Spring 3-25-2020

A Comparison of Public and Private School Teachers' Job Satisfaction When Controlling for Policy Perspectives, Individual, and Workplace Characteristics

Christopher Small
csmall13@students.kennesaw.edu

Recommended Citation

A Comparison of Public and Private School Teachers' Job Satisfaction

When Controlling for Policy Perspectives, Individual, and Workplace Characteristics

Research Dissertation submitted by

Christopher Earl Small

Kennesaw State University

———————————————————————————————

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. David Buckman, Chair

Dr. Nicholas Clegorne, Committee Member

Dr. Arvin Johnson, Committee Member

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. To Tracy Small, thank you for taking care of our family as I spent almost every weekend of the past three years working to achieve this goal. You are an amazing wife and I know that the completion of this dissertation would not be possible without your support. Also, I am thankful for the support of my children. To Cody, Colin, and Cole, I know you value education as much as I do. As you begin your careers, my hope is that you will always find importance in being a leader and a student. Finally, to Isabella, you are an incredibly supportive daughter. You were my cheerleader, encouraging me and reminding me that soon I would be ready for graduation.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the three members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Buckman, my committee chair, thank you for your steadfast approach to keeping me motivated and also thank you for your compassion and patience as I experienced the highs and lows of this research and writing process. Thank you, Dr. Nicholas Clegorne and Dr. Arvin Johnson for agreeing to be a part of my committee. Your time spent as part of my committee is greatly appreciated.

To Dr. Nathan Hand, thank you for asking me to join you in this pursuit of an advanced degree. You were first a mentor to me in school leadership and then a peer in graduate school; however, the most significant relationship has been our friendship. I value our conversations about education and leadership. I look forward to celebrating our completion of this journey.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the empirical literature concerning the factors that contribute to the job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers. Furthermore, an emphasis is placed on how policy, procedures, and workplace characteristics affect levels of job satisfaction. This study focused on other contributing factors of job satisfaction such as personal attributes, human capital, occupational characteristics, and school characteristics. Inferential statistics concluded that there was a statistically significant difference between the job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

A worker's satisfaction with their job is critical for an organization to sustain a healthy and productive workforce (Chalofsky & Krisha, 2009; Likert, 1961; Truxillo, Bauer, & Erdogan, 2016). Organizations that collectively have satisfied workers are said to have a culture that is abundant in collaboration, autonomy, and shared trust (Argyris, 1964; Likert, 1961). As such, one's satisfaction with their job can ultimately lead to positive effects on organizational morale. For example, when pleased with their work environment, satisfied employees will communicate positive remarks about the workplace to other co-workers, which assist in fostering a positive organization culture (Ostroff, 1992). Conversely, dissatisfied workers are said to have behaviors and attitudes that can be harmful to an organization (Ostroff, 1992). It is important that leadership and human resources officers acknowledge organization components that influence employee dissatisfaction because dissatisfied workers have been known to initiate interruptive behaviors that can distress the production and function of the organization (e.g., worker strikes, acute absenteeism, insubordinate behaviors) (Ostroff, 1992).

Teachers that are satisfied with their job are said to make a significant contribution to the academic success of the school (Ostroff, 1992). For instance, teachers that are satisfied with the workplace are reported to have substantial influence on the morale of teachers and students (Ma & McMillian, 1999). Specifically, in Ma and McMillian's study, the researchers specified teachers that were satisfied with the classroom indicated they felt positive about their content knowledge and their ability to apply their knowledge in their instructional practices. Ma and McMillian (1999) concluded that feelings of job satisfaction lead to teachers feeling confident

1

about their effectiveness in the classroom, which increased the likelihood of them being prepared each day to teach lessons and handle student behaviors. Conversely, teachers who are unprepared can be deemed ineffective, and when a teacher is ineffective, students can lose an entire year of academic growth (Hanushek, 1992).

Stakeholders in education (i.e., students, parents, administrators) are annually dependent on teachers to provide quality instruction (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006). However, an alarming rate of teachers are changing jobs each year or moving to a different school. In fact, in 2011-2012 it was reported that approximately 270,000 public school teachers changed schools or chose a different career (Goldring, Taie, Riddles, & The U.S. Department of Education, 2014). More pointedly, in the state of Georgia, it is reported that in the first five years of teaching, 44% of teachers leave the profession (Owens & GADOE, 2015).

In a survey conduct by the Georgia Department of Education, teachers stated that mandated tests were a significant reason for their decision to leave the profession (Owens & GADOE, 2015). In addition, teachers responded negatively because their evaluation system was too reliant on test scores and not subject to other factors of the job. They also noted negative perceptions of the profession were due to a lack of teacher input in educational policy (Owens & GADOE, 2015). As noted above, providing quality instruction is not as clear cut in that teachers are at the mercy of policies that control curriculum (Jennings & Rentner, 2006; Murnane & Papay, 2010).

To better educate students through quality instruction, research has identified factors at the teacher level that can influence job performance such as job satisfaction (Crossman & Harris, 2006; Ingersoll, 2001; Kim & Loadman, 1994; Perie & Baker, 1997). Job satisfaction is described as one's personal perception of the working environment, attitudes surrounding the

work, and relationships with co-workers (Herzberg, 1968; Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997). The construct of job satisfaction has been examined by practitioners for over a century. In terms of evaluation, research has categorized the measurement of job satisfaction by a global approach and a faceted approach. Rogelberg (2007) describes the global approach as an overall perception that labels work as satisfying or dissatisfying; while, the faceted approach highlights specific elements of the job (i.e., work it-self, pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers) (Rogelberg, 2007).

Theoretical Framing

Multiple frameworks have been utilized to theoretically identify what factors influence one's satisfaction with their job. Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller, and Remus (2001) theorize that one's perception of their satisfaction with work is based on two constructs, 1) a cognitive approach (i.e., intellectual processing) and 2) an affective approach (i.e., emotional processing). When describing thoughts about job satisfaction, the cognitive approach applies logic (i.e., intellectual reasoning) to describe job satisfaction. Additionally, an affective approach is an interpretation of feelings and attitudes about the job. Both the cognitive and affective approaches are the foundation of the theoretical framing of the job satisfaction construct (Judge et al., 2001).

The literature describes the framework in three different categories: 1) situational theories 2) dispositional approaches, and 3) interactive theories (Judge et al., 2001). Job satisfaction, described by situational theories, focuses on the worker's environment, the work it-self, and characteristics of the job. Theories applied in this framework are the two factor theory (Herzberg, 1959), the job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldman, 1976), and the social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978).

Herzberg's two factor theory is explicated by motivation and hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1959). The two factor theory indicates that job satisfaction can only be achieved by motivation factors (e.g., promotion, advancement, professional growth). Conversely, hygiene factors (e.g., policy, pay, supervision) can only affect job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959). While practical in application, the two factor theory has been refuted by several researchers (Park, Lovrich, & Soden, 1988; Ruthankoon & Ogunlana, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1967). In sum, the aforementioned studies have concluded that motivation and hygiene factors are not polarizing and can operate together and lead to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Work characteristics and the relationship with internal motivation are described in the job characteristics theory. Hackman and Oldman (1976) based their theory on particular components of work or work characteristics (i.e., work it-self, the significance of work, the variety of work, the autonomy of work). When all characteristics are attained, the model concludes that one can experience any or all of the three psychological states (i.e., meaningfulness of work, the experience of responsibility, knowledge of results). Conceptually, experiencing all three psychological states results in higher levels of job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldman, 1975; Hackman & Oldman, 1976).

The social information processing theory is described by one's social interactions at work. Miller, Ellis, Zook, and Lyles (1990) indicate these social interactions are shaped by conversations and observations that take place at work. Social influences and the impact they have on job satisfaction is most supported in the research conducted by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978). Ultimately, the researchers purport that job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is achieved by one's experience of stress at work and influences via co-workers.

A dispositional approach, supported by Weiss and Adler (1984), describes factors leading to job satisfaction by examining one's emotional state (i.e., feelings, attitudes). In addition, personality traits, self-efficacy, and one's evaluation of themselves are the basis for the following theoretical approaches: *job attitudes approach* (Staw & Ross, 1985), *cognitive/personality traits* (Judge & Locke, 1993), and *core-valuations* (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). Although, when compared to the situational theories, the dispositional approach lacks a depth of history; the concept of personality traits and job attitudes continue to be a viable determinant of job satisfaction (Bui, 2017; Staw & Ross, 1985).

Whereas situational theories and dispositional approaches loosely share elements of the work it-self and personality traits, the interactive theories combine the work, the situation, and one's personality traits to describe job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001). Theories in the interactive framework are the *Cornell model* (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), the *expectancy motivation theory* (Vroom, 1964), and the *value percept theory* (Locke, 1976). Each theory has unique features; however, all three incorporate a method that studies psychological states (i.e., emotions, attitudes, effort, motivation) and characteristic of the job (i.e., pay, workload, supervision, feedback) at the same time (Judge et al., 2001; Locke, 1976; Smith et al., 1969; Vroom, 1964). The theories introduced in this chapter will be explained further in chapter two and will be used to support factors that influence job satisfaction and assist in interpreting the findings of the study.

Background

A summary of federal policy will be introduced to aid in understanding how control of curriculum and instructional procedures have evolved in the public school. The intent to influence states with federal policy was motivated by the growing need to address students in

low poverty areas, as well as provide equity in education for minority students (United States General Accounting Office, 2006). Furthermore, Strickland (1985) described that federal education policy was created to compete globally with other countries in math, science, and technology. The policies recognized at the forefront of federal influence are the National Defense Education Act of 1957 and the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA).

In the mid-20th century, federal policy had only provided guidelines for the use of federal funds. Moreover, states and local school districts had control of curriculum and education policies. However, the reauthorization of the ESEA in 1994 (i.e., Improving America's School Act) claimed a footing in the control of curriculum with standards-based reform. Additionally, in 2001, another reauthorizing of ESEA (i.e., No Child Left Behind) contributed the stoutest measures of curriculum, assessment, and accountability control (Heck & Chang, 2017; Jennings & Rentner, 2006; Vinovskis, 2015).

Teachers have reported job strain from the effects of curriculum control and increased accountability measures in teacher evaluations (Farber, 1991; Friedman, 1991; McNeil, 2000; Smith 1991). Jennings and Rentner (2006) suggested that teachers have less autonomy because of the recommended procedures (i.e., continuous test preparation) used to increase standardized test scores. Murnane and Papay (2010) found teachers to be less satisfied with the profession because of the loss of control to make instructional decisions in the classroom. Research in the area of teacher perceptions of the education system conclude that external control factors and increased accountability measures have led to issues of role conflict, poor self-efficacy, teacher burnout, and teacher attrition (Byrne, 1994; Kakananen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010).

The academic culture of public schools has predominately focused on strong accountability measures (i.e., standardized tests, school improvement plans) for three decades ("Helping America Reach High Standards," 1997; "Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education," 2018; No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002). Because of the increased measures, school leaders (i.e., principals) have experienced pressures that influence their management of teachers. Berryhill, Linney, and Fromewick (2009) indicated that teachers are overly concerned with getting un-satisfactory evaluations because principals place too much emphasis on test results, and therefore, only focus on achievement and not other components of the job when evaluating.

Crum and Sherman (2008) posited that the post-NCLB era led to accountability changes for school principals. For example, principals in the Post-NCLB era have increased pressures to construct school improvement plans that address goals to increase student achievement to meet the prescribed achievement metrics administered by the state (Crum & Sherman, 2008; Gonzalez & Firestone, 2013). As such, the responsibilities of leading change to increase academic achievement have increased the work related stress associated with being a principal (i.e., instructional leader) and has resulted in changes in principal behaviors and attitudes that affect teachers job satisfaction (Balyer, 2012; Gonzalez & Firestone, 2013; Malloy & Allen, 2007). For example, researchers have indicated a principal's attitude when providing teacher support, feedback, and management can significantly influence a teacher's perception of their job or job satisfaction (Aydin, Sarier, & Uysal, 2013; Balyer, 2012; Mally & Allen, 2007).

Supervision is just one of the characteristics that influence one's perception and attitude about the job. Other characteristics such as recognition, pay, social interactions, and workload are also significant factors in measuring levels of job satisfaction (Milkovich & Newman, 2008;

Singh, 2016; Spector, 1997). For instance, specific feedback (i.e., verbal appreciation) related to work and effort is reported to increase one's level of satisfaction with their job (Singh, 2016).

Pay is another significant factor that considerably influences job satisfaction. The literature expands on the construct of pay by defining other compensation elements that contribute to job satisfaction such as salary schedules, raises, and benefits (Heneman & Schawab, 1985). Additionally, these factors of pay can be measured independently, and combined to create an overall level of pay satisfaction. Buckman, Tran, and Young (2016) and their pay satisfaction study demonstrates that pay is such a powerful construct that it can be used in research as a sole dependent variable.

Lastly, working conditions (i.e., social interactions) and workload (i.e., hours worked or effort given at work in piece rate models) also contribute to one's perception of being satisfied with their job (Burke, Borucki, & Hurley, 1992). For a teacher, the social interactions that take place on a daily basis are with students, administrators, and other faculty members (i.e. stakeholders). Additionally, the teacher's emotional and physical capacity is impacted by each one of these relationships (Burke et al., 1992). To add, a teacher's workload can be classified as quantitative and qualitative work (Spector, 1997). A teacher's quantitative workload can be summed by days and hours of contractual obligation (Podgursky, 2003); while a qualitative workload can be defined in terms of physical and emotional effort (e.g., effort given to lesson planning) (Horn, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2004; McNeil, 2000; Murnan & Papay, 2010).

Factors that contribute to job satisfaction are the same in both the public and private school settings. However, the public and private school teacher perceive the factors that lead to job satisfaction differently. Kennedy (2004) explains that the private school can be more attractive to teachers or teacher candidates because of the freedom to make decisions in the

classroom and the support received from the administration. McGrath and Princiotta (2005) suggest that teachers refrain from turning over employment in the private school setting because of the positive working environment and shared values and beliefs of the school staff.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of public and private schools on teacher job satisfaction after controlling for perceptions of curriculum control (i.e., policies) as well as workplace and personal characteristics. Job satisfaction research has supported that satisfied employees have greater output (Hackman & Oldman, 1975; Locke, 1976). In the education system, output can be defined by a teachers potential to provide students a quality education based on metrics of student achievement and further vindicates the importance of studying teacher job satisfaction (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). This study also shed light on teacher attributes (i.e., age, race, gender) that affect job satisfaction and the findings can be used to provide school districts with personnel characteristic information that can assist in identifying strategies to better serve all teachers and aid in decision making.

To conclude, better understanding job satisfaction can impact schools and school districts in multiple areas, which include but are not limited to: 1) recruitment and retention of teachers, 2) teacher performance, and 3) indirect influences on student achievement. Teacher job satisfaction as an area of research highlights the external factors and internal factors that contribute to a teacher's commitment to the profession. In a similar manner, this study will examine the aspects of job satisfaction, which include work it-self, pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers, and curriculum and instruction oversight to determine the job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers. By doing so, this study's findings can potentially provide insight on an area that has limited research (i.e., private schools) and assist in determining if these two school types differ in terms of employee perceptions of satisfaction.

Research Question

As stated above, this study analyzed the job satisfaction of both public and private school teachers. Public and private school teachers were used to determine if two focal positions influenced job satisfaction differently among teachers on the basis that one is governed by state and national educational policy (i.e., public schools) and the other is influenced by an internal governing system (i.e., private schools). The following research question guided this study:

1. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers as measured by the JDI score when potential covariates have been controlled?

Hypothesis

H_0: There is no significant difference between public school teacher and private school teacher job satisfaction as measured by the summative JDI scores when potential covariates have been controlled.

Statistical Method

To address the aforementioned research question and hypothesis, the following procedures were conducted. A block wise multiple regression procedure was completed to identify the relationship between the independent variable, dependent variable, and covariates. The data was entered in a simultaneous order using an ordinary least squares method to estimate unknown parameters in the linear model. An analysis of the data was conducted using the Statistics Package for Social Science (SPSS).

The first multiple regression block was an examination of all covariates and their relationship with the dependent variable to determine the amount of variance the covariates

account for in the model. The covariates identified for the study are categorized by a) personal attributes, b) human capital elements, c) workplace characteristics, and d) curriculum oversight. The covariates assisted in reducing statistical error by controlling for elements that influence job satisfaction outside of the independent variable and aided in determining if there was a statistical difference between the job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers. In total, 11 factors serve as covariates: 1) age, 2) gender, 3) race, 4) years of experience, 5) highest level of education, 6) salary, 7) contractual workdays, 8) student enrollment, 9) geographic region, 10) curriculum control, and 11) professional discretion.

