPaola, in press). For the remainder of this study, principal support is discussed and analyzed using these two factors.

The results of the factor analysis are summarized in Table 4.2. The two factors, expressive and instrumental support, explained, 79.94% of the cumulative variance. The Cronbach’s alpha measure of internal consistency for the measure of expressive support was .954 and instrumental support was .955. This is considered to be high reliability.
Table 4.2

*A Two-Factor Varimax Solution for the 16-item PSS, N=34*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPRESSIVE SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives me a sense of importance that I make a difference.</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports my decisions.</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusts my judgment in making classroom decisions.</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows confidence in my actions.</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives me undivided attention when I am talking.</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is honest and straightforward with the staff.</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for me to grow professionally.</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional growth.</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides adequate planning time.</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides time for various nonteaching responsibilities.</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides extra assistance with I become overloaded.</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally distributes resources and unpopular chores.</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisal Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides data for me to reflect on following classroom observations.</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides frequent feedback about my performance.</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me evaluate my needs.</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides suggestions for me to improve instruction.</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td>11.312</td>
<td>1.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Variance</strong></td>
<td>70.701</td>
<td>79.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha Coefficient of Reliability</strong></td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Principal Support

The descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, range and reliability were found for the following variables, job satisfiers, job dissatisfiers, expressive support and instrumental support. Reliability was found using Cronbach's Alpha. These are included in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

*Descriptive Data for Jobs Satisfaction and Principal Support (N=34)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfiers</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.70-4.68</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Dissatisfiers</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.77-3.72</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Support</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.26-5.63</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Support</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.51-4.94</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlational and Regression Analyses

A Pearson's $r$ correlation coefficient was found for each dimension of job satisfaction and principal support in order to address each research question. A positive relationship, where one variable increases the other variable increases, would be represented by a positive $r$. A negative or inverse relationship, where one variable increases while the other variable decreases would be represented by a negative $r$. A perfect correlation would be represented by $r = +1$ or $-1$ (Gall et al., 2007).

**Question 1.** The first question asked: What is the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support? There was no significant correlation found between teacher job satisfaction and principal support. See table 4.4 for presentation of these data.
**Question 2.** The second question asked: What is the relationship between job satisfiers and the four dimensions of principal support and which make an independent contribution to explaining variance in job satisfiers? There was no significant correlation found between job satisfiers and the two new dimensions of principal support. A multiple regression was performed in order to determine if any dimension of principal support made an independent contribution to explaining variance in job satisfiers. There were no significant results found.

**Question 3.** The third questions asked: What is the relationship between job dissatisfiers and the four dimensions of principal support and which make an independent contribution to explain variance in job dissatisfiers? There was no significant correlation found between job dissatisfiers and principal support. There were no significant results found. A multiple regression was performed in order to determine if any dimension of principal support made an independent contribution to explaining variance in job satisfiers. Again, there were no significant results found.

**Question 4.** The last question asked: Which dimension of principal support is the most important in explaining teacher job satisfaction? There were no significant results found in the multiple regression analysis.

**Auxiliary Findings.** In addition to answering the research questions the correlational analysis did find two significant relationships. First, job satisfiers were negatively correlated to job dissatisfiers ($r = -0.421, p < .05$). Second, expressive support was positively correlated to instrumental support ($r = 0.796, p < .01$). See Table 4.4.
Table 4.4

Correlation Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Principal Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Dissatisfiers</td>
<td>-.421*</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Satisfiers</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.796**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expressive Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instrumental Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01

Table 4.5

Regression Analysis of Job Satisfiers and Principal Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Support</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Support</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.525</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .009

Adj. R² = -.055

S.E. = .9956
Table 4.6

*Regression Analysis of Job Dissatisfiers and Principal Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Dissatisfiers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Support</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>-.937</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Support</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R\(^2\) = .028

Adj. R\(^2\) = -.034

S.E. = 1.0081

**Further Exploratory Analysis**

Due to the lack of any significant correlations between satisfaction and support, which contradicts the previous research on job satisfaction and principal support as well as intuitive connections, further analyses were conducted. The statistical weakness of the job satisfaction instrument, PJSS was a concern. It produced an overall reliability of .728, with job satisfiers accounting for only 12.71% of the variance. However, the reliability of the PSS was very high with both factors, expressive and instrumental producing a Cronbach’s Alpha of .95. To determine if the weakness of the PJSS was a cause, the PSS was further examined to support its strength as an instrument.

