

Factors Affecting Teachers Job Satisfaction

Saira Naz ¹

Email: saira_naz85@hotmail.com

Abstract

Teachers in Pakistan and across the world are generally not satisfied with their jobs. This leads towards high turnover and adverse performance. This study has measured the effects of work goals, self-efficacy, positive effect, working conditions, and goal support on teacher's job satisfaction. The scope of the study was restricted to the school teachers of Karachi. A self-administered questionnaire from the literature was adapted for the study. The developed model was tested through SEM. Prior to estimating the hypothesized model, the normality, reliability, and validity of the constructs on the present data set was checked. The results suggest that self-efficacy has a strong effect on job satisfaction followed by positive effect and working conditions.

Keywords: *Job satisfaction, work goals, self-efficacy, goal support, positive effect, working conditions.*

Introduction

Job satisfaction refers to the subjective feeling of employees towards their work. This could either be favorable or unfavorable (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014). If there is a synergy between employee job demands and their expectation, it will result in a favorable situation and high job satisfaction. A gap between these aspects will result in low job satisfaction (Demirdag, 2015). There are many factors including positive effect, work conditions and goals that affect job satisfaction. Past studies have found that factors including quality of relationship with the supervisors, work goals, self-efficacy, working conditions and goal support are important determinants of job satisfaction (Badri, Mohaidat, Ferrandino, & El Mourad, 2013).

Teachers in Pakistan and abroad are not fully satisfied with their jobs. This has adversely affected the standard of education and the motivation levels of the students (Amin, Shah, & Tatlah, 2013). According to a survey about 27,037 teachers work in the public and private schools of Karachi, and the average salary is meager Rs. 14,000/ per month. In addition, these teachers are highly dissatisfied due to poor working conditions and lack of autonomy.

¹Faculty Member at Iqra University Karachi

The high level of dissatisfaction among teachers leads to a high rate of absenteeism and job turnover (Akram, Malik, Sarwar, Anwer, & Ahmad, 2015).

Although schools and universities have implemented various initiatives for improving the satisfaction level of teachers, these have not been very effective. Most of these initiatives have not addressed the core issues of teachers (Akram et al., 2015). This study aims to extend Lent and Brown's (2006) model of job satisfaction in Karachi schools. Specifically, this study will measure the effects of self-efficacy, work goals, working conditions, goal support and positive effect on job satisfaction.

Literature Review


Education leads to development. Development is only possible if one is satisfied with what he/she is doing. A direct association has been found between teachers' job satisfaction and their turnover. In addition, teachers have different perceptions about job satisfaction which affects their intention to stay in teaching (Liu & Meyer, 2005). Teachers have a responsibility to create future leaders. Therefore, it is important to ensure that teachers are satisfied. However, teachers across the world are not satisfied with their jobs and they have a very high turnover (Chamundeswari, 2013). This satisfaction level and turnover could be improved by identifying the determinants that affect teachers satisfaction and by bringing adequate reforms (Tickle, Chang, & Kim, 2011).

Employees are considered as an important asset of an organization. Dynamic and progressive organizations make all the possible efforts to attract and retain the right person for the right job at the right time. A conducive environment will keep employees highly motivated (Casio, 2003). While extending the social cognitive model of work satisfaction, studies have found that working conditions and self-efficacy have a positive effect on job satisfaction. On the contrary, goal support and goal progress have an insignificant effect on job satisfaction (Duffy & Lent, 2009; Lent & Brown, 2006). Other studies have found that working conditions and goal progress have a positive effect on job satisfaction.

Theoretical Grounding

Lent and Brown's (2006) model of job satisfaction has been extended in this study to measure the direct effects of working conditions, positive effect, self-efficacy, work goals and goal support on job satisfaction. However, indirect effects as envisaged in the model have not been measured since they are beyond the scope of the study. The conceptual framework is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework



Job Satisfaction

Teachers can be retained successfully by ensuring job satisfaction. Job satisfaction enhances performance and decreases employee turnover (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014). Monetary and non-monetary incentives can be used to manage teachers' job satisfaction and turnover (Aydin, Sarier, & Uysal, 2013). The performance and productivity of teachers tends to rise with their satisfaction level. Satisfied teachers will be able to deliver quality education to students by motivating and inspiring them. Earlier studies suggest that low job satisfaction adversely affects the productivity level of even highly qualified and skilled teachers. It also affects productivity through burnout, absenteeism and turnover (Chamundeswari, 2013). Job satisfaction has relationships with positive effect, self-efficacy, working conditions and work goals (Van den Berghe et al., 2014).