The second regression block analyzed the entire model with all covariates and the independent variable. Type of school teacher (i.e., Georgia public vs. Georgia private) served as the independent variable. The level of significance or alpha level used to reject or accept the null hypothesis was set at 0.05. This criteria also applied for determining the significance of all other variables.

Definition of Terms

1. A Nation at Risk – is a report and not a policy that was issued by the Secretary of Education in 1983 (United States National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984).

2. Burnout – is physical and emotional exhaustion from working to intensely, as well as depersonalization of effectiveness (Byrne, 1994; Langelaan, Bakker, Van Doornen, & Schaufeli, 2006).

3. Compulsory Attendance Laws – are state laws that require school age children to attend school (Baines, 2006).

4. Dispositional Approaches – are theories that consider one's personality and character traits (Weiss & Adler, 1984).

5. Improving America's School Act of 1994 – is the federal policy that started standards-based education ("Helping America Reach High Standards," 1997).

6. Interactive Theories – Theories that consider both personal traits and the work to explain one satisfaction with work (Judge et al., 2001).

7. Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 – is a reauthorization of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (Darling-Hammond, Marks, United States, & Rand Corporation, 1983).

8. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 – is one of the first federal policies that addressed the needs of at-risk students (i.e., socioeconomic disadvantaged students). (Kennedy, Birman, & Demaline, 1986; United States General Accounting Office, 2000).

9. Every Student Succeeds Act – signed by President Barack Obama in 2015 with the intention of changing requirements mandated by No Child Left Behind (Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education, 2018).

10. Industrial Psychology – is the science and study of behaviors and attitudes in the workplace (Truxillo et al., 2016).

11. Job Facets – Global concepts in the working environment that are captured in categories (i.e., recognition/feedback, pay, working conditions, and supervision) (Smith et al., 1969; Locke, 1976).

12. Job Satisfaction – is one's optimistic description of their emotional state in the workplace (Locke, 1976).

13. Lemon v. Kurtzman – a Supreme Court decision in 1971 that separated the use of public funding for private education ("Lemon v. Kurtzman," 2018).

14. Motivators – are intrinsic factors associated with Herzberg's two factory theory. Intrinsic factors according to the theory are achievement, recognition, growth, the work itself. (Aziri, 2011).

15. National Defense Education Act 1958 – is one of the first federal education policies to affect the curriculum in the classroom. ("National Defense Education Programs," 1963).

16. No Child Left Behind – is a reauthorization of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Signed by President George W. Bush. This bill continued standardized based reform in education with additional accountability requirements for teachers and school districts (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002).

17. Pierce v. Society of Sisters – is the Supreme Court case that provides parents the choice to send their children to private schools (Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 1925).

18. Public Education – is an educational opportunity for all school-age children regulated and funded by federal, state, and local government ("Home | U.S. Department of Education," 2018).

19. Private Education – is an educational organization that is independent and absent of government funding and policy (Balossi & Hernandez, 2016).

20. Self-Efficacy – is the belief that one has to achieve a goal (Bandura, 1982).

21. Situational Theories – are theories based on one's work environment, social situations, and the work itself (Judge et al., 2001).

22. Standardized Assessment – are common standardized tests used to compare student achievement locally, statewide, and nationally (Hamilton, Stecher, & Yuan, 2008; Kauffman, Johnson, Kardos, Liu, & Peske, 2002,).

23. Standardized Curriculum – are a common set of learning targets theorized to create a more rigorous curriculum (Resknick & Resnick, 1992).

24. Standards Based Reform – is a national movement in education to standardized curriculum and assessments (Resknick & Resnick, 1992).

25. U.S. Department of Education – was founded in 1980 and is a department of the federal government that creates policy, collects education data, and provides funding for each state ("Home | U.S. Department of Education," 2018).

26. Wisconsin v. Yonder – a Supreme Court case decided in 1972. The Supreme Court's decision gave parents the right to exercise religious beliefs and have the option of education outside of public or private school (Bybee, 1996; Wisconsin v. Yonder, 1972).

Chapter Two

Review of the Related Literature

To gain an understanding of whether or not employment at private or public school settings influences the job satisfaction of educators, one must take an in-depth review of empirical literature. This literature review will provide a detailed framework of public and private school operations with an emphasis on federal case law, federal legislation, and characteristics of schools. In addition, the aforementioned components will be explored to identifiy their influence on the teaching profession. From the 1600's to the late 1800's, education was primarily for the wealthy; however, in 1852, Massachusetts passed the first compulsory school attendance law which enforced that all children be educated throughout the elementary ages (i.e., eight to fourteen) (Baines, 2006).

This law was credited to Horace Mann, the father of the common school movement. His work, based on his belief that the wealthy should not be the only individuals entitled to an education, initiated the movement for public schooling (Hinsdale, 1898). By the turn of the century, the compulsory school attendance law was ratified by most states, and by 1918, all children were provided access to a free education (Baines, 2006). Over the next 100 years, public education was continuously evaluated and modified to keep pace with competing nations and to ensure an equitable education was provided to all students (Baines, 2006).

A History of Public School Policy, Procedures, and Characteristics

The federal department of education was established in 1867 ("Federal Role in Education," 2017) and was developed to provide a common place for states to share school district information as well as instructional strategies to help support effective school systems ("National Defense Education Programs," 1963). In the early 1900's, the federal government

began an era of financial support to all states and provided funds for vocational training in the areas of industrial work, agriculture, and independent living skills. As the United States approached 1960, federal involvement in education became a priority with the National Defense Education Act (NDEA).

National Defense Education Act

On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union launched a satellite (i.e., Sputnik) that could orbit the earth and, as a result, created a sense of vulnerability for the United States (Strickland, 1985). Because of the scientific community's reaction to Sputnik, federal leaders reviewed the United States progress in the race for space and the Soviet Union's position as a national threat (Gaidar, 2007). This period, also known as the cold war, presented an urgency for schools to increase their focus on math, science, and technology, in addition to advocating for students to further their education by enrolling in colleges and universities (Strickland, 1985).

Through the passing of the NDEA in 1958, the federal government increased its influence on public education by providing funding to support classroom instruction ("National Defense Education Programs," 1963). For example, Title III of the NDEA offered grant opportunities to school systems that put forth initiatives to make school improvements as well as provided funding for special science equipment in support of technology initiatives ("National Defense Education Programs," 1963). Ultimately, the NDEA aided the educational needs of elementary, secondary, and post-secondary aged students ("National Defense Education Programs," 1963).

To support students graduating from high school and entering post-secondary education, Title II of the NDEA established a federal student loan program. In addition, to increase the number of effective educators teaching in U.S. public schools, students who graduated from college and became teachers were provided student loan forgiveness (i.e., credit for each year

taught for up to ten years) ("National Defense Education Programs," 1963). In sum, the NDEA was a reaction to the Sputnik movement and created a system where states depended on federal funding to support local public schools. This form of federal support would serve as a precursor to the renowned Elementary and Secondary Education Act ("Elementary and Secondary Education Act the Legislation," 2018).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

The sixties decade brought to the forefront issues of civil rights and an awareness of differences among American families. Lyndon Johnson, the 36th president of the United States, used education as a way to level the so-called playing field for racial diversity, socioeconomic diversity, and language diversity ("Elementary and Secondary Education Act · The Legislation," 2018). On April 9, 1965, Johnson signed The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This bill provided a substantial amount of funding for socio-economically disadvantages students and provided resources for teachers (i.e., classroom supplies and professional development opportunities) (United States General Accounting Office, 2000).

Since 1965, the ESEA has been revised eight times and each revision has added more procedures for school districts to follow (Kennedy et al., 1986). In addition, educators have experienced added responsibilities (i.e., requirements to show evidence of student growth) (Kennedy et al., 1986; "H.R.3941 - 97th Congress (1981-1982): Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981", 1981; Knapp, United States, & SRI International, 1989). As each revision has affected education, four revisions have had significant influences on educators.

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA). Ronald Regan, the 40th President of The United States, intended to decrease the mandates of federal policy on public education. The reauthorization of ESEA in 1981 changed the federal government's involvement

in education with decreased regulations. In addition, significant amounts of funds were reduced from each state (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983). The Regan era in education put the responsibility of education back on the states and local school systems. By the next decade, a new presidential administration planned to reform education with a standardized system of changes for school administrators, teachers, and students (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983).

Improving America's School Act (IASA). On October 20, 1994, President Bill Clinton signed into law The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 ("Helping America Reach High Standards," 1997). The purpose of the IASA was to replenish the millions of dollars cut from the reauthorization in 1981. As a result, the additional funds provided resources for school reform in the areas of literacy, curriculum standards, and professional development for teachers ("Helping America Reach High Standards," 1997). In Addition, IASA began a movement to nationalize education with expectations for high standards for students and teachers ("Helping America Reach High Standards," 1997).

No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Public Law 107-110, titled No Child Left Behind, was another reauthorization of the ESEA of 1965 (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002). The reauthorization again addressed the need to improve the achievement gap in socio-economically disadvantaged students, but with more requirements to show evidence of improvements (No Child Left behind Act of 2001, 2002; Vinovskis, 2015). NCLB created standards for each state to follow, with specific expectations in the areas of standardized tests, measured student growth, and—for the first time in federal policy—penalties for schools not making improvements (No Child Left behind Act of 2001, 2002). This new system of accountability in education affected teachers in many ways (i.e., proffesional certification, teacher evaluations, classroom instructon, and assessment of student learning) (Stevenson & Sims, 2002).

Accountability was a significant component of NCLB, and empirical literature continues to explain the impact that NCLB has had on students, teachers, administrators, and school communities (Heck & Chang, 2017). Because of NCLB, more students are now being exposed to high standards of instruction for math, reading, and science (Heck & Chang, 2017). Nonetheless, teachers are spending less time on other subjects such as social studies, physical education, and fine arts (Jennings & Rentner, 2006). In sum, NCLB produced increased learning results in math and reading, set high expectations for each public school, and required each teacher to be highly qualified, but adverse effects from this policy have been documented in non-high stakes teaching areas (Jennings & Rentner, 2006).

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). According to the National Education Association (2016), since NCLB, public education has experienced improvements on standardized test results and graduation rates. Conversely, the growth was not enough to keep schools from being considered failing according to the regulations of NCLB ("With Passage of Every Student Succeeds Act, Life after NCLB Begins - NEA Today," 2016). Over the course of a decade, adjustments were needed; therefore, the next reauthorization of ESEA created modifications that allowed states to gain back their independence from layers of federal policy ("With Passage of Every Student Succeeds Act, Life after NCLB Begins - NEA Today," 2016).

Barack Obama, the 44th President of The United States, identified the need to reauthorize ESEA with significant changes ("Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education," 2018). The critical changes signed in to law on December 10, 2015, addressed standardized testing and the evaluation of schools and teachers (Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education," 2018). As a result of the changes in ESSA, states were given the opportunity to develop new systems of accountability (i.e., the use of multiple sources

of data) that were more conducive to the demographics and geographic location of their schools (Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education," 2018).

Standards Based Education

Federal policy has influenced the professional culture of schools, as a result, teachers have experienced higher levels of stress from the changes in professional duties, curriculum standards, and testing (Bozeman, Scoggin, & Stuessy, 2013; Kauffman et. al., 2002). The empirical literature continues to address how federal policy has influenced instructional practices, student achievement, and the quality of educators (Swanson & Stevenson, 2002). Elmore (1993) explains the federal role in education before 1980 had mainly focused on funds provided to states. It was not until 1983 that the federal government attempted to make a direct impact on four main areas: 1) curriculum content, 2) the amount of time students are in school, 3) expectations for school leaders, and 4) expectations for educators (Hewitt, 2008; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

A Nation at Risk. In 1983, Secretary of Education, T.H. Bell, formed the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) (Vinovskis, 2015). The commission created a report about the current state of education in The United States. The document titled "A Nation at Risk" was not a bill; it was merely a message from the federal government detailing a call for all stakeholders to take responsibility for the education of all students (United States National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984).

A benchmark for improvements was set with a comparison of the American education system too many foreign education systems, and over the course of eighteen months, the commission made specific recommendations about work expectations for teachers. Those suggestions were: 7 hours of daily instruction, 180 or more days of instruction, and 11-month

contracts (Hewitt, 2008; United States National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984). As a result, leaders in education made the requested changes, and since that time, several recommendations continue to be a part of the culture for educators (Hewitt, 2008).

Standards-based reform. Before the standards-based initiative, teachers were using textbooks to teach basic skills and historical knowledge (Resknick & Resnick, 1992). The history of the standards movement was based on the theory that students needed a rigorous curriculum to obtain higher order thinking skills for complex problem-solving (Resknick & Resnick, 1992). Furthermore, by the mid-1990s, teaching to standards (i.e. a common curriculum) was becoming the norm. As standards developed, so did the implementation of standardized tests (Hamilton et. al., 2008). As the standards based movement grew, teachers experienced conflict with common standards that may not be appropriate for all demographics and large-scale assessments that did not always align with the standards (Hamilton et. al., 2008).

Standards-based assessment. Standardized tests are now a part of the culture in elementary, middle, and high schools. The test scores continue to be one of the main sources for measured school success (Hamilton et. al., 2008; Kaufmann et. al., 2002). Ravitch (2013) suggests that the standards-based reform movement, specifically the use of standardized tests, used shortcuts for school improvement. Consequently, teachers continued to experience added pressure to teach to a test (Diamond, 2007). Because of standards-based curriculum and its accompanied assessment, it is purported that teachers in the public school system persistently struggle with the conflict of adhering to both federal policy and researched based instructional practices in regards to enhancing student achievement (Diamond, 2007).

A History of Private School Policy, Procedures, and Characteristics

The empirical literature is limited in research on private school educators. Nevertheless, private schools and their educators are a major source of educational opportunity in the United States ("CAPE | Private School Facts," 2018). The next section will explore the history of elementary and secondary private education. Furthermore, this section of the literature review will examine federal influence on private school policy, private education procedures, and the characteristics of private education.

Private schools are educational opportunities that are non-public (i.e., receive no public funding) and are defined by two main categories independent (i.e., governed by a single entity or board) and parochial (i.e., religious) (Balossi & Hernandez, 2016). Additional literature describes three specific types of private schools: 1) religious schools, 2) schools for specific populations, and 3) specific pedagogy and curriculum experiences ("CAPE | Private School Facts," 2018). The attendance numbers have maintained consistency over the past several decades with 90 percent of school-aged students attending public schools and the remaining 10 percent attending private schools ("CAPE | Private School Facts," 2018; Jones, 2008; Murphy, Louis, & American Educational Research Association, 1999). The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) (2017) reported the following findings for the 2015-2016 school year:

- 34,576 private elementary and secondary schools established

- 4,903,596 enrolled students in private schools

- 481,558 full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers in private schools

- 142 students were the average amount enrolled in all private schools

Private education is rooted in autonomy and rights of parents to exercise freedom to choose private education. The next section will describe the Federal Supreme Courts influence on private schooling.

Supreme Court: The Influence of Federal Case Law

Pierce v. Society of Sisters. Public education in the United States is a right that all have; however, parents have the authority to choose to have their child educated outside of the public school system per Pierce v. Society of Sisters (U.S. Department of Education: Office of Innovation and Improvement Office of Non-Public Education, 2009). In Pierce v. Society of Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, the Supreme Court ruled each child of the state was required to attend school according to the compulsory school attendance law. However, the choice lies in the decision of the parents as to whom they want to educate their child, and where they want their child to be educated (Abrams, 2009; Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 1925). Since the Supreme Court decision, private schooling has been an option in all 50 states. In addition, each state has the responsibility to regulate a system of accountability to make sure each child in each state has an educational opportunity (U.S. Department of Education: Office of Innovation and Improvement Office of Non-Public Education, 2009).

According to Jones (2008), Pierce v. Society of Sisters gave parents the right to have their children schooled in a religious setting and not in the common public school where cultural norms and national pride of the United States were taught. Consequently, this ruling was not nationally supported. Common public schools were developed to share diversity among socio-economic groups and help bridge gaps in religion and idealization (Jones, 2008). Furthermore, the next section will describe how beliefs systems influenced court rulings at the state and federal level.

Wisconsin v. Yonder. Major influence from federal and state law in education rests in case law where the Supreme Court has made rulings that guide the relationship between federal and state association with private schools as well as parental rights. In the early 20th century, states increased the compulsory attendance law requiring students to complete secondary school, and in Wisconsin, it was defined as two extra years after the 8th grade ("Wisconsin v. Yoder 406 U.S. 205 (1972)," 2018). The case of Wisconsin v. Jonas Yoder became relevant to private education when the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled in favor of Yoder and ruled that three Amish boys did not have to attend school after the 8th grade due to their freedom of religion rights ("Wisconsin v. Yoder 406 U.S. 205 (1972)," 2018). The Amish community and the parents of the three boys believed that the boys had enough formal education. Furthermore, the Amish community believed boys should start working in the community and learn vocational training ("Wisconsin v. Yoder 406 U.S. 205 (1972)," 2018).