Data from other researchers on the team was available to perform a correlation analysis between the PSS and other social variables, such as Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Principal’s Openness to Change, Faculty’s Openness to Change, and Community Pressure for Change. These items had the following significant
relationships to principal support: Expressive Support and Organizational Justice were positively correlated ($r = .911, p < .01$). Instrumental Support and Organizational Justice were positively correlated ($r = .693, p < .01$). Expressive support and Organizational Citizenship Behavior were positively correlated ($r = .469, p < .01$). Expressive Support and Principals Openness to Change were positively correlated ($r = .749, p < .01$). Expressive Support and Community Pressure for Change were positively correlated ($r = .441, p < .01$). Instrumental Support and Principals Openness to Change were also positively correlated ($r = .674, p < .01$). Finally, Instrumental Support and Faculty Openness to Change were positively correlated ($r = .347, p < .05$). The analyses are found in Tables 4.7-4.9. These relationships were supported by previous research and expected outcomes for the researchers on this team. These additional results strengthen the validity of the PSS.

Table 4.7

*Correlation Analysis of Principal Support and Organizational Justice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instrumental Support</th>
<th>Organizational Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expressive Support</td>
<td>.796**</td>
<td>.911**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instrumental Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.693**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01
Table 4.8

Correlation Analysis of Principal Support and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Instrumental Support</th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expressive Support</td>
<td>.796**</td>
<td>.469**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instrumental Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01

Table 4.9

Correlation Analysis of Principal Support and Organizational Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expressive Support</td>
<td>.796**</td>
<td>.749**</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.441**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instrumental Support</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td>.347*</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Principal’s Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty’s Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.564**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01
Conclusion

The results of this study found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and principal support. A significant relationship between the dimensions of each variable was found. Job satisfiers had a significant negative correlation to job dissatisfiers and expressive support had a significant positive correlation to instrumental support.

The reliability of the PJSS, measuring job satisfaction was questionable, yielding only a Cronbach’s Alpha of .728. Furthermore, the validity of the measure may have been compromised due to the change in the scale format and response sets. Due to availability of data on other school social variables, additional correlation analyses were completed. Principal support, measured by the PSS was examined to see if there were relationships to any of the other school social variables. Results found several significant relationships, detailed in Tables 4.7-4.9, further strengthening the validity of the PSS as a measurement for principal support. Discussion in Chapter 5 will examine the PJSS as a weakness in this study and other possible explanations for these results.
CHAPTER 5

Summary, Discussion, and Implications

_A Nation at Risk_, published in the early 1980's, called attention to the crisis in the American education system. American schools were failing its youth, despite government reform efforts. They were not producing a quality and competitive workforce. Citizens began to question the public education system and thus began a deeper look at teachers. In the mid-1980's, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) conducted a number of separate surveys concerning schools and school personnel (NCES, 2008). Results from the first School and Staffing Surveys (SASS) showed that a large number of teachers were leaving the profession. Originally thought to be due to teacher retirement, the Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) released shocking results that teachers were leaving for other reasons, including lack of job satisfaction. In 1997, the NCES followed up with another report; "Job Satisfaction among American Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation". Results showed that administrative support significantly affected teacher job satisfaction, and lack of job satisfaction was causing teachers to leave the profession (NCES, 1997).

Based on the results, and change occurring over time, the NCES redesigned future SASS survey systems to emphasize teacher demand and shortage, teacher and administrator characteristics, school programs, and general conditions in schools. The latest report in 2008, found the teachers are continuing to leave the profession in an increasingly high rate, at least
2% more than the average of other professions within and outside of the social science field (NCES, 2008). The continuation of these disturbing statistics laid the foundation for this study's look at the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal support.

A relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment has been shown in several studies (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Perrachione et al., 2008; Singh & Billingsley, 1996; Squillini, 2001; Thompson et al., 1997). One study found that job satisfaction is the strongest predictor of intent to stay in teaching (Cross & Billingsley, 1994). Job satisfaction, in turn, has been found in several studies to be positively correlated to administrative support (Balkar, 2009; Blase & Blase, 2006; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Littrell & Billingsley, 1994; Ma & McMillan, 1999).

This study used Herzberg’s two factor theory on job satisfaction, which states that there are job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers. Job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers act independently of one another on dual continuums. For example, Herzberg stated that job satisfiers motivate employee productivity whereas the dissatisfiers affect a worker’s attitude toward their job (Herzberg, 1959). The two factor theory has been used in education and generally supported (Gaziel, 2001). Sergiovanni was the first to use Herzberg’s two factor theory in education and he found that job satisfiers focused on the work itself, where job dissatisfiers were related to the conditions of work (Sergiovanni, 1967). Blank (1993) created the Professional Support Survey (PSS) that was used to examine Herzberg’s two-factor theory in higher education settings. The PSS was used in additional studies to examine job satisfaction in higher education (Bailey, 1997; Schroder, 2008).

Principal support was based on House’s theory of social support. House (1981), a sociologist, focused on the role that social support had in reducing work stress and improving
health. He created a framework for social support that included four types of support; emotional, instrumental, informational, and appraisal (House, 1981). This theory was later adapted to the educational setting by Littrell and Billingsley (1994), who found four dimensions of administrative support in a school setting. The 40 item operational measure was further adapted by DiPaola (in press), who reduced Littrell and Billingsley’s Principal Support Survey to 16 items and renamed the measure of informational support, professional support, which better captured the meaning of the dimension in the school context.

Results

There was no significant correlation found between teacher job satisfaction and principal support. There was no significant correlation found between job satisfiers and the two new dimensions of principal support. There was no significant correlation found between job dissatisfiers and principal support. Finally, there was no significant finding as to what dimension of principal support is the most important in explaining teacher job satisfaction.

However, significant findings, which were not addressed through research questions, include a positive correlation between expressive and instrumental support and a negative correlation between job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers. Prior to completing the correlational analyses, a principal factor analysis was completed for both job satisfaction and principal support. This found that the PSS had high reliability with both factors, expressive and instrumental showing a Cronbach’s Alpha of .954 and .955 respectively, and the PJSS was weaker with satisfiers at .728 and job dissatisfiers at .939.
Discussion

It makes intuitive sense that job satisfaction is related to principal support. The burning question is: Why did this study’s results not show a significant relationship between principal support and teacher job satisfaction? There are a few possibilities that were explored. The strongest possible explanation for the outcomes is that the PJSS was not a reliable or valid instrument. The second is the appropriateness of using the Herzberg two-factor theory in education. Third, it may have been inappropriate to treat job satisfaction and perceptions of principal support as school-level variables. It may be that teachers are influenced by their personal experience of principal support or lack of support as factors of job satisfaction, rather than whether the principal is generally regarded as supportive or unsupportive. A final possibility is that in this time of extreme pressure for schools with the “No Child Left Behind” Act, “Race to the Top” initiatives, high stakes testing and improved measures of teacher evaluation, many teachers are worried and principals may not be in full control of these pressures.

The PJSS as a valid and reliable measurement tool. The PJSS was altered from its original form in order to better align the items with the other instruments given at the same time in two ways. First, it was modified from a dual continuum scale to a single scale. It was placed on a six point scale from Strong Disagree to Strongly Agree. Therefore, it was changed from a unidirectional measure to a bi-directional measure. This change was made before by Schroder (2008). In his adaption, he provided a 5 point scale ranging from highly dissatisfied (1) to highly satisfied (5). To further align it with other measurements, and allowing it to be completed using a set of uniform directions, it was additionally changed to
distinguish which items caused satisfaction and which caused dissatisfaction. Table 3.2 illustrated this change.