Work Goals

Biases, support, and resistance in a working environment play a significant role in achieving work goals and goal progress (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2011; Hyvönen, Feldt, Salmela-Aro, Kinnunen, & Mäkikangas, 2009). Researchers have defined work as daily tasks and routines of workers including the level of autonomy given to them (Herzberg et al., 2011).

Work goals enhance the subjective wellbeing and performance of an employee. It also increases the overall satisfaction level of an employee (Luthans, 2002). According to goal setting theory, higher goals lead to higher satisfaction and vice versa (Locke & Latham, 2006). Studies have found that employees with higher goals have a higher level of job satisfaction (Koestner, Lekes, Powers, & Chicoine, 2002; Wiese & Freund, 2005).

Self-efficacy

Capability and attitude are important aspects of goals. Teachers should have consistency, eagerness, dedication, devotion, and drive. This is only possible when teachers have a high level of self-efficacy. Teachers self-efficacy is the ability of obtaining desired outcomes from students through motivation (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014; Soodak & Podell, 1996). Studies have found that teachers self-efficacy has a relationship with student performance in the class room (Dicke et al., 2014). Teachers' behavior in the class room depends on their satisfaction level, which again depends on efficacy. Teachers with high levels of self-efficacy are more open to new ideas and exhibit greater levels of planning and organization. They tend to experiment with innovative teaching strategies and have clear goals (Moulding, Stewart, & Dunmeyer, 2014; Rodríguez et al., 2014). Prior research has found that a higher level of self-efficacy leads to higher satisfaction. It also increases the desire to continue with the teaching profession (Hosford & O'Sullivan, 2016; Soodak & Podell, 1993). Several studies have validated the effect of self-efficacy on job satisfaction (Aldridge & Fraser, 2016; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017).

Positive Effect

Positive effect refers to an individual's tendency to experience a positive state of emotion (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Positive effect towards work leads to a high level of job satisfaction (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen, 2013). It also helps individuals to process emotional information accurately and efficiently. Positive effect helps employees solve problems, make plans and strive for achievements (Abbas, Raja, Darr, & Bouckenoghe, 2014). Positive effect has a significant relationship with job satisfaction. Generally, individuals who experience positive emotions are more likely to be satisfied at work (Todorova, Bear, & Weingart, 2014).

Goal Support

Goal support refers to the support received to overcome barriers specifically in relation to work goals and self-efficacy (Righetti, Kumashiro, & Campbell, 2014). Studies have found that task performance and job satisfaction are achieved by supporting, encouraging, and motivating employees (Lent & Brown, 2006; Tang, Siu, & Cheung, 2014). The Lent and Brown (2006) model suggests that support in achieving goals enhances job satisfaction. Some studies have found that goal support has a weak and insignificant relationship with job satisfaction. Others have found that support received from co-workers, supervisors and family members positively influence job satisfaction (Babin, Boles, & Griffin, 2015; Cullen, Edwards, Casper, & Gue, 2014; Grant, 2014; Tang et al., 2014).

Working conditions

In the context of schools, infrastructure and school policies are part of working conditions (Nie, Chua, Yeung, Ryan, & Chan, 2015). Several studies have validated the relationship between working conditions and job satisfaction (Hui et al., 2014; Karim, Khan, & Shamim, 2017; Nie et al., 2015). The empowerment of teachers and sound policies are part of working conditions. If these are not adequate, they will negatively affect job satisfaction (Jordan, Mišlić, Todorović, & Marič, 2017; Khany & Tazik, 2016). A heavy teaching load adversely affects teachers satisfaction level and class room management (Demirdag, 2015).

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses will be empirically tested in the study.