The state of Wisconsin appealed this ruling to the Federal Supreme Court, and on May 15th, 1972 the ruling came in support of Yoder ("Wisconsin v. Yoder 406 U.S. 205 (1972)," 2018). Wisconsin v. Yoder is significant as states use this ruling as a mark to make state requirements for private education (e.g., attendance, accreditation). Therefore, since Wisconsin v. Yoder, states have continued to develop methods to monitor private education (ByBee, 1996; "Home | U.S. Department of Education," 2018).

Required state reports. Private schools do exercise autonomy in many of their policies and procedures; however, there are specific guidelines and information that they must document and share with their particular state. ("Home | U.S. Department of Education," 2018). Each individual state mandates reported information such as: a) accreditation, b) licensing, c) teacher certification, d) length of school day, e) length of school year, f) curriculum, g) record keeping,

h) health and safety requirements, I) tax exemption, j) public aid for private education ("Home |
U.S. Department of Education," 2018). These are the main areas requiring documentation for
private schools to function in their specific state.

Lemon v. Kurtzman. To demonstrate the implication of the involvement of state funds on
private education, in the late sixties Pennsylvania and Rhode Island adopted statutes that
supported funding for private school organizations ("Lemon v. Kurtzman", 2018). In
Pennsylvania, funds were used for private school teacher pay, textbooks, and resources for the
classroom ("Lemon v. Kurtzman," 2018). Similarly, in Rhode Island, state funds were used for
supplementing private school teacher pay ("Lemon v. Kurtzman," 2018.). Both states were sued
by their citizens because they believed that the use of state funds for private education violated
the first amendment of separation of religion and state ("Lemon v. Kurtzman", 2018). The final
decision rested with the Supreme Court with a ruling of 8-1 in decision for Lemon ("Lemon v.
Kurtzman", 2018). In the explanation of the decision, the court expressed that there should be a
clear understanding that states cannot influence private education with funds ("Lemon v.
Kurtzman", 2018). In sum, these three Supreme Court cases built a foundation for the separation
of public and private education with regard to choice in attendance and the use of funds to
influence policy and procedures.

Characteristics of Private Schools

Teachers make choices each year about their employment options and take a host of job
factors, core values, and personal beliefs into consideration (Gamoron, 1996). Gamoran (1996)
explains one main area that separates the public from a private school is a theme or belief
system. Private schools, specifically religious based schools, provide a culture of shared beliefs
among administration, teachers, students, and parents (Gamoran, 1996). The shared belief

increases the social capital (e.g., network of people and relationships) of the school and thus

reflects a perception of having a positive academic environment (Gamoran, 1996).

Choice in private education. Coleman, Hoffner, and Kilgore (1982) indicate a private

school allows parents a choice in academics, attendance policy, and behavior expectations.

Whereas, choice is limited in public school selection due to local school board policy regulations

pertaining to attendance zones. Parents surveyed in 1982, during the time of "A Nation at Risks",

indicated making a choice to send their children to a private school was due to the negative

climate of the public schools (e.g., increased violence, increased drugs, and low academic

standards) (Coleman et al., 1982).

Academic environment. Coleman et al.'s (1982) researched public and private school

student outcomes in vocabulary and mathematics. The research indicated that the private school,

when compared to public schools, did have greater gains in academic achievement. In this

particular study Coleman et al. (1982) discussed the difference between private school policy on

homework and attendance and the policies effect on student learning. According to this study,

the freedom that private schools have to create policy affects student behavior and learning

(Coleman, et al., 1982). In addition, discipline procedures in the private school allowed for the

option of removing students without explanation, while public school districts were required to

continue to educate all students (Coleman et al., 1982).

Private school workplace conditions. Several factors contribute to one seeking

employment in the private school setting: autonomy, student population, administrative support,

mission/beliefs, number of students in a class, and a workplace environment (Akhtar, Hashmi, &

Naqvi, 2010; Kennedy, 2004). In the private school setting, these factors are more controllable

due to the small hierarchy structure and minimal bureaucratic layers (Kennedy, 2004; Shakeel &

DeAngelis, 2016).

The use of federal law to increase student achievement is driven by the concept that more

funding increases the ability of a school to provide a quality education increases (Diamond,

2007; Heck & Chang, 2017; Jennings & Rentner, 2006). Furthermore, standards based reform

has raised expectations for public education. However, the policy of standardizing education has

led to increased amounts of stress for teachers because of the increased accountability measures

(Couch, Shughart, & Williams, 1993). As student population and diversity increases in the

United States, the need for quality teachers in public and private schools will continue to rise.

Therefore, research in the field of job satisfaction for public and private educators remains to be

a relevant topic.

The Impact of Policy, Procedures, and Workplace Characteristics

Strategies used to manage and improve schools can negatively or positively affect job

satisfaction levels for the teacher workforce (Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, & Harrington, 2014).

Federal education policy (i.e., NDEA 1958, ESEA 1965, ECIA 1981, IASA 1994, NCLB 2001,

and ESSA 2015) set out to create opportunities for teachers to better prepare students for post-

high school graduation opportunities (Jennings & Rentner, 2006; National Education Panel,

1999; Pepper, 2010). Similar to public schools, private schools create policy and procedures for

the same purpose (i.e., quality education for students) (Labaree, 1997). In both venues, teachers

are the primary contributor to the overall morale and functioning of the day-to-day operations of

a school (Berryhill et al., 2009). For that reason, to keep a quality teacher workforce, school

leaders must consider policy, procedures, and workplace characteristics as main predictors of job

satisfaction (Guarino et al., 2006; Kim & Loadman, 1994).

Effects of Educational Policy

Sandfort and Moulton (2015) describe policy implementation as a top-down process that starts with a formal policy written by a governing organization, approved by the governing body, and then passed down for implementation. For the implementation stage to be successful, the policy must effectively move through the design, planning, and assessment phases (Sandfort & Moulton, 2015). In addition, for a policy to be operational, it must have support from key actors (i.e., educators) (Sandfort & Moulton, 2015).

Education policy, specifically NCLB, has impacted public education (i.e., elementary and secondary schools) for the past two decades (Pepper, 2010; Vinovskis, 2015). Additionally, the process of school reform has created popular terms such as high stakes testing and standards-based reform (Hannaway & Kimball, 1998). Moreover, in the era of school reform policy, six key elements were highlighted for change (Hannaway & Kimball, 1998):

- Content and performance standards set at high expectations for all students
- Taking the standard and aligning curriculum and instructional material
- Linking assessments to the standards
- The standards linked to professional development
- School and district accountability linked to student performance
- Parent and community partnerships with schools (pg. 8)

To implement these expectations, specific players (i.e., district administrators, school-level administrators, and teachers) were identified as solutions to creating change (Sandfort & Moulton, 2015; Vinovskis, 2015). The literature states that school leadership can affect learning in the classroom; however, that influence is secondary to the classroom teacher (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Furthermore, school administrators have established, in

policy procedures, that teachers will endure the responsibility of student achievement (Hannaway & Kimball, 1998; Mintrop & Trujillo, 2005).

Murnane and Papay's (2010) review of the literature indicates teachers praise the intention of the NCLB. Teachers expressed the policy focused needed attention on the students that were at risk of failing or dropping out of school (Murnane & Papay, 2010). Consequently, teachers do point out the effect of raising test scores to show proficiently in the core areas of reading, math, and science have produced negative consequences for the teaching profession (Murnane & Papay, 2010).

Autonomy. Procedures and expectations have changed since the dawn of the standards based reform era, and it has affected teacher's autonomy to make decisions in the classroom (Jennings & Rentner, 2006). Teachers now struggle with raising test scores with prescribed instructional strategies (Jennings & Rentner, 2006). Conversely, this conflicts with decision-making and affects teacher's autonomy to do what they professionally feel is best for students (Murnane & Papay, 2010). In sum, teachers feel confined by the limitations put on their ability to use what they have learned through their own experiences and educational achievements (i.e., education degrees) (Murnane & Papay, 2010).

Work Itself. Empirical literature provides evidence that policy and procedures can have an adverse effect when the policy has a strong measure of student achievement (i.e., standardized tests) and strong accountability measures for teachers (i.e., teacher evaluations linked to the test scores) (Farber, 1991; Friedman, 1991; McNeil, 2000; Smith 1991). Work itself can also have an impact on the well-being and job satisfaction of teachers. Occupational well-being has been said to affect one's level of commitment to work, motivation, efficacy, and emotional stress (Horn et al., 2004).

Purpose of work. Chalofsky and Krishna (2009) describe that the significance and purpose of work (i.e., teaching) are essential for a healthy psychological state. In addition, an organization should provide opportunities for autonomy, creativity, flexibility, and empowerment for one to find significance and commit to the work (Chalofsky & Krisha, 2009). Contrarily, when any of those elements are compromised, satisfaction and one's emotional state can be affected in a negative manner (Chalofsky & Krisha, 2009).

Role conflict. Berryhill et al. (2009) investigated the unintended consequences of accountability policies and their effect on teacher's job engagement and role conflict. The literature states teachers can experience high levels of stress due to role conflict (i.e., conflict of values or dilemmas in the workplace) (Byrne, 1994; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). For example, in their study, teacher's level of stress increased when they felt they had to teach only for a standardized test and could not give attention to other academic and social needs (Berryhill et al., 2009).

Additionally, Teachers did not take total responsibility for low-test scores. They indicated that low-test scores were not an indication of their pedagogy (Berryhill et al., 2009). The findings indicated that teachers thought other factors (i.e., students with disabilities, student behaviors, and home life influences) were the main contributors to low test scores. Results of the study also indicated that teachers, when being evaluated, experienced high levels of stress because they thought their principal might put too much emphasis on standardized test scores and not considered other factor of their work.

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is described as one's ability to cope with the demands of a job with a high level of confidence (Zimmerman, 2000). Bandura (1982) began the research in self-efficacy and set self-efficacy apart from other psychology constructs (e.g., self-esteem and

emotional stability). While these constructs are at times connected to each other, self-efficacy is found to be less abstract and a better predictor of job performance (Zimmerman, 2000). Bandura (1982) defines self-efficacy as the belief that one has to achieve a goal, coupled with the behaviors and values that one has to contribute to the process. Teacher self-efficacy can range from low to high, and this depends on the belief that a teacher has about their ability to be an effective instructor (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008).

Globally, researchers have continued to study how school improvement efforts affect a teacher's job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For example, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) conducted a study on 2,249 Norwegian teachers to find out how self-efficacy, burnout, and external control factors influenced teachers. The findings indicated that when a school leader supported the cognitive ability and emotional well-being of a teacher, the teacher's level of self-efficacy and job satisfaction increased (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). The positive relationship with job satisfaction and school leadership was a result of the teacher's perception of trust (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). For instance, in their study, teachers said that they felt comfortable seeking advice from school leadership because of the emotional support they received. However, two types of burnout (i.e., depersonalization and emotional exhaustion) affected efficacy and were the strongest predictors of teacher's dissatisfaction with work (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). Additionally, the findings indicated that a teacher's workload and time pressure lead to emotional exhaustion.

Burnout. Burnout is described as one's depersonalization of their effectiveness, and can be described by one's emotional exhaustion by feeling drained physically and mentally from working too intensely (Byrne, 1994; Langelaan et al., 2006). Brouwers and Tomic (2000) theorize that teachers who lack a high level of self-efficacy can experience three dimensions of

burnout 1) emotional exhaustion, 2) depersonalization, and 3) personal accomplishment. Additionally, Brouwer and Tomic (2000) posit that there is a relationship with a teacher's well-being and their ability to be effective in the classroom.

Since NCLB, teachers have experienced high levels of pressure from policy mandating an increase of standardized test scores, and the increased stress has led to burnout and loss of autonomy (Berryhill et al., 2009). Burnout has been linked to a teacher's commitment to their work and thus leading to negative thoughts and behavior issues on the job (Rudow, 1999). A teacher's experience of burnout can also contribute to issues of absenteeism, depression, and attrition (Lauermann & König, 2016). Moreover, research throughout different cultures has shown burnout to affect teacher motivation (Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2006).

Globally there is a shared concern about maintaining a healthy and effective workforce of teachers. Hakanen et al. (2006) completed a study on teacher burnout and the relationship with organizational commitment. In the study, 2,038 teachers were given a questionnaire to measure burnout, work engagement, job demands, resources, ill health, and organizational commitment. The results of the study indicated that job demands such as increased workload and school goals were related to burnout, ill health, and psychosomatic disorders. Conversely, the study recognized that job resources and shared decision making increased a teacher's commitment to school goals.

As a result of NCLB, there has been an increase in the empirical literature on the impact of educational policy on public schools (AU, 2007; Berryhill et al., 2009; Dee & Jacob, 2009; Diamond, 2007; Grissom et al., 2014; Hamilton et al., 2008; Mallory & Allen, 2007). Yet, the empirical literature on private school policy is limited because policy and procedures in a private

school are exclusive to the individual school. Therefore, policy remains one of the main factors distinguishing the public and private school settings.

Workplace Conditions

Examples of the workplace conditions are administrative support, student behavior, parent support, routine duties, availability of resources, control in the classroom, and interactions with co-workers (Perie & Baker, 1997). Research also identifies climate and culture as parts of workplace characteristics (Minor, 1995). In addition, research explains that there is a difference between culture and climate whereby the culture of an organization is described as the values and norms, and the climate is defined by the behaviors (i.e., work, communication, and decision making) (MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009).

The research in organizational culture and hiring practices are embedded in matching the person with the culture; thus, creating a culture that promotes collaboration (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). For a board, school district, and principal seeking to increase quality teachers, one must find the balance in supporting a positive school culture that addresses both extrinsic and intrinsic motivators. This is true for both public and private schools; teachers can be dissatisfied with pay and promotion opportunities and still be satisfied with the work environment and the administrative support (Akhtar et al., 2010; Ingersoll, 2001). Therefore, as school leaders seek an understanding of the needs of teachers, the leaders must also understand the many components that create feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Public school principals. Research refers to the years after NCLB as the post-NCLB era (Hale & Rollins, 2006). School leaders in the post-NCLB era continue to be held accountable for student achievement while also managing a school to promote physical and emotional safety for students and teachers (Crum & Sherman, 2008). Federal policy has redefined the role of the

33

public school principal from a wide-ranging manager of a social organization of teachers and students, to a leader of instruction who also answers to several different stakeholders (Gonzalez & Firestone, 2013).

Bidwell (2005) expressed how the social organization of a public school in the early 20th century was based on a broad centralized structure where the principal had autonomy with the curriculum and policy of the school while having a loose system of accountability to the superintendent and board of education. Now, in the era of standardized reform, the superintendent manages the principal, thus creating a working environment with less autonomy and more accountability (Gonzalez & Firestone, 2013). The post-NCLB era has driven the mission of school principals each year to create a system of school improvement that emphasizes improving standardized test scores (i.e., reading and math proficiently) (Crum & Sherman, 2008). In addition, a principal is also accountable for the management of student behaviors, the maintenance of the facility, and the professional growth and well-being of the faculty and staff (Crum & Sherman, 2008).

Private school principals. The availability to compare private school to public school leadership in empirical literature is limited. The research of Shakeel and DeAngelis (2016) described private school principals as having different priorities than the public school principal. Traditionally, the private school principal is consumed with initiatives to keep students and parents satisfied each year, and public school principals work each year to retain teachers (Shakeel & DeAngelis, 2016). Furthermore, according to Shakeel and DeAngelis (2016) from a management perspective, public schools suffer from constraints of equity whereas private schools can exercise more autonomy and focus on efficiency and performance. This provides the private school principal more opportunity to make changes in the environment. Additionally,

principals in the private school setting tend to have more influence over decision making in curriculum and policy (Shakeel & DeAngelis, 2016).

Leadership and organizational commitment. Aydin et al. (2013) conducted a meta-analysis of principal's leadership styles between the years of 2005 to 2010. The intention of the study was to see if there was a relationship between the principal's behaviors and teacher job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The findings concluded teacher's job satisfaction and organization commitment increased in a positive direction when the principal was more committed to focusing on efforts of teacher growth and professional development. Additional findings indicated that teachers were superficially committed to the school when a principal displayed management style behaviors.

Malloy and Allen (2007) conducted a case study during the NCLB era in a rural school in North Carolina where the school was able to keep a quality staff through this period even with a lack of resources and aged facilities. This case study was completed by interviewing 31 teachers. The finding indicated that the faculty at the school had a high level of engagement because of the school leader's collective decision-making as well as a high level of academic expectations and encouragement for the staff (Malloy & Allen, 2007). Although the study recognized the school size (i.e., 442 students in the K-8 setting) as a limitation, the findings do support that teachers have a high level of commitment when school leaders value shared decision making with teachers (Malloy & Allen, 2007).