Job satisfiers explained a cumulative variance of 12.71% and a Cronbach's Alpha of .728; to be considered a strong measurement a Cronbach's Alpha should be higher than .80 (Gall et al., 2007). These modifications could have led to the weaknesses reported in these results. Job dissatisfiers showed more potential with a reliability measure of .939, and explaining 47.87% of the cumulative variance. However, expectations based on prior research, that significant relationships to the factors of principal support would emerge, were not realized.

Due to the strong reliability results of the PSS, measuring Principal Support and yielding a .95 and .96 for expressive and instrumental dimensions, a cumulative variance of 70.70% for expressive support and 79.93% for instrumental support, further analyses were completed. The data available from the other researchers on the team were used to determine whether principal support had a relationship to any other school social variable being studied. The correlational analyses revealed positive relationships to Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Change Orientation. This supported the idea that the PSS was a strong measure; therefore the strength of the operational measure of satisfaction (PJSS) was questioned.

Reliability was not the only concern on the PJSS. The content validity was also called into question. Job dissatisfiers' reliability was stronger and explained almost half of the variance in satisfaction. Studies in education have shown that the items regarding interpersonal relationships, although seen as a dissatisfier by Herzberg, may be sources of job satisfaction. It can be argued that interpersonal relationships involve socialization and this
may leave teachers feeling fulfilled intrinsically (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Nias, 1981; Schroder, 2008). For example, a relationship where a teacher can see a student grow through their teaching may result in the teacher feeling internally rewarded. Teachers who also grow close to parents through working with their children may also feel intrinsically rewarded (Nias, 1981). According to Herzberg, things that motivate individuals intrinsically are related to job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1959). Therefore, in education, interpersonal relationships could have strong potential to contribute to job satisfaction, as well as dissatisfaction (Schroder, 2008). Evidently, the operational measure did not do a good job in capturing the participants’ level of satisfaction as it was conceptualized in the study. This may have been caused by the structure of the measurement.

After the changes were made to the PJSS there was no pilot study or field test done to further test the validity and reliability before using the measurement in this study. When the study was complete, informal feedback from participants revealed that questions were too lengthy and caused some confusion. It should also be noted that the PJSS had not been used previously in elementary or secondary school settings, just in higher education (Bailey, 1997; Schroder, 2008). Whereas the PSS has been used multiple times and more recently, in the K-12 setting (Cross & Bilingsley, 1994, Litrell & Billingsley, 1994; DiPaola, in press).

The staying power of Herzberg’s two factor theory. Another possible explanation of these results is that Herzberg’s two factor theory wasn’t valid in this study. Herzberg’s two factor theory has been followed by controversy throughout its existence. Job satisfiers presented as a weak factor in this study. Research has found that intrinsic rewards, that are normally associated with job satisfiers, such as recognition, achievement, and personal growth can cause dissatisfaction when absent from a work place (Pearson & Moormow,
Another study found that public sector employees experience less satisfaction with recognition, advancement, accomplishment, and development skills (Maidani, 1991). Other research revealed a shift in dissatisfiers causing some satisfaction (Maidani, 1991; Schroder, 2008). This shift may be caused by the difficult economic times characterized by layoffs and rising health care costs, when workers place increased value on salary, benefits, job security, and status due to the financial restraints they may be experiencing (Schroder, 2008). One or more of these factors could have contributed to the weakness of job satisfiers.

Herzberg’s framework may be dated or not relevant to education. Achievement, advancement, and recognition loaded very low as job satisfiers. These items may not be what caused teachers to be satisfied. This leaves open the question as to what other parts of work cause teachers’ satisfaction. Perhaps, teachers as a group value certain job aspects that are not parallel to other jobs, such as in the business world. Perhaps, in this time of extreme pressures, such as high-stakes testing or the economic crisis, new satisfiers and dissatisfies have evolved. Herzberg’s theory is based on the idea that there are intrinsic and extrinsic factors that affect job satisfaction. This may still hold true, however what those factors are may have changed.