- H1. Work goals have a positive effect on job satisfaction.
- H2. Self-efficacy has a positive effect on job satisfaction
- H3. Positive effect has a positive impact on job satisfaction.
- H4. Goal support has a positive effect on job satisfaction.
- H5. Working conditions have a positive effect on job satisfaction.

Methodology

Scope and sample

The scope of this study was restricted to secondary school teachers working in Karachi. The data was collected through a questionnaire. The sample size for the study was 200 and the response rate was 96%. The respondents include 75 males and 125 females. Around 77 teachers had a Master's degree, 95 teachers had an undergraduate degree and the remaining were intermediate qualified. The average age of the respondents was 27 years and their

average experience was 9 years. The average income of school teachers was around Rs. 13,000 per month.

Scales and Measures

The study has 5 questions on demographics all based on the nominal scale. It also has six constructs and each construct has five items. All the constructs of the study have been adapted from Equitable Access to Excellent Educators Survey (2014).

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis was performed to ascertain the normality of the data and the internal consistency of the adopted constructs. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis

	Cronbach Alpha	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Positive Effect	0.66	3.90	0.77	-0.94	1.26
Working Con.	0.65	3.31	0.87	-0.30	-0.35
Work Goals	0.70	2.88	0.95	-0.03	-0.54
Job Satisfaction	0.64	4.03	0.86	-1.47	2.26
Self-Efficacy	0.65	3.92	0.70	-1.06	1.85
Goal Support	0.76	4.09	0.69	-1.36	3.40

Table 1 shows that the Cronbach alpha of goal support was the highest ($\alpha = 0.76$, Mean = 4.09, Std. Dev = 0.69) and the lowest for job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.64$, Mean = 4.03, Std. Dev = 0.86). The Cronbach alpha of all the constructs were greater than 0.60 indicating acceptable internal consistency (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). The variable working conditions has the lowest Skewness (SK=-0.30) while goal support has highest skewness (SK=-1.36). The Kurtosis values for goal support is highest (KR= 3.40) and lowest for working conditions (KR=-0.35). Since all the Kurtosis and Skewness values lie between ± 3.5 , the adopted constructs fulfill the requirements of univariate normality (Looney, 1995).

Correlations Analysis

Bivariate correlations were calculated to examine whether the constructs are unique and distinct. The correlations also enable us to assess whether the variables are collinear. The bivariate correlations are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Bivariate Correlations

	JS	WC	PE	WG	SE	GS
Job satisfaction	1					
Working conditions	.432**	1				
Positive Effect	.495**	.329**	1			
Work goals	.278**	.393**	.231**	1		
Self-efficacy	.514**	.408**	.532**	.354**	1	
Goal support	0.086	0.114	0.065	0.056	0.78	1


** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 2 indicates that the highest correlation ($R = .532$) was between self-efficacy and positive effect. On the other hand, the lowest correlation ($R = 0.06$) was between goal support and positive effect. The low correlations suggest that there is no issue of multi-collinearity (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2013).

Test of the predictive model

The predictive model fitted very well (Refer to Figure 2). All the fit indices are within the prescribed limits. For example, Chi-square/df (χ^2/df) = $1.829 < 3$; RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) = $0.065 < 0.08$; AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) = $0.928 > 0.90$; IFI (Incremental Fit Index) = $0.901 > 0.90$; IFI assesses the degree of complexity in the model and value is near to 0.90; PCFI (Parsimony Comparative of Fit Index) $0.743 > 0.50$; PNFI (Parsimony Normed Fit Index) $0.656 > 0.50$.

Figure 2: Model of Job Satisfaction



The results suggest that work goals ($R^2 = -0.12, p > 0.05$) and goal support ($R^2 = -0.05, p > 0.05$) do not have a significant effect on job satisfaction. On the contrary, self-efficacy ($R^2 = 0.65, p < 0.05$), positive effect ($R^2 = 0.55, p < 0.05$) and working conditions ($R^2 = 0.36, p < 0.05$) have a significant effect on job satisfaction.