Balyer (2012) also found in a qualitative study that a teacher's willingness to change on the job behaviors was influenced by the way they were treated by their principal. Teachers had high levels of commitment when principals supported their individual growth and personal needs. In terms of supervision and leadership, principals that develop positive relationships with

teachers are able to act as a team coach, and because of this, teachers feel supported (Aydin et al., 2013). In sum, behaviors of principals (i.e., supervisors) affect a teacher's perception of support and well-being, which also affect a teacher's level of satisfaction at work.

Workplace characteristics in private schools. As a reminder, the empirical literature on job satisfaction of private schools is limited. This section gives a brief description of how the workplace characteristics of the private school setting effects teachers. McGrath and Princiotta (2005) reported on private school teacher's job satisfaction and their intent to stay at a school, move schools, or change professions. The report analyzed three types of private schools: 1) Catholics private schools 2) other religious private schools and 3) non-sectarian (McGrath & Princiotta, 2005). This particular report examined private school teachers from one of the largest sample sizes to allow for an in-depth view of private school teachers' satisfaction with different facets of their job and their relationship with reasons for staying in a school or moving to a different school.

Findings indicated private school teachers that moved schools experienced job dissatisfaction due to a lack of administrative support, low pay, and minimal opportunity to contribute to policymaking decisions (McGrath & Princiotta, 2005). Conversely, private school teachers that remained at their school chose to because of mutually shared values and increased opportunities for autonomy in the classroom (McGrath & Princiotta, 2005). When distinguishing between the different types of private schools and their organizational characteristics, specific differences arose.

For example, catholic school teachers reported greater dissatisfaction with their salary when compared to other religious schools and non-religious schools (McGrath, & Princiotta, 2005). Additionally, Catholic school teachers reported having less opportunity to have input into

policy and decision-making. In addition, the report indicated non-religious school teachers had more opportunities to have input into school policy and they had fewer issues with student behaviors than religious private schools (McGrath & Princiotta, 2005).

Ingersoll (2001) identifies that educators in public or private school have unique characteristics when compared to other professions. The researcher also purports that school teachers want to be a part of a clear mission and have a sense of belonging to a community with shared values. Considering much of the research on teacher turnover and job satisfaction has been focused on the teacher's demographics, Ingersoll suggests more emphasis should be put on the impact of workplace characteristics (i.e., decision-making, autonomy, supervision).

The Construct and Research of Job Satisfaction

Industrial psychology is an applied science that addresses many aspects of organizations related to employee behaviors and attitudes, as well as the resources used to hire and maintain an effective workforce (Truxillo et al., 2016). The purpose of industrial psychology, also known as occupational psychology, is to analyze and solve workplace problems through theory and research methods in specific areas of organizations such as: a) safety, b) health and well-being c) team goals, d) productive behavior, e) motivation, f) culture, g) leadership, and h) job satisfaction (Bowling, Eschleman, & Wang, 2010; Ferguson, 1963). Furthermore, this section will explain the history of the construct of focus (i.e., job satisfaction) for this dissertation.

To lead a high functioning organization, a leader must have committed and empowered employees, and for the purpose of this literature review, one must consider job facets and perceptions of job satisfaction as significant sources of data to meet the aforementioned objective (Melenyzer, 1990; Short & Rinehart, 1992). The Elementary and Secondary Education Act does not address the satisfaction of teachers as a part of school reform. However, when addressing

37

school reform, the educator is one of the main factors that influence student learning (Berryhill et al., 2009; Bogler, 2001). Therefore, understanding how a worker (i.e., teacher) is motivated on the job is vital to sustaining a high functioning organization (i.e., kindergarten thru twelfth education setting) (Bass, 1990).

According to Spector (1997), the concept is vast, and there are several different components connected to the construct of job satisfaction. Locke (1976) describes the satisfaction of one's job as one's optimistic description of their emotional state in the workplace. Herzberg (1968) describes the measurement of job attitudes as the key to investigating how a person feels about their job and the morale of the workplace. Research has combined various aspects of the workplace and work itself through social settings and cognitive processing to construct a definition of job satisfaction (Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997).

Psychology of job satisfaction. Close to, a century of research has focused on the construct of job satisfaction. For example, the findings from Hoppock's research on human relationships can be said to be the foundation of industrial and organizational psychology (Hoppock, 1935). Hoppock defines job satisfaction as the measurement of one's expression of how they feel about the work environment (Aziri, 2011; Hoppock, 1935). His early research focused on three components of influence on job satisfaction. The three areas in no particular order are as follows: 1) one's level of social status in the workplace, 2) autonomy while working, and 3) relationships with peers and supervisor (Cucina & Bowling, 2015).

Job satisfaction is one of the most studied topics in organizational psychology (Judge et al., 2001). Research in organizational psychology focuses on human relationships and behavior in social situations (i.e., the working environment). Judge et al. (2001) describes job satisfaction as a construct that supports practical application to improve organizations and maintain one's

38

well-being. Scholars continue to explore job satisfaction because of its influence on the workplace (Locke, 1976).

Evaluating job satisfaction. Theories suggest job satisfaction is constructed by one's thoughts and feelings. A cognitive approach takes into consideration one's reasoning and intellectual description of their satisfaction with work and an affective approach describes one's feelings (i.e., emotions) towards their job (Judge et al., 2001). While a cognitive approach and an affective approach are two different objectives, each one should not be viewed as competitors (Judge et al., 2001). Instead, they both should be viewed as approaches that expand on one another to form job satisfaction theories (Judge et al., 2001).

Rogelberg (2007) posits that job satisfaction can be examined in two different categories (i.e., global approach and faceted approach). The global approach is broad and seeks to answer general questions of job satisfaction with a response of "yes," I am satisfied with my job; or, "no," I am not satisfied with my job (Rogelberg, 2007). The second approach analyzes job satisfaction by examining facets (e.g., the physical environment, supervision/leadership, colleagues, pay, nature of work, advancement, recognition, and well-being) (Rogelberg, 2007). Examining job satisfaction facets provides an organization an opportunity to analyze and determine how different facets influences one's attitude and feelings toward work (Rogelberg, 2007).

Theories of Job Satisfaction

During the last century, many studies have utilized theories in further explaining job satisfaction. Judge et al. (2001) believe that the antecedents leading to job satisfaction can be classified into three categories: 1) situational theories, 2) dispositional approaches, and 3) interactive theories. Situation theories are supported by the nature and environment of one's job,

dispositional approaches align with one's personal attitude and psychological make-up, and interactive theories address the social environment as well as the interactions between colleagues and supervisors at work (Judge et al., 2001).

Situational Theories

An employees work environment and the work itself are the central focus of the situational theories. The three that have the most influence on job satisfaction, as discussed by Judge et al. (2001), are the two factory theory (Herzberg, 1959), job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldman, 1976), and social information processing theory (Salancik& Pfeffer, 1978). Each theory is defined with distinctive characteristics; however, all three theories have aspects of similar description when defining job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001).

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory. Frederick Herzberg's theory of motivation began by questioning the scientific management theory (Taylor, 1911) and Mayo's (1945) theories of management and motivation (Lyons, 2007). His research concluded that Taylor and Mayo overlooked a fundamental construct of job satisfaction. Taylor and Mayo based their theory on pay and productivity, which indicated the more one produces, the better the pay will be (Lyons, 2007). Herzberg disputed that this extrinsic motivator of pay did not always produce a claim of job satisfaction (Lyons, 2007). Thus, Herzberg's assumption leads to his research and publication of the two factory theory of motivation. His work stated that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were not opposites and instead operated in separate continuums (Judge et al., 2001).

The first type identified extrinsic factors of job satisfaction (i.e., policy, supervision, interpersonal relationships, work conditions, salary, status, and job security) (Judge et al., 2001). These factors were labeled as hygiene factors. The second type is considered the intrinsic factors

of motivation and were coined as motivators (i.e., achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, growth). Herzberg explains that when hygiene factors are addressed, the result does not necessarily lead to one being satisfied with their job (Aziri, 2011). The theory supports that there is a stronger correlation to achieving job satisfaction with the motivating factors of growth and achievement as compared to hygiene factors (Judge et al., 2001).

The two-factor model provided evidence purporting that job satisfaction qualities (i.e., motivators) and job dissatisfaction qualities (i.e., hygiene factors) operated in separate polar continuums (Judge et al., 2001). Although this theory may appear to be sound in nature, many researchers have provided rebuttals and offered contradictory theories opposing Herzberg's model (Park et al., 1988; Ruthankoon & Ogunlana, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1967). According to Sergiovanni (1967), when the two factor theory was tested with teacher job satisfaction, the two factors of motivation and hygiene contributed to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. When satisfaction or dissatisfaction correlated with both motivating factors and hygiene factors, Sergiovanni (1967) referred to this as the bipolar factor.

Those that have found issue with Herzberg's two factory theory have suggested that the two-factor theory test will produce differing results when utilized on different occupations (Ruthankoon & Ogunlana, 2003). Ruthankoon and Ogunlana (2003) conducted a study on 125 construction workers, which included 64 engineers and 61 foremen. The findings indicated that both motivators and hygiene factors had an impact on both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. For example, company policy and administration is a hygiene factor according to Herzberg (1968); however, in this study, the construction workers had both satisfaction and dissatisfaction experiences with company policy and administration. Park et al. (1988) had similar findings with

vocational teachers in the United States and Korea. Respondents in their study had both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with work itself and advancement (i.e., motivators).

Job characteristic theory. The job characteristics theory recognizes how one may achieve higher levels of job satisfaction when one is engaged by the five core job characteristics (Hackman & Oldman, 1980; Judge et al., 2001). Additionally, a model of the job characteristics theory was designed by Hackman and Oldman (1980) to define one's internal motivation for work. The model starts with the five core job characteristics:

1. Task identity – The degree to which one can see one's work from the beginning to the end.

2. Task significance – The degree to which one's work is seen as important and significant.

3. Skill variety – The extent to which a job allows employees to do different tasks.

4. Autonomy – The degree to which employees have control and discretion in how to conduct their job.

5. Feedback – The degree to which the work itself provides feedback for how the employee is performing the job (pg. 29)

According to the model, the five job characteristics can be associated with three psychological states (Judge et al., 2001). The first state is meaningfulness of work, defined as a state of being motivated intrinsically to share personal values that benefit the work environment and or co-workers (Judge et al., 2001). The second psychological state is the experience of responsibility for work outcomes. For example, in service industries or product production companies, the employee would take the burden of being responsible for the quality of work or production; as such, this responsibility could generate intrinsic motivation (Judge et al., 2001). Internal knowledge of the results pertaining to the work activities supports the third

psychological state, which indicates the employee is able to reflect on the performance of their work and rate how well they were able to complete a task (Judge et al., 2001).

Hackman and Oldman (1975) described the job characteristic model by integrating their theory on psychological ownership. Upon experiencing the psychological states, one would have outcomes that aid in defining one's level of performance and satisfaction with their job. These outcomes could include high internal work motivation, high growth satisfaction, high general job satisfaction, and high work effectiveness (Hackman & Oldman, 1975). Within these two variables of job characteristics and psychological states lies the employee's growth need strength (Hackman & Oldman, 1975). Growth need strength describes how one determines how much they want to grow professionally; therefore, one's growth is impacted by intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors (Hackman & Oldman, 1975).

Social information processing theory. The social information processing theory provides a perspective on the influence of the social environment of the workplace (i.e., co-workers attitudes and behaviors) (Morgeson, Garza, & Campion, 2012). Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) theorize that one does not consider job satisfaction until they are asked to define their satisfaction with their job. Only then will one start to form an opinion based on their behavior and or social cues from their co-workers. The theory also suggests when answering a questionnaire about job satisfaction, one would answer the question of job satisfaction the way they are expected to and then rationalize their response based on experiences on the job (Judge et al., 2001).

Miller et al. (1990) expand on Salanick and Pfeffer's (1978) research in social information process by including components pertaining to the communication and conversations with co-workers. When co-workers have conversations at work, the influence of

the conversation develops either a positive or a negative attitude toward the workplace; therefore, one's attitude can influence one's thoughts about the workplace and then a degree of satisfaction is developed (Miller et al., 1990). Through learned attitudes displayed and expressed by co-workers, social information processing can explain how individuals cope with stressful work situations. Furthermore, this theory is supported by the influence of what one hears and sees in the workplace and its connection to one's perception of the job itself (Miller et al., 1990).

Dispositional Approaches

When reviewing job satisfaction research, the dispositional approach has not been as widely studied as the situational theories; however, it remains to be a significant approach as it considers personalities and character traits (Weiss & Adler, 1984). In general, the dispositional research takes into consideration emotionality, qualities of individuals, and how they affect one's level of satisfaction in life and on the job (Judge et al., 2001). The concept of emotionality can be linked to Hoppock (1935) who found that workers who were satisfied with their job were also emotionally regulated in a positive way (Judge et al., 2001). In this approach, job satisfaction is identified by the relationship with one's emotional state according to three concepts: 1) job attitudes approach, 2) personality traits, and 3) core-self evaluations (Judge & Locke, 1993; Staw & Ross, 1985; Watson & Slack, 1993).

Job attitudes approach. Staw and Ross's (1985) research in the area of dispositions makes the argument that job attitudes will remain consistent over a period of time even during times of change (i.e., a new job or a new supervisor). A study of 5,000 middle-aged men over a period between 1966 and 1971 found that one's level of job satisfaction stayed the same due to one's consistent attitude about employment over the five-year period (Staw & Ross, 1985). For example, the results of the regression analysis indicated that job attitudes in 1966 and then in

44

1971 were the strongest predictor, *b* = .267, of job satisfaction. Also, when adding pay change, *b* = .281 or change in status, *b* = .282, the stronger predictor of job satisfaction was still prior attitudes (Staw & Ross, 1985).

From an organizational perspective, Staw and Ross (1985) point out that job attitudes over a period do not change significantly even with a pay change or job change. Job redesign or pay redesign may not be enough to change one's attitude to influence job satisfaction. Furthermore, organizations seeking employees with positive work attitudes should consider improvements to the selection process of future employees as opposed to having to react with strategies to improve current employee attitudes (Staw & Ross, 1985).

Cognitive/personality traits. Judge and Locke (1993) further build upon the history of the dispositional approach by considering one's thinking process and how one's cognitive functioning effects one's well-being and job satisfaction. Their study was conducted in a large northeastern university on a sample of clerical professionals from several different departments on campus. The study researched the link between levels of job satisfaction and dysfunctional thoughts (i.e., depression and anxiety) (Judge & Locke, 1993).

As hypothesized, negative thoughts contributed to negative thoughts about one's job (Judge & Locke, 1993). The findings indicated that one's negative thought process led to feelings of not having autonomy, having to be dependent on others at work, and generally not experiencing joy at work (Judge & Locke, 1993). In concluding the research, Judge and Locke (1993) note that their study only analyzes one category of cognition and does not consider other variables such as self-efficacy and intelligence.

Core-evaluations. The literature identifies a lack of depth in research concerning the core-evaluations approach (Judge et al., 2001). However, the research on one's core evaluation

of self, and the influences from co-workers, and the environment adds to the understanding of

one's level of satisfaction on the job and in life (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Core

evaluations refer to one's fundamental view of themselves with regard to levels self-esteem, self-

efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism (Judge et. al., 1997).

Judge et al. (1998) indicated from a survey, completed by a diverse sample of physicians

and college students from the United States and Israel, that core evaluations do have a significant

effect on one's job satisfaction. In addition, the findings indicated that the effect of core

evaluations on job satisfaction was independent of job factors (i.e., task significance and

autonomy) (Judge et al. 1998). Therefore, people who see themselves as neurotic (i.e., insecure,

guilty, or timid) are likely to be dissatisfied on the job, even when there is a high level of

autonomy. Contrarily, those that experience a locus of control (i.e., a belief in one's ability to

influence an outcome) experienced positive satisfaction on the job and in life (Judge et al., 1998).

Interactive Theories

Interactive theories take into consideration two variables to job satisfaction (i.e., the

person and the situations surrounding the workplace) (Judge et al., 2001). While there are

theories that evaluate both the individual's personality and the social surroundings as separate

constructs, the interactive theories examine the processes simultaneously and determine how

one's input effects one's outcome in regards to job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001). The three

interactive theories that will be described below are: 1) the Cornel model, 2) the expectancy

motivation theory, and 3) the value percept theory.