One interesting finding was that this study found that job dissatisfiers had a significant negative correlation with job satisfiers. Herzberg’s theory explicitly states that the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction. However, as stated previously, by removing dissatisfiers, principals are removing impediments to job satisfiers (Silver, 1983). The more dissatisfiers in place, the more difficult it would be to benefit from job satisfiers (Perrachione et al., 2008). For example, if physical conditions of a school are horrendous, with mice droppings and cockroaches everywhere, teachers may not be able to focus on
teaching. It becomes difficult for them to do their jobs, as they constantly have to work around these distractions. The principal could improve the working conditions by having the building fumigated. Then teachers could go in and be able to focus more on teaching. Removing pests will not ensure that teacher will love their job more, but they will have a better attitude because the dissatisfier was removed (Silver, 1983). Herzberg places satisfiers and dissatisfiers on a dual continuum, but he often wrote that individuals need both to be fully satisfied at work (Herzberg, 1966), a conclusion not supported by this study.

**External factors.** Over ten years has passed since the national study on job satisfaction and Ingersol’s examination of why teachers were leaving the workforce. It was at that time that administrative support was the number one factor effecting job satisfaction (Ingersol, 2001). This study did not yield those same results. However, a lot has changed in ten years. New educational reforms have swept the nation. First, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, calling for equality in schools with an annual benchmark system, demands that all students reach certain passing percentiles on state tests, expecting 100% passing for all students by 2014, quickly approaches. Next, there is Race to the Top (RTTT) Initiatives, which call for a renewed teacher evaluation system. Although Virginia is one of four states that have chosen not to participate in RTTT, teacher evaluation systems are being reconstructed to hold teachers more accountable.

Another change has been the housing market crash and economic recession that the United States is still experiencing. States have made several cuts to school funding. As a result, some schools have been closed and teachers laid off. Those still working have had salaries cut or frozen for years. Resources are very scarce. "Do more with less." is a popular mantra. This has placed tremendous hardships on teachers personally and professionally.
Teachers are feeling pressure that they never had before, pressures that principals do not have full control over. When examining job satisfaction in such times, principal support may no longer be the number one reason for teacher job satisfaction.

Other Findings

Principal support. Although the hypotheses that undergirded the research questions were not supported by the results, through the analysis, other results of significance were found. There was a positive correlation between both factors of principal support, expressive and instrumental. Principals who are perceived as supportive are most likely to be supportive in both dimensions. This is not surprising considering the traits of effective school leaders. Previous research found that supportive school principals involved teachers in decision making, provided strong professional development, provided meaningful feedback on instruction, and produced schedules that are considerate of teachers' time (Bonzonelos, 2008; Watkins, 2005).

In addition to finding a correlation between both dimensions, it was surprising that the factors of principal support collapsed into two new dimensions. Expressive and instrumental supports are two dimensions that educational leadership has cited before in contributing to effective leadership (DiPaola, in press). These two new dimensions and a strong operational measure of them, opens the door for other researchers wishing to explore principal support and its relationships to other school variables.

Implications for Future Research

Based on the review of literature and the results of this study, several research questions still remain and several new research topics have been opened to explore. First, teacher demographics were not examined in this study. Although previous research found no
change in teacher demographics and job satisfaction, it would be interesting to examine as another variable in these times of economic hardships and high stakes testing. In addition, in studying principal support, it would be interesting to see if teacher demographics and principal demographics have any influence. Littrell and Billingsley's (1994) original research compared special education and general education teacher's perceptions of administrative support. Using the PSS to compare these two groups again or to compare other content specific teachers in a high school setting would be interesting as well. The analysis performed using the PSS and other instruments examining Organizational Justice, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Change Orientation showed relationships that should be further examined. Other questions raised, based on the findings involving Principal Support are listed below.