Discussion of Results

The hypothesis (H1) that work goals have a positive effect on job satisfaction was not supported by the results. This finding is not consistent with the prior literature. Past research suggests that work goals enhance the subjective wellbeing of an employee and his performance. It also increases the overall satisfaction level of an employee (Luthans, 2002). According to goal setting theory, higher goals lead to higher satisfaction and vice versa (Locke & Latham, 2006). Studies have found that employees with higher goals have a higher level of job satisfaction (Koestner et al., 2002; Wiese & Freund, 2005).

The hypothesis (H2) that self-efficacy has a positive effect on job satisfaction was supported by the results. Studies have found that teachers' self-efficacy affects student performance in the class room (Dicke et al., 2014). Teachers with high levels of self-efficacy are more open to new ideas and exhibit greater levels of planning and organization. They tend to experiment with innovative teaching strategies and have clear goals (Moulding et al., 2014; Rodríguez et al., 2014). In addition, teachers with a high level of self-efficacy have a greater desire for teaching and are more likely to continue with their profession (Hosford & O'Sullivan, 2016; Soodak & Podell, 1993).

The hypothesis (H3) that positive effect has a positive impact on job satisfaction was supported by the results. Positive effect towards work leads to a high level of job satisfaction (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Wayne et al., 2013). A positive effect helps individuals process emotional information efficiently for solving problems and planning (Abbas et al., 2014). Generally, individuals who experience positive emotions are more likely to be satisfied at work (Todorova et al., 2014).

The hypothesis (H4) that goal support has a positive effect on job satisfaction was not supported by the results. Studies have found that task performance and job satisfaction are achieved by supporting, encouraging, and motivating employees (Lent & Brown, 2006; Tang et al., 2014). The Lent and Brown (2006) model also suggests that achieving goals enhances job satisfaction. Some studies have found that goal support has a weak and insignificant relationship with job satisfaction. Others have argued that goal support from coworkers, supervisors and family members positively influence job satisfaction (Babin et al., 2015; Cullen et al., 2014; Grant, 2014; Tang et al., 2014).

The hypothesis (H5) that working conditions have a positive effect on job satisfaction was supported by the results. Previous studies have also validated the relationship between working conditions and job satisfaction (Hui et al., 2014; Karim et al., 2017; Nie et al., 2015). The empowerment of teachers and sound polices are part of working conditions. If these are not adequate, they will negatively affect job satisfaction (Jordan et al., 2017; Khany & Tazik, 2016). A heavy teaching load adversely affects teachers satisfaction level and class room management (Demirdag, 2015).

Conclusion

The extended Lent and Brown (2006) model adequately explains the effect of work goals, self-efficacy, positive effect, goal support, and working conditions on job satisfaction. The results suggest that work goals and goal support do not significantly affect job satisfaction. On the contrary, self-efficacy, positive effect and working conditions have a profound positive influence on the job satisfaction of school teachers in Karachi.

Limitations

This research has several limitations. This study has not considered the role of gender when examining the effect of predictor variables on job satisfaction. In addition, future studies may also consider the effect of pension plans, training programs and non-monetary incentives on job satisfaction of school teachers. While this study was confined to school teachers in Karachi, future studies may also examine the determinants of job satisfaction of university faculty members.

Survey Questionnaire

Personal Information

1: **Gender:** a: Male b: Female

2: Age:

a: 20-30 years b: 31-40 years c: 41-50 years d: 51 and above

3: Salary:

a: 10,000-15000 b: 16000-21000 c: 22000-27000 d: 28000 and above

4: Area of Specialization

a: Pakistan Studies b: English c: Urdu d: Math
e: Science _____ f: Others _____

5: Educational Level

a: Intermediate b: Graduate c: Postgraduate

6: Length of Service

a: 1-5 years b: 6-10 years c: 11-15 years
d: 16-20 years e: 21 and above

SCALE:

1 – Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral
5 – Strongly Agree 4 – Agree

Job satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5
1: The job gives opportunity for career enhancement/advancement.					
2: The job achieves short and long term goals.					
3: The job itself gives freedom and independence in completing it.					
4: Teachers well paid in proportion to their ability.					
5: Job increases teacher's responsibility and commitment.					

Working conditions	1	2	3	4	5
1: The faculty and staff have shared objectives.					
2: There is an atmosphere of trust and respect in this school.					
3: Teachers feel comfortable raising issues.					
4: The school management consistently supports teachers.					
5: Teachers get extra allowance or any reward for giving outstanding performance.					