Cornell model. The Cornell model distinguishes itself from other theories of job

satisfaction and attitudes by using one's frame of reference on the evaluation of job outcomes

while also considering one's input on the job (Smith et. al., 1969). This interactive model is a

relationship between what the employee applies to the job (e.g., training, experience, time, and effort) and then considers the results (e.g., pay, status, working conditions, and intrinsic factors) (Judge et al., 2001). Also in the Cornell model, one's frame of reference is considered to affect one's level of job satisfaction. For example, when unemployment is on the rise, one considers their job important and their level of satisfaction is higher. Simply put, it is better to have a job than not have a job (Judge et al., 2001). The opposite frame of reference can be seen when unemployment is down and there is an abundance of jobs. One may decrease their level of job satisfaction due to their awareness of many other job opportunities (Judge, Hulin, & Dalal, 2009).

Hulin (1966) studied 300 female clerical workers in a community that was considered prosperous. The research indicated that due to the variety of options for jobs, the clerical workers saw their job as not important; therefore, they were dissatisfied with their job (Hulin, 1966). Hulin further explains that when one's frame of reference—in this case—a community that has few poor neighborhoods as well as a variety in economic conditions, one will analyze their surroundings to evaluate their satisfaction and input vis-a-vis time and effort. Limitations of the study are the influence of the social situations as well as how one's level of job satisfaction and input might change if they were removed from the social setting (Judge, Hulin, and Dalal, 2009).

Expectancy motivation theory. Vroom (1964) explains that increased efforts will lead to increased job performance; therefore, one is motivated by the expected outcomes of one's behavior. The theory is designed to look at perceptions individually (e.g., what a manager thinks will work for one employee may not necessarily work to motivate all employees). Furthermore, the research expands on how one's motivation is built on beliefs or values. For example, if an

employee values pay more than extra time off, they will be motivated more by an increase in pay versus extra time off (Vroom, 1964).

The expectancy theory is designed around individual choices. There are three factors to consider and all need to work together to complete the formula successfully (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012). First, one's perception that effort will show a positive relationship with one's level of performance; second, the reward that one receives will positively compliment the effort and performance outcome; and third, the degree that one values the reward (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012). The literature indicates the more the reward is valued the more one will be motivated (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012).

In the workplace, the expectancy theory is widely used as a framework to predict the extrinsic motivators that increase job satisfaction (e.g., pay, pay change, overtime, and recognition) (Warren, 1989). As the expectancy theory generally identifies extrinsic rewards, one should note that intrinsic motivators are also reliable indicators of job satisfaction. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators continue to be complex concepts of research. (House, Shapiro, & Wahba, 1974; Parker & Dyer 1976).

Value percept theory. Locke (1976) defines the value percept theory as a concept where one is satisfied with the job when their personal values are met, and conversely only dissatisfied when the job values were not fulfilled. Locke's value percept theory is described in the formula $[S = (V^c - P) \times V_i]$ or also described as [satisfaction = (want - have) x importance] (Judge et al., 2001). This formula indicates that satisfaction is only achieved if the presented job facet is valued by the employee. In addition, the formula can be used to identify how an employee values one facet over another (Judge et al. 2001).

Research has provided limitations to measuring individual facets alone to predict overall job satisfaction. Rice, Gentile, and McFarlin (1991) purported that a study of several job facets and the relationship between them could better serve as a measurement of overall job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Therefore, an organization seeking factors that promote positive effects should analyze more than one facet (Rice et al., 1991). For example, non-monetary items such as benefits and work schedules combined are a better determinant of satisfaction than just using pay itself (Rice et al., 1991).

When making time sensitive decisions, the global approach to assessing job satisfaction may be ideal; however, the faceted approach may be appropriate when multiple personnel structuring decision must be made. Although both can be identified as reasonable approaches to evaluating employee job satisfaction, this part of the literature review will evaluate job satisfaction by utilizing the job satisfaction facets. The section below will identify the importance of job satisfaction facets, their impact on employee overall job satisfaction, as well as the associated supporting literature.

Facets of Job Satisfaction

Research defines the facets of job satisfaction as global concepts that effect all employees of organizations. The most recognized facets are 1) recognition/feedback, 2) pay, 3) working conditions, and 4) supervision (Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Locke, 1976). Research also specifies when defining job satisfaction, the facets can be separated into intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that will effect one's level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction according to events, conditions, and agents (i.e., supervisors and coworkers) (Judge et al., 2001).

Recognition, feedback, and reward. Recognition and reward can be both an intrinsic and extrinsic determinant of one's satisfaction and engagement in work (Singh, 2016). An

employee's motivation to remain engaged in a task at work is driven by multiple forms of recognition. In Singh's (2016) study composed of a group of master level students (n=98), the researcher indicated that the group responded positively to the recognition motivation factor. Specifically, verbal praise and personal statements from supervisors that related to effort and respect influenced the student's motivation. Extrinsic recognition and reward such as pay and raises were significant; however, the intrinsic motivator of personal connection was noted to be the most significant (Singh, 2016).

Pay. Research suggests that pay factors can reduce the intent to leave a job; however, four factors of pay can have a positive or negative effect on one's decision to commit to the organization without having an intent to leave (Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). Heneman and Schawab (1985) suggest that there are multiple dimensions of pay and each one of them can help define one's overall satisfaction with their pay. When considering pay satisfaction, there are four areas to consider: 1) pay level (i.e., one's hourly wage or salary), 2) pay raises (i.e., one's increase in pay level), 3) pay structure (i.e., the organization's pay structure and how it relates to a specific job), and 4) benefits (i.e., insurance and pensions).

Pay is important to the employee and employer and satisfies the financial needs of both (Singh & Loncar, 2010). Strategically, pay is used to motivate employees for positive workplace behaviors and to reduce turnover intent (Milkovich & Newman, 2008). Singh and Loncar (2010) studied 200 nurses from a unionized hospital to gain a further understanding of the relationship with pay satisfaction, overall job satisfaction, and turnover. The results revealed that each dimension of pay: pay level ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$), pay structure ($r = -.33$, $p < .01$), pay raise ($r = -.30$, $p < .01$), and benefits ($r = -.17$, $p < .01$) were all significantly correlated with turnover intent (Singh & Loncar, 2010). Also, job satisfaction ($r = -.42$, $p < .05$) was negatively correlated with

turnover intent (Singh & Loncar, 2010); however, the results indicated that when job satisfaction

was added, only two of the pay dimensions remained significant (pay raise and pay level). This

research concluded both pay and job satisfaction has an influence on one's intent to leave a job;

yet, when considering facets of the job (i.e., autonomy, working conditions, and co-workers)

they may be more important to a worker than increases in compensation (Singh & Loncar, 2010).

Working conditions. The conditions that one experiences at work can contribute to how

they feel about their job and this can affect one's health and well-being. Stressors from a job are

associated with the demands of the job and the working conditions. Spector (1997) describes

stress related to a job as two-fold. First, one can experience a job stressor from an event or

condition of the job such as a supervisor placing high demands on a deadline and using verbal

enforcement at a high volume level (i.e., yelling at a worker) (Spector, 1997). Second, the

response to a job stressor can cause job strain, whereby, the job strain can contribute to

mental/emotional conditions (i.e., anxiety and depression) and physical symptoms (i.e.,

headaches) (Spector, 1997).

Workload. The demands that are placed on an employee define one's workload and this

can be classified into qualitative or quantitative work. Spector (1997) defines qualitative work as

the effort that is put into the job performance using one's physical or emotional capacity. In

addition, quantitative work is the amount of work required to complete a task (e.g., contractual

workdays or amount of hours required at work) (Podgursky, 2003; Spector, 1997). Both types of

work can have a positive or negative effect on job satisfaction.

Supervision. Supervision from the employee's perspective is the way that one receives

support from their supervisor with regard to management, availability of resources, and support

for training (Burke et al., 1992). Furthermore, the support that an employee receives from the

supervisor can have a direct impact on the employee's performance and their commitment to the organization. The literature also suggests that a supervisor that is too critical of the employee will have an adverse effect on the employee's willingness to problem solve (Burke et al., 1992).

Conversely, a supervisor that provides constructive feedback will promote a positive effect on a workers performance and willingness to take risks (Burke et al., 1992). Babin and Bole (1996) hypothesize that a supervisor's support of employees is directly related to an employee achieving a positive level of job satisfaction. In their study, surveys were given to full service restaurant employees who were asked questions regarding work involvement, supervisor support, and role stress. The results supported a positive relationship *(b =.41, p <.01)* with perceived supervision support and an increased satisfaction with work.

Implications of Job Satisfaction on the Teaching Profession

In public and private settings, teachers are the cornerstone of student achievement, and their effect on student learning is lasting and cumulative (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). The research dating back to 1966 concluded that the quality of the teacher explained more about the variance in student achievement more so than any other resource in a school (Coleman et al., 1966). Moreover, teachers are significant investments for school districts seeking high marks of student achievement (Borman & Dowling, 2008).

Supply and Demand for Teachers

Recruitment and retention policies have a direct effect on teachers deciding to enter or stay in the teaching profession (Guarino et al., 2006). However, before a school or school district focuses on those two aspects of the teacher labor market they must first consider the supply and demand of teachers. Guarino et al., 2006, describes the demand of teachers by the overall

teaching positions at a given level of compensation, and the supply as the number of qualified

teachers willing to work at the overall level of compensation.

The attractiveness of the profession is what drives an individual to pursue a specific

career (Bozeman et al., 2013). Furthermore, other industries are competing against the teaching

professional (Guarino et al., 2006). Therefore, schools (i.e., public or private) should consider the

many facets of the job as significant factors that influence one to seek and remain in the teaching

profession (Guarino et al., 2006).

Teacher Retention

National and state polices continue to focus on recruiting and retaining quality teachers.

Historically, research has focused on pay, benefits, and promotion to increase the labor market of

educators (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Bozeman et al., 2013; McDonald, 1999). Over the two

decades leading up two NCLB, the policy landscape was focused on professional development

and incentives to attract college-bound students to the teaching profession (Borman & Dowling,

2008). Additionally, Since NCLB, states have focused on rigorous requirements for teacher

candidates to earn a teacher certification (Borman & Dowling, 2008).

During the 2000-2001 school year, the National Commission on Teaching and America's

Future reported a 22% turnover rate for teachers in high poverty urban areas, a 16.4% rate for

teachers in high poverty rural areas, and a 12.8% rate for low poverty areas (Spradlin &

Prendergast, 2006). Also, there was a larger turnover rate in southern states when compared to

northern states (Spradlin & Prendergast, 2006). In the 2011-2012 school year, there were

3,377,900 employed public school teachers. At the conclusion of that year, 8% left the teaching

field and 8% moved to a different school (Goldring et al., 2014).

For the 8% that migrated, 59% moved to a school in the same school district, 39% of the teachers moved to a school in a different school district, and 3% moved to a private school (Goldring et al., 2014). Studies identify the baby boomer generation as the group of teachers that are about to retire and they account for one-third of the teacher workforce (Eldridge, 2016; Duncan, 2009). Furthermore, as the generations of teachers retire, and new generations (i.e., millennials) become teachers, school districts have to continue to investigate the intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that keep teachers from leaving the profession (Eldridge, 2016; Guarino et al., 2006; Hakanen et al., 2006; Langelaan et al., 2006).

A Historical Review of Public and Private Teachers' Job satisfaction

Late 20th-century empirical literature states that, historically, private school teachers have a higher level of job satisfaction when compared to public school teachers (Perie & Baker, 1997). Additionally, a more recent study again concludes that private school teachers have a high level of job satisfaction when compared to public school teachers (Gius, 2015). When research controlled for age and experience older teachers in private schools were more satisfied then younger teachers. Conversely, in the public school setting less experienced and younger teachers were more satisfied then teachers with several years of experience (Perie & Baker, 1997).

When comparing elementary and secondary school teachers, elementary school teachers tend to be more satisfied with teaching as a career (Perie & Baker, 1997). In addition, female teachers report being more satisfied with teaching than males (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992; Klassen & Anderson, 2009; Perie & Baker, 1997). Conversely, research that is more recent indicates that female teachers are more stressed and dissatisfied with their workload when compared to male teachers (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Also, when considering race, minority teachers (i.e., black, hispanic) reported lower levels of job satisfaction when compared to white teachers (Masters,

Sun, & Loeb, 2016) Moreover, research also indicates that minority teachers tend to be employed in schools that have a high enrollment of students academically at risk.

Teacher characteristics, school demographics, and human capital have been common variables (i.e., gender, ethnicity, age, years of experience, education, region, and student enrollment) used to determine levels of job satisfaction (Crossman & Harris, 2006; Perie & Baker, 1997). However, the variables that have shown evidence to be the most significant predictors of job satisfaction are administrative support and teacher autonomy (Kim & Loadman, 1994; Moore, 2012; Perie & Baker, 1997). Moreover, current research indicates that job satisfaction can be affected by changes in the economy and political scene.

Masters et al. (2016) studied the teacher workforce specifically in the areas of overall job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and job security. The data used was from a time span of 1994 to 2008, and collected by the U.S. Department of Education's Common Core of Data (Masters et al., 2016). This time span is significant because of the changes in the economy (i.e., the great recession) and the major change in federal education policy (i.e., NCLB) (Masters et al., 2016).

Findings in the study indicated that overall job satisfaction during the year 2000 was down for teachers and non-teaching occupations (i.e., private industry, non-profit organizations). However, in 2008, the teacher workforce showed a slight increase in job satisfaction (87.4%) when compared to non-teacher occupations (71%). Masters et al. (2016) speculate that the slight increase had to do with the changes in the economy. At this point, private industries were reducing jobs and cutting pay; while, school districts were able to keep teachers employed and keep pay the same.

Conversely, in 2008, private school teachers showed a slight decrease in job and pay satisfaction (Masters et al., 2016). The research also indicated that teachers in public schools had

less satisfaction with job security when compard to private school teachers (Masters et al., 2016). They recognized in the study that public school teachers during the NCLB era became more concerned about job security due to the increased accountability policies.

In conclusion, this review of the literature has covered a broad range of the constructs of job satisfaction. The review has also captured a comprehensive look at the history and development of both public and private education. Additionally, the literature has been reviewed to capture the impact that policies, procedures, and workplace characteristics have on the profession of teaching. Lastly, the purpose of this study will be to update empirical literature on the factors that influence job satisfaction of teachers in the public and private schools.

Chapter Three

Methodology

Population

For an accurate representation of the public and private school workforce, Georgia was chosen as the sample state to conduct research on public and private school teachers' job satisfaction. There are over 550 private schools reported in the state of Georgia by the GADOE ("FY2016 Private School Data Collection," 2018). Additionally, statewide school information reports a total of 2,263 Georgia public schools. To demonstrate a more accurate depiction of the education systems in Georgia, the GADOE disaggregated their data into four different school types and also provided the total number of schools within each school type (e.g., elementary schools - 1,319; middle schools - 481; high schools - 448; and kindergarten thru twelfth grade schools - 15) ("GADOE – school count type," 2018).

Moreover, Georgia was chosen as the population because of the growing need to recruit and retain public school teachers. According to survey data collected by the Georgia Department of Education, within the first five years of employment, 44% of Georgia public school teachers leave the profession (Owens & GADOE, 2015). In the survey, teachers were asked if they would recommend the teaching profession to students about to graduate from high school. The results of the study indicated 66.9% of teachers responded that they were unlikely or very unlikely to recommend teaching as a professional choice, and only 14.9% of the teachers responded with likely or very likely (Owens & GADOE, 2015).

There is a paucity of private school research in terms of teacher job satisfaction, the likelihood of teaching in a private school setting, and the potential to turnover. Research in job satisfaction of the teacher workforce in Georgia will provide significant information for factors

that contribute to recruitment and retention. Moreover, for this study, the population of Georgia

public school teachers as compared to Georgia private school teachers will further contribute to

the empirical research in the area of job satisfaction of teachers and provide empirical data for

Georgia education practitioners.

Sample

Power Analysis

Cohen's (1988) power analysis was conducted to identify the sample size necessary to

have the adequate statistical power to detect statistical significance of variables with the

regression analysis. A power analysis takes into consideration the number of independent

variables, covariates, level of significance, the effect size, and the specific power to determine

the required sample size for the study. This particular study has eleven covariates and one

independent variable. In addition, a medium effect size $(f^2 = .15)$, a defined level of significance

set at $(\alpha = .05)$, and a specific power level $(\beta = .80)$ was utilized. From the aforementioned

parameters set by Cohen (1988), the recommended sample size for multiple regression was

determined to be 127 participants (n= 127) (Soper, 2018).

Response Rates

With the surge of internet use in the 1990's, the use of electronic surveys increased, and

the margin became smaller between return rates in electronic and postage mail. Nichols and

Sevidi (1998) showed the use of postage mail had an 84% return rate and the use of email had

a 63% return rate. In comparison, Truell, Bartlettt, and Alexander (2002) indicated a much

smaller gap in responses rates with postage mail (i.e., 53%) and e-mail (i.e., 51%). More

contemporary research suggests that researchers should consider the ease of access to the survey

(i.e., the use of a web-link to access survey software) and the respondent's comfortability with technology (Fan & Yan, 2010) when deciding on the mode of delivery.