1. How do the demographics of teachers compared to principals affect teachers' perceptions of principal support?

2. How have external forces affected teachers perceived Principal Support?

3. Do all content teachers perceive the same amount of principal support?

4. What types of principal support are most valued by all teachers?

Focusing on job satisfaction and the use of Herzberg's theory, there are several directions future researchers could take. Below are some questions raised by this study's results. To answer them, future researchers should carefully select and pilot a new or modified instruments involving Herzberg's two factor theory in education. Qualitative methods should also be used in order to help find what teachers view as leading to job satisfaction.
1. How does Herzberg's two factor theory of job satisfaction generalize to the K-12 school setting? Are the items Herzberg used still relevant in a K-12 educational setting or are there new job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers?

2. Does Herzberg's two factor theory stand the test of time in a K-12 educational setting? Are there still two factors on a dual continuum?

3. How have external forces such as economic times and high stakes testing affected teacher satisfaction?

4. Are teacher's personal experiences of principal support a factor of their job satisfaction?

Conclusion

Research has shown that teacher job satisfaction is related to principal support. Unfortunately, the results of this study did not find this relationship. This could be due to the operational measure that was used, or the effectiveness of using Herzberg's two factor theory in the current educational setting. This study did refine the conceptual framework of principal support. Two dimensions in schools emerged: expressive and instrumental support. The reliability and validity of the PSS is strong and it is a viable instrument for future research. This study also found a strong negative relationship between job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers. What else contributes to these positive and negative work experiences?

External forces and teacher demographics should be examined in order to further understand job satisfaction in teachers, as well as their perceptions of principal support. In this era of increased external pressure on teachers it is important to help support them in finding satisfaction with their job, so they may provide a positive learning environment for all children.
References


Evans, V., & Johnson, D. J. (1990). The relationship of principals' leadership behavior and teachers' job satisfaction and... *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 17*(1), 11.


doi:10.1080/15700760701263790
APPENDIX A

Principal Support Scale (PSS)

Six Point Scale (Strongly Disagree - 1 to Strongly Agree – 6)

1. The principal gives me undivided attention when I am talking.
2. The principal is honest and straightforward with the staff.
3. The principal gives me a sense of importance- that I make a difference.
4. The principal supports my decisions.
5. The principal provides data for me to reflect on following classroom observations of my teaching.
6. The principal provides frequent feedback about my performance.
7. The principal helps me evaluate my needs.
8. The principal trusts my judgment in making classroom decisions.
9. The principal shows confidence in my actions.
10. The principal provides opportunities for me to grow professionally.
11. The principal encourages professional growth.
12. The principal provides suggestions for me to improve my instruction.
13. The principal provides time for various non-teaching responsibilities (e.g. IEPs, conferences, test students).
14. The principal provides adequate planning time.
15. The principal provides extra assistance when I become overloaded.
16. The principal equally distributes resources and unpopular chores.
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APPENDIX B

Professional Job Satisfaction Survey (PJSS)

Six Point Scale (Strongly Disagree - 1 to Strongly Agree – 6)

1. Achievement, defined by the successful or unsuccessful completion of a job; solution or non-solution of problems; seeing the results of one's own work, causes me to be satisfied with my job.

2. Advancement, defined by change in status within the organization as a result of performance (i.e., promotion, lack thereof, or demotion), causes me to be satisfied with my job.

3. Growth, defined by changes in the work situation such that advancement is more or less likely; increase or decrease in chances to learn, causes me to be satisfied with my job.

4. Interpersonal Relations (w/subordinates) defined by pleasant or unpleasant interactions with persons at lower levels in the organizational hierarchy, causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

5. Interpersonal Relations (w/peers), defined by pleasant or unpleasant interactions with persons at the same level in the organizational hierarchy causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

6. Interpersonal Relations (w/students), defined by pleasant or unpleasant interactions with students causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

7. Interpersonal Relations (w/supervisors), pleasant or unpleasant interactions with superiors that may or may not be directly relevant to task accomplishment causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

8. Job Security, defined by clear indications of the likelihood or unlikelihood of continuous employment, such as tenure, permanent contracts, budgetary stability, assurances of continued employment, causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

9. Organizational Policy and Administration, defined by adequacy or inadequacy of school management, including clarity of communications, adequacy of resources, personnel policy, fringe benefits causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

10. Recognition defined by attention in the form of praise; personal acknowledgement by administration; reward that is directly related to task accomplishment, causes me to be satisfied with my job.