Positive effect	1	2	3	4	5
1: The job based on teacher's personal judgment and critical thinking.					
2: This platform enhances teacher's leadership qualities.					
3: Teachers are encouraged by management to show their potential/innovation.					
4: Teachers are recognized as educational experts.					
5: Teacher gets full free hand to show their intellectual qualities.					

Work goals/ Work-related goal progress	1	2	3	4	5
1: Sufficient resources are available for professional Development in school.					
2: The procedures for teacher evaluation are consistent.					
3: Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.					
4: Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.					
5: An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional development.					

Self-efficacy	1	2	3	4	5
1. Help other teachers with their teaching skills.					
2. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.					
3. Teachers have adequate space to work productively.					
4. Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership rules.					
5. Teachers can Express views freely on important school matters.					

Goal support	1	2	3	4	5
1: Teachers collaborate with other teachers for solutions and support.					
2: The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems.					
3: Follow up is provided from professional development.					
4: Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.					
5: Teaching provides a secure future.					

References

- Abbas, M., Raja, U., Darr, W., & Bouckennooghe, D. (2014). Combined effects of perceived politics and psychological capital on job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and performance. *Journal of Management, 40*(7), 1813-1830.
- Akram, M., Malik, M. I., Sarwar, M., Anwer, M., & Ahmad, F. (2015). Relationship of teacher competence with professional commitment and job satisfaction at secondary level. *International Journal of AYER, 4*, 58-70.
- Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2016). Teachers' views of their school climate and its relationship with teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Learning Environments Research, 19*(2), 291-307.
- Amin, M., Shah, S., & Tatlah, I. A. (2013). Impact of Principals/Directors' Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction of the Faculty Members: Perceptions of the Faculty Members in a Public University of Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education, 7*(2), 97-112.
- Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2013). The Effect of School Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Educational sciences: Theory and practice, 13*(2), 806-811.
- Babin, B. J., Boles, J. S., & Griffin, M. (2015). The Moderating Role of Service Environment on the Customer Share Customer Commitment Relationship *New Meanings for Marketing in a New Millennium* (pp. 266-271): Springer, Cham.
- Badri, M. A., Mohaidat, J., Ferrandino, V., & El Mourad, T. (2013). The social cognitive model of job satisfaction among teachers: Testing and validation. *International Journal of Educational Research, 57*, 12-24.
- Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. California: Sage Publications.
- Casio, W. (2003). Responsible restructuring: Seeing employees as assets, not costs. *Ivey Business Journal Online, 1-5*. Retrived: <https://iveybusinessjournal.com/publication/responsible-restructuring-seeing-employees-as-assets-not-costs/>
- Chamundeswari, S. (2013). Job satisfaction and performance of school teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 3*(5), 420-428.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2013). *Applied Multiple Regression/ Correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New Jersey: Routledge.

- Cullen, K. L., Edwards, B. D., Casper, W. C., & Gue, K. R. (2014). Employees' adaptability and perceptions of change-related uncertainty: Implications for perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 29*(2), 269-280.
- Demirdag, S. (2015). Assessing teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Middle school teachers. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World (WJEIS), 5*(3), 35-43.
- Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., Marsh, H. W., Kunter, M., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2014). Self-efficacy in classroom management, classroom disturbances, and emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediation analysis of teacher candidates. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(2), 569-585.
- Duffy, R. D., & Lent, R. W. (2009). Test of a social cognitive model of work satisfaction in teachers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*(2), 212-223.
- Equitable Access to Excellent Educator Survey based on North Carolina's Teacher Working Condition 2014, Accessed July 19, 2017, Available: www.k12.wa.us/titleIIA/EquitableAccess/AppendixB.pdf
- Grant, A. M. (2014). Autonomy support, relationship satisfaction and goal focus in the coach-coachee relationship: which best predicts coaching success? *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 7*(1), 18-38.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (2011). *The Motivation to Work*. Newbruswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Hosford, S., & O'Sullivan, S. (2016). A climate for self-efficacy: the relationship between school climate and teacher efficacy for inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 20*(6), 604-621.
- Hui, H., Jenatabadi, H. S., Ismail, B., Azina, N., Radzi, W. M., & Jasimah, C. W. (2014). Principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction: A case study in China. *Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research 5*(4), 175-184
- Hyvönen, K., Feldt, T., Salmela-Aro, K., Kinnunen, U., & Mäkikangas, A. (2009). Young managers' drive to thrive: A personal work goal approach to burnout and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*(2), 183-196.
- Jordan, G., Miglič, G., Todorović, I., & Marič, M. (2017). Psychological Empowerment, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Among Lecturers in Higher Education: Comparison of Six CEE Countries. *Organizacija, 50*(1), 17-32.
- Karim, N., Khan, R. A., & Shamim, A. (2017). Determinants of Job Satisfaction in Schools of Agha Khan Education Board, Karachi. *Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies, 7*(1), 37-47.