Research in support of electronic surveys indicates that the use of electronic delivery by way of e-mail is useful for specific populations (i.e., teachers) that have a high rate of daily access to the internet (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004). Also, empirical research purports that populations that regularly use the internet will have a better response rate on surveys provided in electronic form than surveys that are provided by other methods (e.g., surveys sent by the postage system) (Kaplowitz et al., 2004). Sheehan and Hoy (1999) point out that emails are automatically archived on electronic devices until one purposely deletes the email, which is beneficial for storage and accessing data. Conversely, a postage mailed survey stands the risk of being misplaced. Because of the easy access to email via electronic devices (i.e., phones, tablets, computers) and the fact that survey software is now equipped for participants to complete surveys on the said devices, electronic delivery for administering the surveys was chosen.

Representation

Considering that job satisfaction of two different groups will be analyzed (i.e., public and private school teachers), research suggests that the two groups be equally represented in the sample. According to Onwuegbzie and Leech (2007), the sample group should be selected in such a way that the data will be statistically generalizable to the population. Therefore, by randomly sampling from a population, the selected sample was both an adequate representation of the population and generalizable to that particular population.

A stratified random sampling technique was employed to select participants for the study. The total sample of two thousand individuals was provided with surveys (n=2,000), which was randomly selected into two stratum, public school teachers (n=1,000) and private school teachers

(n=1,000). This technique for sampling assured equal sampling representation. MCH Strategic Data (i.e., a data retrieval company) was used to identify the sampling population for both the public and private school settings. They also provided contact information and school characteristic data.

Procedure

Within the surveys, participants were asked to provide three different types of information: 1) personal data gathered from an informational questionnaire, 2) curriculum oversight data provided by a curriculum control and professional discretion questionnaire, and 3) job satisfaction data acquired from the job satisfaction survey. All surveys were administered and all data was gathered by way of online survey software (i.e., Qualtrics survey web-based software). Participants were contacted via email and were provided with details pertaining to the research purpose as well as informed consent information and a link to the survey questionnaire. According to Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009), to increase the response rate, they recommend the following: 1) after initial contact, provide a second email as a follow-up reminder, and 2) email a third and final reminder for those that did not respond with completed surveys.

Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014) also suggest the composition of the cover letter consisting of a) the significance of the research, b) a description of the research, c) a statement of commitment to the confidentiality of the participant, and d) directions for completing the questionnaire and survey. The purpose of the cover letter in this study was to inform the participants of the researcher's interest in the studied topic, as well as inform participants of the measures that were taken to protect the confidentiality of their response data.

Instrumentation

      Informational survey. The informational questionnaire requested that participants provide information in three different areas: 1) personal attributes, 2) human capital elements and, 3) workplace characteristics. Personal attributes were those characteristics that are unique to the person (i.e., age, gender, and race). In quantitative research, the use of personal characteristics assists in the process of comparing groups (Crossman & Harris, 2006; Perie & Baker, 1997) and identifies any distinguishing characteristics that may confound the results of the study.

      Schultz (1961) explains human capital is an investment one takes in themselves. In education, educational attainment and years of experience are identified as human capital and serve as metrics to determine advancement in pay and promotion. For the purpose of this study, teachers were asked their years of experience in the teaching profession and their highest level of education achieved. Years of experience and advanced degrees were relevant for this study as they are two factors that employers use to determine pay in traditional salary schedules (i.e., fixed rate) as well as a component used to evaluate advancement potential. In addition, wages and promotions are facets that affect job satisfaction (Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008); therefore, any factor with potential to highly correlate with the dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction) should be included in the analysis as a covariate.

      Occupational characteristics are elements that are provided by the employer for the employee. In the teaching workforce, teachers are provided contractual workdays, which can affect both an individual's salaries and their work stress via work-life balance. This questionnaire asked for information pertaining to both of these characteristics. The typical annual contract for educators ranges from 180 to 190 workdays in both public and private schools (Podgursky,

2003). Salaries in the state of Georgia are a combination of a base salary schedule provide by the state and then supplemented with local funding to create a final salary scale. Each school district and private school has their own salary scale or method in determining teacher pay.

Curriculum oversight questionnaire. To account for teachers' perception of curriculum control and professional discretion in the classroom, a curriculum control and professional discretion scale was used. By including these variables as covariates, the distinguishable factors outside of school characteristics (i.e., academic freedom/government influenced curriculum) will be controlled and any detected difference in job satisfaction between the two types of teachers will be assumed to be a result of the private school vs. public school dynamic. This particular questionnaire was originally created by Archbald and Porter (1994) in their study of curriculum control policies, teacher autonomy, and job satisfaction on math and social studies high school teachers. This specific questionnaire was adapted by May (2010) to study the effects of state and district curriculum control policies (i.e., standardized reform) and teachers' perception of professional discretion in the classroom. Additionally, the Likert scale was adjusted from a five-point scale to a six-point scale.

This study will use the version modified by May (2010). Participants will provide responses to thirteen items in the curriculum control scale, as well as the five items in the professional discretion scale. . A Factor analysis tested for validity, and from the correlations matrix it was determined that there was no correlations greater than 0.8 (May, 2010). Also when testing for validity, a content validity procedure was applied. A panel of graduate students examined the instrument for clarity and confidentiality (May, 2010).

Job satisfaction survey. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is a 72 item survey that measures five facets of job satisfaction and provides an overall job satisfaction score (Smith et

62

al., 1969). Furthermore, the five individual facets that can be measured independently are: 1) work itself, 2) pay, 3) promotion, 4) supervision, and 5) co-workers. In addition, each of the facets has one question that is accompanied by 9 – 18 words or phrases for participants to respond.

Tasios and Giannouli (2017) describe that each of the five facet areas, along with the job in general (JIG), are measured by the participants responding to a list of words (i.e., adjectives or adjective phrases). Each word or phrase will be answered with: (Y) for yes, (N) for no, and a (?) question mark for cannot decide. Each item is scored in a non-conventional way; however, research has determined that this way of scoring is reliable, stable, and valid (Kinaki et al., 2002). Also for scoring purposes, positively worded items (e.g., helpful, likable, smart) will be scored 3, 1, and 0 (e.g., Y = 3,? = 1, N = 0) and negatively worded items (e.g., rude, lazy, stubborn) will be reversed order scored. For example, negative words that were scored a 3 will be changed to a 0, and 0 will be changed to 3. Items with the value of 1 will not need to be changed (Brodke et al., 2009).

This study will use the JDI because it is one of the most globally used surveys to measure job satisfaction. Moreover, the JDI has been translated into several different languages for the use of measuring job satisfaction in countries outside of the United States (i.e., Spanish, Hebrew, French) (Hulin, Drasgow, & Komocar, 1982; Hulin, & Mayer, 1986; Johns, 1978a; Johns, 1978b; McCabe, Dalessio, Briga, & Sasaki, 1980; Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991; Ronen, 1977). The JDI was created in 1969 by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin and the survey was constructed to measure how one feels about his or her job. The JDI has been updated since its original version and the update in the early 1980's replaced 11 questions throughout four of the faceted domains,

as well as added an overall measure of job satisfaction described as the job in general (JIG) (Kinicki, Mckee-Ryan, Schriesheim, & Carson, 2002).

Most recently, the JDI was updated in 2009, and this version was used in this study to measure perception of the overall job satisfaction of public and private school teachers (Buckman, 2017). For the purpose of consistent reliability and validity when measuring job satisfaction, the JDI was chosen as the source of measuring overall job satisfaction (i.e., summative score) (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989). In terms of measuring the JDI for reliability, a Cronbach's coefficient alpha method was used (Brodke et al., 2009). Research indicates that an alpha of .80 or higher measures a strong degree of reliability. The facets of the JDI have the following measures when psychometrically analyzed for internal consistency: work .90, pay .88, promotion .91, supervision .92, co-workers .92, and JIG .92.

Validity was determined by Pearson correlations with other selected scaled instruments (i.e., intent to quit scale, feelings of stress scale, and single item measures of overall job satisfaction). Each faceted area was correlated to be significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed). For example, when the JIG was tested against the intent to quit scale, feelings of stress scale, and single item measure of overall job satisfaction, the scores were as follows -0.61, -0.30, and 0.79, respectively. For the population in this study, this particular instrument aligns with school characteristic constructs and provides the needed reliability and validity across different populations (Gillet & Schwab, 1975; Johnson, Smith, & Tucker, 1982; Kinicki et al., 2002). For this particular study, to capture job satisfaction, the JDI summative score was used.

Variables

Covariates. As noted above in the previous section regarding instrumentation, and the type of elements that were included in the survey questionnaires, to account for factors that may

influence the dependent variable in addition to the independent variable, statistical controls (i.e., covariates) were included in this study to reduce the probability of type-I and type-II error (Becker et al., 2015; Huck, 2012). There are eleven covariates in this study: 1) age, 2) gender, 3) race, 4) years of experience, 5) highest level of education, 6) salary, 7) contractual workdays, 8) student enrollment, 9) geographic region, 10) curriculum control, and 11) teachers professional discretion in the classroom. In addition, when covariates are not applied there can be a misinterpretation of the relationship between the independent and dependent variable, thus leading to a false null hypothesis not being rejected or a true null hypothesis not being accepted (Huck, 2012).

To determine statistical relationships between public school teacher and private school teacher job satisfaction, control variables were used to assist with determining if the difference associated with the two types of schools has affected the profession regarding personal perceptions (i.e., teachers). Personal attributes (i.e., age, gender, and race) served as covariates because of the large amount of research documented in empirical literature supporting their relationships with job satisfaction (Buckman, 2017; Crossman & Harris, 2006; Perie & Baker, 1997).

Perie and Baker (1997) specify that younger and less experienced teachers in public schools are more satisfied with the profession when compared to teachers in the later stages of their career. On the other hand, young private school teachers indicate low levels of job satisfaction when compared to more experienced private school teachers. In terms of gender and its relationship with job satisfaction, research has reported mixed results. Some researchers have indicated that there is no relationship between gender and job satisfaction (Klecker, 1997; Nestor

& Leary, 2000), while other researchers have purported that female teachers are more satisfied with the teaching profession than male teachers (Bogler, 2002; Perie & Baker, 1997).

Race is also a factor that contributes to the prediction of job satisfaction. Recent research concluded that non-white teachers were less satisfied with teaching as a profession (Masters et al., 2016). Other research on race and its association with job satisfaction indicated that when school staff and student population are racially aligned, teachers report being more satisfied with their work (Fairchild et al., 2012). In sum, age, gender, and race were included in this analysis because they have been identified as sustainable factors used in past research to predict job satisfaction.

Additionally, occupational characteristics (i.e., workload and salary) served as covariates to control for the relationship of job satisfaction between public and private schools. Research indicates that workload is a significant factor when considering job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). The characteristic of workload can be classified in qualitative or quantitative terms. For the purpose of this research, quantitative forms of workplace characteristics will be used. As previously noted, the annual contracts for both settings are typically 180 to 190 work days and are directly associated with teacher pay. Therefore, workload as defined by annual contracts is a necessary covariate that can influence teacher job satisfaction and should be included in any analysis that compares job satisfaction of distinguishable groups.

Another measurable form of a workplace characteristic is teacher salary. Pay has been determined to affect one's financial needs, and it influences the perception of satisfaction with work (Milkovich & Newman, 2008). In fact, pay satisfaction has been such a potent factor of job satisfaction that it has served as a standalone dependent variable in past research (Buckman et al., 2016; Currall, Towler, Judge, & Kohn, 2005; Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). In K-12

education, a teacher's level of education may affect their salary, and this can influence their level of satisfaction with pay and inadvertently influence their overall job satisfaction. Traditionally, a teacher's salary will increase when an advanced degree is earned (e.g., Master's Degree, Educational Specialist Degree, Doctoral Degree) (GADOE, 2019). In addition, years of experience can also serve as a factor that allows a teacher to earn an additional step increase on a traditional fixed-rate salary schedule. In Georgia, according to the public school teacher salary schedule, pay is increased by two factors: 1) educational level and 2) years of experience defined by each service year completed (GADOE, 2019); however, private schools have more autonomy in determining how teachers are paid (i.e., fixed-rate salary schedule, merit pay, etc.) (Ballou, 2001).

School characteristics are also a consistent variable used in empirical educational research (Goldring et al., 2014; Moore, 2012). The school environment has shown to have significant effects on teachers deciding to stay in the profession or migrate to a different school or different career. Therefore, total student enrollment and location of the school (i.e., rural, urban, suburban) provided data that was used to assist in determining the relationship between the job satisfaction level of public and private school teachers.

To capture the perception of control of curriculum and teacher autonomy, curriculum control and professional discretion in the classroom were added as covariates. Teachers in public and private school experience curriculum control from external governmental and administrative sources. In the public school setting, policy and procedures are mandated by federal, state, and local school boards (Bozeman et al., 2013; Kauffman et al., 2002). Private schools, while independent, also have external factors of control from school leaders and local governing boards (Coleman et al., 1982; Shakeel & DeAngelis, 2016).

Teachers value school leaders that provide opportunities for shared educational decisions (i.e., policy development) (McGrath & Princiotta, 2005; Murnane & Papay, 2010). Additionally, teachers value discretion in the planning and implementation of the instructional process. Teachers, when provided with empowerment, will perceive the working environment as satisfying (Chalofsky & Krisha, 2009). Therefore, the two covariates, curriculum control and professional discretion in the classroom, supported the examination of public and private school teachers' job satisfaction.

Independent variable. The independent variable for this study was Georgia public and private school teachers. Using a dummy code system, the independent variable was separated. Georgia public school teachers was coded as (1) and private school teachers was coded as (0).

Dependent variable. The dependent variable for this study was job satisfaction as determined by the Job Descriptive Index. In this particular study, the participants were asked to complete the JDI to determine a summative score for the use of analyzing data. Statistic Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used to provide statistical analysis for this study.

Research Question

This study will assess the following research question:

1. Is there a significant difference between the job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers as measured by the JDI when potential covariates have been controlled?

Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to explain the data in this study. The use of descriptive statistics (i.e., measures of central tendency) was utilized to summarize and describe the independent, dependent, and control variables (i.e. private/public school, job satisfaction, age, gender, race, years of experience, highest level of education, contractual work days, salary, student enrollment, and geographic location). Inferential statistics was used to identify if a relationship exists between the variables.

This study employed a multiple regression procedure whereby data from each variable was entered into the regression model using a simultaneous order of entry (Huck, 2012). Furthermore, Huck (2012) explains that since there are more than two variables being analyzed (i.e., independent and dependent), there is a need to include covariates to avoid confounding results. Therefore, multiple regression was chosen as a statistical tool as opposed to a simple linear regression. The least squares (i.e., Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)) principal was utilized to identify the best-fit line used in the analysis.

The first regression model to test the hypothesis included all of the covariates. An alpha level of .05 or less served as the criteria to identify statistically significant variables in the first block. All of the covariates (i.e., control variables) were entered at the same time (i.e., simultaneous order of entry) to establish each variables viability (i.e., accuracy). Considering research has not specified a reason to enter the variables in a hierarchical manner, this method of entry is ideal (Huck, 2012). In the second block, the independent variable (i.e., public and private school teachers) were added for further testing of the hypothesis. By using a block style regression, the analysis provided both the amount of variance associated with all control variables on the dependent variable as well as the amount of variance associated with just the

independent variable when all other factors were controlled. In doing so, interpretation of the unstandardized regression coefficient along with change in r^2 (i.e., variance) provided both statistical significance, as well as practical significance of the independent variable.

Null Hypothesis

The purpose of this study was to identify if there is a significant difference in the job satisfaction of public school teachers and private school teachers when potential covariates have been controlled. An alpha of .05 ($\alpha = .05$) was used to either accept or reject the null hypothesis.

H_0: There is no significant difference between public school teachers and private school teachers' job satisfaction as measured by the summative JDI scores when potential covariates have been controlled.

Chapter Four

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Participants in the study were chosen from a population of public school and private school teachers in the state of Georgia. The purpose of this study was to determine if a statistical difference existed between the job satisfaction levels of Georgia's public and private school teachers. To determine the representation of the population, a stratified random sampling technique was used. This procedure provided a total sample of 2,000 teachers (n=2,000) composed of 1,000 Georgia public school teachers and 1,000 Georgia private school teachers. Contact information for each participant in the sample was provided by a data retrieval company (i.e., MCH Strategic Data).

To find an adequate sample size for the study, Cohen's (1988) power analysis was utilized. Cohen's power analysis considers the number of independent variables, covariates, level of significance, effect size, and power to make a determination for a suitable sample size. For this study, it was determined that 127 Participants (n=127) would be necessary for multiple regression. Additionally, a medium effect size ($f^2 = .15$), a level of significance set at ($\alpha = .05$), and the specific power level at ($\beta = .80$) were used as statistical parameters as recommend by Huck (2012) to avoid type-1 and/or type-2 statistical error.