11. Responsibility defined by presence or absence of autonomy in carrying out assignments; increase or decrease of authority over others; accountability for task accomplishment, causes me to be satisfied with my job.

12. Salary, defined by wage and compensation factors, such as pay scales, adjustments, reimbursements causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

13. Status defined by signs, symbols, or tokens of position and prestige, such as privileges, work space size and location, work space décor, symbolic titles, causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.

14. Supervision, defined by competence of incompetence, fairness or unfairness, and efficiency of superiors.

15. Work Itself, defined by the nature of the task to be accomplished on the job (i.e., routine or varied, interesting or dull), causes me to be satisfied with my job.

16. Working Conditions defined by the physical conditions of work, such as the amount of work, temperature control, ventilation, adequate equipment and supplies, causes me to be dissatisfied with my job.
APPENDIX C

SURVEY DIRECTIONS

Thank you for your time this afternoon. My name is ________________ and I am a researcher from the College of William & Mary. Your principal __________ has been kind enough to invite me to your campus to conduct a 1 page survey. This instrument amounts to a general survey of social variables in public high schools. No data will be reported by school and no schools will be identified. The survey is completely confidential, anonymous, and concerns the collective faculty perceptions on a number of variables. Please bubble in your responses. Your responses are voluntary if you feel uncomfortable answering any item, feel free to leave it blank or you may stop at any time. When you are finished with the survey, please place it in the manila folder located in the front. This should take no longer than 10 minutes. I know there are many demand on teachers, and I sincerely appreciate your time in completing this survey.
APPENDIX D

Request to Perform Dissertation Study Letter Sample

DATE

RE: Request to Perform Dissertation Study

Dear Assistant Superintendent X & Principal X,

Doctoral candidates in the Educational Policy Planning and Leadership (EPPL) program at the College of William & Mary are conducting separate research studies examining the relationships between school social variables and student achievement. The researchers are in need of a sample representative of Virginia high school teachers. Participation in the study is voluntary and involves classroom teachers at Sample VA High School (SHS) completing a 73-item survey. The researchers will collect data either in person or through a designated faculty member. Completing the survey should take no longer than 15 minutes. Teacher responses to the questions on the survey will be kept confidential. Teachers will not place any identifying information on the survey other than a number that will be used by the researchers to identify your school and perform unit level analysis related to student achievement. All data collected from SHS will be kept confidential. No data will be reported in the final study or any future reports linking SHS to aggregated responses on the survey instrument. Upon request the researchers will provide Principal X with a summary report of data collected.

If Sample VA High School and/or the S school division agree to participate in this study, please notify Kathleen Bressler, EPPL Doctoral Student and Assistant Principal of Grafton Middle School, at either xxx-xxx-xxxx or kbressler@ycsd.york.va.us.

Attached is a copy of the 73-item questionnaire, that will be divided into a Form A and Form B and administered to separate halves of instructional staff, for your review and consideration. If you have any questions regarding this study and/or with participation in this study, please contact Dr. Michael DiPaola, project manager and dissertation chairperson, at 757-221-2334 or mfdipa@wm.edu. Problems and/or grievances associated with this study and/or your school’s participation in the study may be reported to Dr. Thomas Ward, Chairperson of the School of Education Internal Review Committee, at 757-221-2358 or tjward@wm.edu or Dr. Michael Deshenes, Chairperson of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William & Mary at 757-221-2778 or mrdesc@wm.edu.

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2011-04-15 AND EXPIRES ON 2012-04-15.

Sincerely,

Travis Burns, tburns@gc.k12.va.us
Kathleen Bressler, kmolea@wm.edu
Karen Cagle, kecagl@wm.edu
Jennifer Tindle, jtedwa@wm.edu