- Khany, R., & Tazik, K. (2016). On the relationship between psychological empowerment, trust, and Iranian EFL teachers' job satisfaction: The case of secondary school teachers. *Journal of Career Assessment, 24*(1), 112-129.
- Koestner, R., Lekes, N., Powers, T. A., & Chicoine, E. (2002). Attaining personal goals: self-concordance plus implementation intentions equals success, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(1): 231-234
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2006). On conceptualizing and assessing social cognitive constructs in career research: A measurement guide. *Journal of Career Assessment, 14*(1), 12-35.
- Liu, X. S., & Meyer, J. P. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of their jobs: A multilevel analysis of the teacher follow-up survey for 1994-95. *Teachers College Record, 107*(5), 985-1003.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*(5), 265-268.
- Looney, S. W. (1995). How to use tests for univariate normality to assess multivariate normality. *The American Statistician, 49*(1), 64-70.
- Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *The Academy of Management Executive, 16*(1), 57-72.
- Moulding, L. R., Stewart, P. W., & Dunmeyer, M. L. (2014). Pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy: Relationship to academic ability, student teaching placement characteristics, and mentor support. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 41*, 60-66.
- Nie, Y., Chua, B. L., Yeung, A. S., Ryan, R. M., & Chan, W. Y. (2015). The importance of autonomy support and the mediating role of work motivation for well-being: Testing self-determination theory in a Chinese work organisation. *International Journal of Psychology, 50*(4), 245-255.
- Righetti, F., Kumashiro, M., & Campbell, S. B. (2014). Goal difficulty and openness to interpersonal goal support. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*(9), 1107-1118.
- Rodríguez, S., Regueiro, B., Blas, R., Valle, A., Piñeiro, I., & Cerezo, R. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and its relationship with students' affective and motivational variables in higher education. *European Journal of Education and Psychology, 7*(2), 107-120.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports, 114*(1), 68-77.

- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal structure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*(Oct-17), 152-160.
- Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1993). Teacher efficacy and student problem as factors in special education referral. *The Journal of Special Education, 27*(1), 66-81.
- Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1996). Teacher efficacy: Toward the understanding of a multi-faceted construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*(4), 401-411.
- Tang, S. w., Siu, O. I., & Cheung, F. (2014). A study of work–family enrichment among Chinese employees: The mediating role between work support and job satisfaction. *Applied Psychology, 63*(1), 130-150.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46*(2), 259-293.
- Tickle, B. R., Chang, M., & Kim, S. (2011). Administrative support and its mediating effect on US public school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(2), 342-349.
- Todorova, G., Bear, J. B., & Weingart, L. R. (2014). Can conflict be energizing? A study of task conflict, positive emotions, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(3), 451-466.
- Van den Berghe, L., Soenens, B., Aelterman, N., Cardon, G., Tallir, I. B., & Haerens, L. (2014). Within-person profiles of teachers' motivation to teach: Associations with need satisfaction at work, need-supportive teaching, and burnout. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 15*(4), 407-417.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070.
- Wayne, J. H., Casper, W. J., Matthews, R. A., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Family-supportive organization perceptions and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work–family conflict and enrichment and partner attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(4), 606-624.
- Wiese, B., & Freund, A. (2005). Goal progress makes one happy, or does it? Longitudinal findings from the work domain. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*(2), 287-304.