An electronic survey delivery service (i.e., Qualtrics) was used to deliver and communicate with the sample group. Email delivery was chosen because school teachers typically access email applications for communication on a daily basis (Kaplowitz et. al., 2004). Additionally, with the increased use of mobile devices for communication, research indicates that electronic delivery services could increase response rates (Fan & Yan, 2010).

On the initial delivery 2,000 public and private school teachers in Georgia were sent the survey link. In total, 8% of the sample group completed the survey. Additionally, a stratified random sampling technique was used to balance both strata. After the random removal of entries, the sample groups consisted of 67 public school teachers and 67 private school teachers.

The survey and questionnaire administered to participants addressed personal information (i.e., personal attributes, human capital, and workplace characteristics), curriculum control and teacher's professional discretion in the classroom, and job satisfaction (i.e., Job Descriptive Index). Each survey was analyzed for internal consistency via Cronbach's Alpha (Huck, 2012). The suggested range for reliability using a Cronbach's Alpha is .70 or greater. In terms of the surveys used in the study, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) reported a Cronbach' Alpha rating of .947, the curriculum control survey reported a .830, and the teacher's professional discretion in the classroom reported a .784.

All nominal variables (i.e., school type, degree level, gender, race, location) were dummy coded for analysis purposes. This coding process was necessary for the statistical software (i.e., SPSS) to analyze the data. The following tables will provide a report of descriptive and inferential statistics.

The average school enrollment for this study was 765.94 students (see Table 4.1). Additionally, the student enrollment ranged from a minimum of 40 students and a maximum of 3,699 students. Descriptive statistics also indicated the average teacher's age of the sample was 46.55. Teacher ages ranged from 24 to 75 years old. Also, the average contract for teachers in the sample group was 185.03 days and a range maximum of 280 days. Teachers in the sample averaged 17.18 years of teaching experience which ranged from 2 years of experience to 53

years of experience. Additionally, the average salary for teachers was $50,632, with a range maximum of $102,000.00.

Table 4.1

Work Experience, Pay Information, and Age of Participants

Variable	N	Mean	Range	SD
Enrollment	128	765.94	3,659	543.71
Experience[a]	128	17.18	51	10.45
Work Days[b]	128	185.03	280	23.26
Salary[c]	128	50,632	102,000	19,392
Age	128	46.55	51	10.68

Note. [a]Years of Teaching. [b]Contractual Work Days. [c]U.S. Dollars.

Teachers educational attainment was operationalized through degrees earned, which were categorized at four different levels (i.e., Bachelor's, Master's, Specialist or credits beyond Master's, Doctorate). The data indicated that 31.3% of the participants had at least a Bachelor's Degree, 45.3% of the teachers earned a Master's Degree, 18.8% of students earned a Specialist Degree or credits above a Master's Degree, and 4.7% earned a Doctorate Degree (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2

Education

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bachelors	40	31.3	31.3	31.3
Masters	58	45.3	45.3	76.6
Specialist	24	18.8	18.8	95.3
Doctorate	6	4.7	4.7	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

In addition to education and workplace characteristics, teachers were asked personal demographic questions. Females accounted for 77.3% of the participants, while male participants accounted for 22.7% of the participants (see Table 4.3). This statistic is consistent with the empirical literature concerning gender. Historically, females have accounted for a majority of the workforce in education (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992; Moore, 2012; Perie & Baker, 1997).

Table 4.3

Gender

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	29	22.7	22.7	22.7
Female	99	77.3	77.3	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Participants in the study were also asked to provide their race (i.e., African American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino/Spanish, White/European American, Multi-racial, other). Because of the low participation of races other than white, the race variable

was categorized into two groups (i.e., white and non-white). White participants accounted for 82.0% of the total sample, while non-white participants accounted for 18.0% (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4

Race

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
White	105	82.0	82.0	82.0
Non-White	23	18.0	18.0	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

The location of the school was requested from participants and served as a school level variable in the analysis. The location of the schools was divided into three categories: urban, suburban, and rural. Suburban schools represented 56.3% of the sample; while urban and rural schools were equally represented at 21.9% (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5

Location

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Urban	28	21.9	21.9	21.9
Suburban	72	56.3	56.3	78.1
Rural	28	21.9	21.9	100.0
Total	128	100.0	100.0	

The survey provided to participants also measured two categories associated with control of curriculum (i.e., external and internal) as well as teacher's professional discretion in the classroom. The two portions of the survey required participants to evaluate their perspectives of

the aforementioned topic using a 6-point Likert scale. The data from the curriculum control and

teacher's perception of professional discretion were converted to a composite score. The

curriculum control survey provided an average composite score of 2.44. The teacher's perception

of professional discretion provided an average composite score of 3.59 (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6

Curriculum Control and Teachers Professional Discretion

Variable	N	Mean	Range	SD
Curriculum Control	128	2.44	3.93	.841
Teachers Professional Discretion	128	3.59	4.50	1.15

The focus of this study was on the relationship of the dependent variable (i.e., job

satisfaction) with the independent variable (i.e., school type, public school vs. private school).

Therefore, Table 4.7 is used to display the relationship of the variables using Pearson's

correlations. Within the correlations matrix, there are two variables that have a significant

relationship (i.e., $p < 0.05$) with the dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction). Those variables are

public school and teacher's perception of professional discretion in the classroom (see Table

4.7).

The first variable that significantly correlates with job satisfaction was public school. The

correlations co-efficient matrix indicated that there was a negative relationship ($r = -.284$, $p <$

.001; see Table 4.7). This finding suggests that teachers in public schools, on average, have a

lower level of job satisfaction than private school teachers.

Teachers perception of professional discretion had a positive relationship with the

dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction) ($r = .324$, $p < 0.01$; see Table 4.7). This relationship can

be interpreted as, when teachers are able to make more independent decisions in the classroom, their level of job satisfaction increases. In addition, there was a positive relationship with teachers perception of professional discretion and curriculum control ($r = .566$, $p < 0.01$; see Table 4.7). Furthermore, this positive relationship indicated that as teachers perceptions of control in the classroom increased, their perception of curriculum control also increased (i.e., information, concepts, and skills).

There were significant negative relationships with teachers perception of professional discretion in the classroom with school enrollment ($r = -.191$ $p < 0.05$), public school ($r = -.567$ $p < 0.01$), and race ($r = -.184$, $p < 0.05$) (see Table 4.7). This finding revealed that teachers perceived they had less professional discretion in schools with higher enrollment. Findings also highlighted teachers in the public school perceived they had less control in the classroom with professional discretion when compared to private school teachers. Finally, the results suggested that non-white participants reported less professional discretion in the classroom than their white counterparts.

Curriculum control had a negative relationship ($r = -.652$, $p < 0.01$) with the predictor variable (i.e., public schools). This finding suggests public school teachers reported less curriculum control than private school teachers. Also, curriculum control had a negative relationship with the control variable race ($r = -.236$, $p < 0.01$) (see Table 4.7). As such, non-white participants reported less control of curriculum than white participants.

Workdays had a positive relationship with teacher salaries ($r = .262$, < 0.01). This relationship suggests that when the number of days a teacher worked increased, their salaries also increased. Additionally, teachers' salaries had a significant positive relationship with enrollment ($r = .244$, $p < 0.01$), public school ($r = .299$, $p < 0.01$), degree level ($r = .444$, $p < 0.01$),

years of teaching (r = .347, p <0.01), and age (r = .188, p <0.05). These findings convey the following: 1) teachers' salaries increased when school enrollment increased, 2) teachers with advanced degrees had higher salaries than teachers with a Bachelor's Degree or less, 3) teachers with more years of teaching experience reported higher salaries than those with less years of teaching experience, and 4) teachers older in age reported higher salaries than teachers younger in age.

Race had a significant positive correlation with school enrollment (r = .229, p < 0.01). This finding suggested that the number of non-white teachers increased as school student enrollment increased. Additionally, there was a significant correlation with race and public schools (r = .265, p <0.01) (see Table 4.7), signifying that there are more non-white teachers in public schools than there were in private schools.

Age of teachers had a significant negative correlation with school enrollment (r = -.185, p <0.05). This correlation indicated that as student enrollment increased, the age of the teachers decreased. In Addition, age had a significant negative relationship with public schools (r = -.214, p <0.05), indicating there were more younger teachers employed in public schools than in private schools. Conversely, age had a positive significant correlation with years of teaching (r = .753, p <0.01) (see Table 4.7), which means that as age increased, years of teaching also increased.

Years of teaching had a significant correlation with public school. The correlations co-efficient between years of teaching and public school was negative (r = -.176, p <0.05; see Table 4.7). This finding insinuated that teachers in public schools reported fewer years of teaching experience in the classroom than teachers in the private school setting. Lastly, public schools were significantly correlated with enrollment (r = .354, p <0.01; see Table 4.7), suggesting public schools had higher student enrollment than private schools.

Table 4.7

Correlation of All Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Enrollment	1												
Public Schools	.354**	1											
Degree Level	.000	.170	1										
Years of Teaching	-.113	-176*	.070	1									
Age	-.185*	-.214*	.105	.753**	1								
Gender	-.209	.019	.160	.138	.112	1							
Race	.229**	.265**	-.031	-.121	-.013	-0.87	1						
Salary	.244**	.290**	.444**	.347. **	.188*	-.151	.160	1					
Work Days	.145	.156	.136	-0.14	-.120	-0.98	.122	.262**	1				
Location	0.31	.165	.014	.035	-0.46	.113	-.185*	-.119	.063	1			
Job Satisfaction	-.141	-.284**	.094	.056	.149	.023	-.094	.042	-.012	-.090	1		
Curriculum Control	-.139	-.652**	.011	.014	.054	-.045	-.236**	-.104	-.144	-.165	.103	1	
Professional Discretion	-.191*	-.567**	.042	.092	.122	-.013	-.184*	-.082	-.133	-.113	.324**	.566**	1

Note.   **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
     *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Assumption Testing for Multiple Regression

To avoid misleading or inaccurate results, Huck (2012) suggests researchers test to ensure their data meets all of the assumptions of their respective statistical test (i.e., in this case multiple regression). Furthermore, the assumptions that should not be violated are normality, equal variance (i.e., Homogeneity), and multicollinearity. For testing, normality was assessed in SPSS using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro–Wilk test (Grande, 2015a). Additionally, when the dependent variable is checked for normality (i.e., Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) and (i.e., Shapiro-Wilk test), the results should not be significant (i.e., $p < .05$) (Grande, 2015a; Huck, 2012).

In the first test of normality for job satisfaction (i.e., dependent variable), the results were significant (Kolmogorov-Smirnov $= .000$, $p < .05$) and (Shapiro-Wilk $= .000$, $p < .05$). The normality assumption was not met. According to Huck (2012), to meet the assumptions for normality, data can be transformed without compromising the results of the research. Data transformation can be conducted by using a log reflection transformation. Grande (2015a) adds that outliers contribute to negatively skewed data, and that removal of outliers and the log reflection transformation can assist in meeting the assumption of normality.

To address normality, extreme values were identified and outliers were removed. To maintain balanced strata, three outliers for public schools and three outliers for private schools were removed (i.e., public schools, n = 64; private schools, n = 64). The dependent variable was again tested for normality and the results were not significant (Kolmogorov-Smirnov $= .200$, $p > .05$; Shapiro-Wilk $= .130$, $p > .05$), indicating the data met the assumptions for normality.

Another assumption that should be met before testing the hypothesis is the assumption of equal variance (Huck, 2012). The assumption of equal variance can also be referred to

homogeneity of variance. In this study, the assumption for equal variance was tested using Leven's Test for Equality of Variances (Huck, 2012). The significance value was greater than .05 (i.e., Levene Statistic = .150, $p > .05$) and the assumption of equal variance was met.

To reduce high correlations between the independent variable and control variables, all variable need to be checked for multicollinearity. When checking for multicollinearity, an acceptable Variance of Inflation Rate (VIF) is 3.0 or less. The only variable that exceeded the 3.0 threshold was years of teaching (VIF = 3.123). Historically, years of teaching has served as a significant variable in empirical literature when considering teacher's job satisfaction and was kept in the multiple regression analysis (Crossman & Harris, 2006; Perie & Baker, 1997). Additionally, to check for multicollinearity there should be no correlation greater than .700 (Grande, 2015b). In the correlations matrix, age is correlated with years of teaching (r = .753; see Table 4.8). Therefore, because of the correlation age was removed from the analysis. With the removal of age all variables meet the acceptable VIF for multiple regression (see Table 4.8).

Other assumptions that should be met for multiple regression are: 1) an adequate amount of records for the independent variable, 2) a linear relationship with the dependent variable and independent variable, 3) standard residuals in a range between -3 and 3, and 4) a Cook's distance no greater than 1.00 (Huck, 2012; Grande, 2015a). In this study, the independent variable is school type and according to Grande (2015a), there should be at least 20 records (i.e., participants). This study meets that assumption with 128 participants. The data also meets the assumption of a linear relationship with the dependent and independent variable. All data points fell within a range of -3 to 3 as observed on a scatter plot (Grande, 2015a). Additionally, the linear relationship is observed as all data points fall within the line on the probability-probability

plot. Lastly, the Cook's distance should not have a value greater than 1.00 (Grande, 2015). In this study, the minimum Cook's distance is .000 and maximum is .132.

Table 4.8

Multi-collinearity Diagnostics Table

Model	Tolerance	VIF
Enrollment	.772	1.295
Degree Level	.669	1.447
Years of Teaching	.666	1.502
Gender	.823	1.215
Race	.822	1.216
Salary	.469	2.131
Work Days	.878	1.137
Location	.875	1.167
Curriculum Control	.473	2.116
Professional Discretion	.599	1.670
Public Schools	.367	2.726

Note. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of less than 3.0 utilized to avoid multi-collinearity.

Inferential Statistics

For the purpose of this study, an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) multiple regression was used to analyze the dependent variable, independent variable, and covariates. Job satisfaction (i.e., dependent variable) was regressed on the independent variable (i.e., school type) and all covariates. The abovementioned analysis was used to test the following null hypothesis.

H_0: There is no significant difference between public school teachers and private school teachers' job satisfaction as measured by the summative JDI scores when potential covariates have been controlled.

The criterion used to accept or reject the null hypothesis was determined by the alpha of .05 ($\alpha = 0.05$). In analyzing the data, the first step was to determine how much variance was accounted for when regressing the dependent variable with only the control variables within the first model. All control variables were entered simultaneously in the multiple linear regression equation and accounted for approximately 13% of the models variance (see Table 4.9). In the second step, the independent variable (i.e., public school) was included into the regression equation with all control variables and resulted in a 3.6% change in variance between model 1 and model 2 (see table 4.9).

Table 4.9

Multiple Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.360[a]	.130	.055	.23832
2	.407[b]	.166	.087	.23433

Note. [a]Predictors (Constant), Professional Discretion in the Classroom, Gender, Location, Degree Level, Years of Teaching, Work Days, Enrollment, Race, Curriculum Control, Salary. [b]Predictors (Constant), Professional Discretion in the Classroom, Gender, Location, Degree Level, Years of Teaching, Workdays, Enrollment, Race, Curriculum Control, Salary, Public Schools.

Displayed in Table 4.10 is the influence of the independent variable (i.e., school type) on the dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction) when adjusting for the covariates. Model two is the final step of the multiple linear regression analysis. The effects of the multiple linear regression when the independent variable (i.e., school type) is added indicates that this variable is statistically significant (b = .314, p <0.05; see Table 4.9). Another variable that was found to be statistically significant was professional discretion in the classroom (b = -.284 p < 0.05; see Table 4.10). Lastly, curriculum control was also statistically significant (b = .283 p <0.05; see Table 4.10).

Table 4.10

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	1.803	.229		7.870	.000		
Enrollment	-4.819E-6	.000	.011	-.111	.912	.772	1.295
Degree Level	-.038	.030	-.128	-1.258	.211	.669	1.447
Teaching Exp.	.000	.002	.014	.137	.891	.666	1.502
Gender	.010	.055	.017	.178	.859	.823	1.215
Race	-.015	.059	-.023	-.247	.805	.822	1.216
Salary	-8.758E-7	.000	-.069	-.559	.577	.469	2.131
Work Days	.000	.001	-.016	-.180	.857	.878	1.139
Location	.028	.034	.077	.841	.402	.875	1.167
Curriculum Control	.082	.036	.283	2.292	.024	.473	2.116
Professional Discretion	-.060	.023	-.284	-2.593	.011	.599	1.670
Public Schools	.153	.068	.314	2.240	.027	.367	2.726

Variables Contribution to Overall Regression Equation
Note. a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction.

When interpreting the slopes of statistically significant covariates, the negative slope of professional discretion in the classroom suggests that as teacher's perception of professional discretion in the classroom decreases, their level of job satisfaction also decreases. The variable curriculum control had a positive slope signifying that teachers who perceived they had more curriculum control reported elevated levels of job satisfaction. Lastly, the independent variable public school had a positive slope indicating that public school teachers had a higher level of job satisfaction than teachers employed in a private school.

As a result of the regression analysis, the null hypothesis must be rejected as stated:

H_0: There is no significant difference between public school teachers and private school teachers' job satisfaction as measured by the summative JDI scores when potential covariates have been controlled.

Instead, the following alternative hypothesis must be accepted:

H_A: There is a significant difference between public school teachers and private school teachers' job satisfaction as measured by the summative JDI scores when potential covariates have been controlled.

Chapter Five

Findings, Discussion, Implications, and Limitation

Job satisfaction should be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of an organization's workers (Melenyzer, 1990; Short & Rinehart, 1992). Researchers continue to study job satisfaction because workers who are not satisfied with their job may exhibit behaviors that can negatively affect co-workers and production (Ostroff, 1992). Conversely, satisfied workers can have a positive influence on the workplace and create an environment that is high in collegiality (Ostroff, 1992). Additionally, supervisors strive to have a culture that promotes shared values (i.e., beliefs, trust, loyalty, accountability); therefore, when an organization provides a work environment that stimulates satisfied workers, the organization is able to provide a workplace that is both vigorous and productive (Chalofsky & Krisha, 2009; Likert, 1961; Truxillo et al., 2016).

The purpose of schooling, public or private, is to provide a quality education for all students whereby students achieve academically and are better prepared for post-secondary options (i.e., college, military, work) (Coleman et al., 1966; Borman & Dowling, 2008). In both educational environments, teachers have the most influence over student achievement (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Therefore, school leaders should not only value teachers, but also engage in activities that increase teachers' job satisfaction.

Teachers with high levels of job satisfaction are said to have an increased level of engagement with their work (Ma & McMillian, 1999). For example, teachers who are satisfied with their working environment are more likely to come to work prepared and ready to make a positive influence on their students (Ma & McMillian, 1999). Conversely, teachers who are dissatisfied with their job are more likely to be ineffective in the classroom. For example, when

led by an ineffective teacher, research indicates that students can lose up to year of growth (i.e., reading and math skills development) (Hanushek, 1992). When students fail to make academic gains, schools increase their likelihood of being coined a "failing school" and research shows poor student achievement correlates with teacher turnover (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013).

Working in public schools is challenging, and in recent years teachers have questioned teaching as a profession. To illustrate, during 2017, the U.S. Department of Education indicated nearly 270,000 public school teachers moved to a different school or decided to seek a different career (Goldring et. al, 2014). When exploring the teacher turnover phenomenon, data provided by the Georgia Department of Education highlighted that 44% of teachers left the profession within their first five years of teaching (Owens & GADOE, 2015). Although teacher job satisfaction was not identified as the cause of teacher turnover in the aforementioned U.S. and Georgia data sets, research has supported a relationship between teacher job satisfaction and teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 2001; McGrath & Princiotta, 2005). As such, to avoid negative teacher behaviors (i.e., lack of motivation, poor performance, turnover) that influence student achievement, it is recommended that school leaders and human resources officers engage in activities and seek factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction in order to increase the performance of the teaching workforce and provide a quality education for all students.

Public and private schools have unique characteristics that contribute to the workplace environment. These varying workplace characteristics can be found in student population, administrative support, belief systems, instructional autonomy, compensation, and organizational policies (Berryhill et al., 2009; Gamoron, 1996). For these reasons, a fundamental element to studying both types of schools is to identify similarities and differences.

Public schools have a history of being influenced by federal legislation, state legislation, and local school districts. Since the early 20th century, public education has been impacted by

88

federal funding that focused on competition with other nations in terms of educating students in the areas of science and technology (Baines, 2006). By the mid-20th century, public education funding was allocated to public schools for the purpose of providing quality education to all races as well as socio-economically disadvantaged students (United State General Accounting Office, 2000). Toward the end of the 20th century, the federal government developed policy that focused on standardizing student achievement and the policy became known as standards-based reform.

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 titled No Child Left Behind created accountability measures to close the gap in achievement for the socio-economically disadvantaged (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002; Vinovskis, 2015). Standardizing public education (i.e., curriculum and instruction), however, had a major impact on the school environment (i.e., culture, climate, reputation). The variance in school environmental dynamics could be attributed to the federal government regulating that school performance be solely evaluated on the basis students' standardized test scores in the core areas of reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies. These accountability measures did have a positive impact on student achievement (i.e., increased reading and math scores) and graduation rates (Jennings & Rentner, 2006). Conversely, the increased stress put on school leaders (i.e., district administration and school administration) to demonstrate school improvement led to increased levels of teacher burnout and loss of autonomy in the classroom (Berryhill et al., 2009; Jennings & Rentner, 2006; Murnane & Papay, 2010).

A significant difference in public and private schools is the separation of federal government funding (Balossi & Hernandez, 2016). Private schools are independent in the development, accountability of policies and procedures, and are not held accountable by federal education policy. Gamoran (1996) explained that private schools are able to have a culture of

shared beliefs (e.g. private religious schools). Additionally, private school enrollment is based on choice; parents choose to send their children to a private school (Coleman et al., 1982). Because private schools have the autonomy to accept and reject student entry into their school, private schools have the authority to choose their student population (Shakeel & DeAngelis, 2016). Another attractive factor found within private school operations is shared voice in the development of school policy and the use of skill variety (e.g., instructional strategies) in the classroom provided to teachers (McGrath & Princiotta, 2005).

Within the literature, job satisfaction is often operationalized by surveys capturing worker's perception of the characteristics of the work environment (Rogelberg, 2007; Spector, 1997). Additionally, the empirical literature uses theoretical frameworks to support research in job satisfaction. The theories that will be used to support the outcomes of this research are the Value Percept Theory and the Job Characteristics Theory (Hackman &Oldman, 1975; Judge et al., 2001; Locke, 1976).

As noted in chapter two, job satisfaction theories are delineated into three categories (i.e., situational theories, dispositional theories, and interactive theories). The Value Percept Theory is categorized as an interactive theory (Judge et al., 2001) and assists in explaining job satisfaction by taking into consideration values and beliefs of a worker along with the characteristics of the work environment. Job satisfaction described by The Value Percept Theory is explained by the formula [satisfaction = (want - have) x importance] (Judge et al., 2001). For example, job satisfaction is achieved when the work environment provides the values that are most important to the worker.

The Job Characteristics Theory is categorized as a situational theory and focuses on internal factors of the design of the job defined in five core job characteristics: 1) task identity, 2) task significance, 3) skill variety, 4) autonomy, and 5) feedback. In addition, the five core

characteristics are linked to three psychological states (i.e., meaningfulness of work, experiences of responsibility, and internal knowledge [reflecting on performance]). The link between the core characteristics and psychological states are said to lead to one's growth need strength and thus affects one's level of job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldman, 1975).

To address the findings of this research, the aforementioned theories will be used to assist in explaining the results. In addition, this study will be explained using a global approach to job satisfaction. Rogelberg (2007) explains that job satisfaction can be studied using a global approach that explains job satisfaction with a comprehensive method that simply describes job satisfaction as satisfied or dissatisfied. To have a more detailed analysis, job satisfaction can also be examined in specific categories called facets. Some examples of facets are co-workers, work itself, pay, and supervision (Rogelberg, 2007). A summative score from the Job Descriptive Index Survey will be used to determine if there is a significant difference between the job satisfaction level of public and private school teachers.

Findings

The purpose of this research was to contribute to the empirical literature on the job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers. This study also focused on other contributing factors of teacher job satisfaction: 1) personal attributes, 2) human capital elements, and 3) workplace characteristics. Personal attributes were age, gender, and race. Human capital elements were years of experience and advanced degrees. Workplace characteristics were contractual workdays, salary, geographic location, and student enrollment. In addition, a survey was provided to account for teachers' perception of curriculum control and professional discretion in the classroom. All of these elements were used to produce a multiple regression model to address the null hypothesis.

H_0: There is no significant difference between public school teacher and private school teacher job satisfaction as measured by the summative JDI scores when potential covariates have been controlled.

The criterion for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis is an alpha of .05 ($\alpha = .05$).

Table 5.1

Factors Entered into the Regression Equation

Variable Type	Characteristic	Regression Variable
Personal Attributes	Age of Teachers	Age
	Male or Female	Gender
	White or Non-white Teachers	Race
Human Capital	Type of Degrees Earned	Education
	Experience	Years of Teaching
Workplace Characteristics	Pay	Salary
	Contract Days	Work Days
	Amount of Students in School	Enrollment
	Geographic Location	Location
	Public and Private Teachers	Public
Teacher Perception of control	Policies and Procedures	Curriculum Control
	Teachers' Decisions in the Classroom	Professional Discretion

The findings in the regression analysis revealed a significant impact on the variance in job satisfaction for public and private school teachers. Two covariates (i.e., curriculum control and teachers' professional discretion) were found to significantly influence job satisfaction. The regression coefficients are significant for public school (b = 2.24, p = .027, p < .05), curriculum control (b = 2.292, p = .024, p < .05), and teacher's professional discretion (b = -.284, p = .011, p < .05). In regard to the null hypothesis of the study, because the public school and other control variables (i.e., curriculum control and teacher's professional discretion) were found to statistically significant, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Discussion

       This study included both private school and public school teachers in the state of

Georgia. A total of 2,000 teachers (i.e., 1,000 public school teachers and 1,000 private school

teachers) were sent an email with a link to a survey that included questions concerning job

satisfaction, personal attributes, human capital, workplace characteristics, teacher's perception of

curriculum control, and teacher's perception of professional discretion in the classroom. From

the total sample, 169 teachers completed the survey rendering a response rate of 8.45%.

       For the purpose of providing data that is not misleading, assumption tests were

completed. In the process of testing the dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction), it was

determined that the data was negativity skewed and the tests of normality and equal variance

were violated. To address the skewed data, outliers were removed and for the purpose of

maintaining balanced strata, a total of three outliers were removed from each of the public school

and private school stratums. When addressing the violation of normality and equal variance,

Huck (2012) explained that data can be transformed to make it interpretable and the

transformation can be completed without compromising the reliability of the data. Therefore,

when the data of the dependent variable was transformed using a log reflection transformation,

the variable was able to meet the assumptions of normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov = .200;

Shapiro-Wilk = .130, $p > .005$) and equal variance (Levene Statistic = .150, $p > .05$).

       In this study, the null hypotheses states there is no significant difference in the job

satisfaction levels of public school and private school teachers as determined by the Job

Descriptive Index when potential covariant have been controlled. However, the findings

indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the job satisfaction levels and the

null hypothesis was rejected. The positive slope of the regression coefficient (b = .314) indicated

public school teachers had a higher level of job satisfaction than private school teachers.

To further explain the findings in this study, there were two covariates that were found to be statistically significant (i.e., curriculum control and teachers professional discretion in the classroom). The covariate curriculum control (b = .283, $p < 0.05$; see Table 4.11) indicated that overall teachers job satisfaction increased when they had more control over the curriculum (e.g., content taught and assessments). Additionally, teachers' perception of professional discretion in the classroom was found to be statistically significant (b = -.284, $p < 0.05$; see Table 4.11). The finding indicated that when teachers perceive less independent decision making in the classroom their level of job satisfaction decreased.

The empirical literature is limited on the comparison of public school and private school teachers. Research in the area of teacher job satisfaction has recently focused on public schools due to the increased accountability measures affecting teachers and because 90% of school age children in the U.S. attend public schools ("CAPE | Private School Facts," 2018; Jones, 2008; Murphy et. al., 1999; Murnane & Papay, 2010). When comparing public school and private school teachers, the research that is available has historically maintained that private school teachers are more satisfied than public school teachers (Gius, 2015; Perie & Baker, 1997).

Private school teachers are assumed to seek employment at private schools because of the independent working environment and a culture of shared beliefs among staff members, parents, and students (Gamoran, 1996; McGrath & Princiotta, 2005). Moreover, in private education, parents choose where to send their children and private school leaders are allowed to strategically select who attends their school (Coleman et al., 1982; Shakeel & DeAngelis, 2016). Conversely, the history of public school is built on an inclusive population of students ("National Defense Education Programs," 1963). For example, federal policy has constructed a culture in education that supports the academic needs of all students no matter the gender, race, or socio-economic status ("Helping America Reach High Standards," 1997; "Elementary and Secondary

Education Act · The Legislation," 2018; No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002; "With Passage of Every Student Succeeds Act, Life after NCLB Begins - NEA Today," 2016). Therefore, an assumption can be made that both educational settings provide a culture of shared beliefs. It can also be assumed that public school teachers have a higher level of job satisfaction because the characteristics of their work environment (i.e., a belief in diversity and providing educational opportunities for all students).

This assumption is supported by the Value Percept Theory. In the Value Percept Theory Locke (1976) purports, job satisfaction is achieved when a personal value is met at the work place. Furthermore, the formulas states that satisfaction is achieved when a worker declares what is valued, the value is achieved at the workplace, and a level of importance is satisfied (Judge et al., 2001). Therefore, a teacher's value may be met when they are employed at a public or private school because both settings provide a unique culture and environment.

When comparing public and private schools, private schools are said to have increased autonomy in the recruitment and hiring of teachers (Balossi & Hernandez, 2016). To add, once teachers are hired and working in a private school, they are able to experience autonomy within their work because of the decreased level of bureaucracy (i.e., federal and state government) (Balossi & Hernandez 2016; Shakeel & DeAngelis, 2016). On the other hand, empirical research on the job satisfaction of public school teachers has purported that standards-based reform has contributed to less autonomy in the classroom and loss of skill variety because of prescribed instructional strategies to increase standardized test results (Crum & Sherman, 2008; Diamond, 2007; Murnane & Papay, 2010).

For example, during the time of standards-based reform, teachers experienced role conflict and lacked the autonomy to use an assortment of skills within their planning and instruction (Farber, 1991; Friedman, 1991; McNeil, 2000; Smith 1991). However, the findings of

this study indicate that public school teachers perceive a higher level of job satisfaction than private school teachers. With the findings in this study, a second assumption can be made that there is change in the work of a public school teacher. Conceptually, an assumption can be made that public school teachers are now experiencing more autonomy and skill variety in their work.

Considering standards-based curriculum and high stakes accountability measures in education were instituted in public schools almost 20 years ago and the average of the sample in this study was 46 years old, the current workforce of teachers may view this practice as a norm and have been adequately trained in teacher preparation programs to work under these parameters. As such, the stressor of government enforced curriculum and accountability may be less potent due to the acclimation and preparation of current teachers and no longer a large contributor to job dissatisfaction for current public school teachers.

To further explain the findings of this study, the job characteristics theory will be used. The job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldman, 1976; Hackman & Oldman, 1980) is a situational theory indicating job satisfaction is explained through the work and the design of the work (Judge et al., 2001). The literature in chapter two explains that a workers satisfaction with their job is achieved by internal motivation (Hackman & Oldman, 1976). Moreover, research indicates that teacher's satisfaction with their job is embedded in the amount of autonomy they have to teach students (i.e., curriculum and instruction) (Argyris, 1964; Likert, 1961; Murnane & Papay, 2010; Singh & Loncar, 2010). Therefore, the findings in this study support that public school teachers could be experiencing a higher level of job satisfaction because they are pleased with the design of their work.

The Job Characteristics Theory further supports the statistically significant findings in the covariates of curriculum control and teacher's professional discretion in the classroom. If teachers have more control of content being taught and how it will be assessed, then their level of

97

autonomy increases and leads to job satisfaction. Similarly, when teachers have less control in the classroom and less control of instructional practices, their level of autonomy and skill variety in the work is reduced and satisfaction with work decreases.

Implications

Over the past two decades public school teachers have been influenced by the strong measures of accountability that were provided by federal legislation (e.g., NCLB) (Berryhill et al., 2009; Murane & Papay, 2010; Jennings & Rentner, 2006). Additionally, these strong measures increased stress and role conflict in public school teachers. For example, teacher's lost autonomy in their instructional practices because they were teaching only for results of standardized tests (Berryhill et al., 2009).

When the ESEA of 1965 was reauthorized in 2016, significant changes were considered. The most significant change was the allowing of states to use multiple means of measurement ("With Passage of Every Student Succeeds Act, Life after NCLB Begins - NEA Today," 2016). This changed allowed states to use other sources of data to measure school success and student growth (i.e., attendance, school safety, school climate, and standardized tests). With the change in legislation, an assumption can be made that the old model for measuring schools (i.e., NCLB) and its associated stressor are no longer prevalent. This has allowed the public school system to loosen some of the strict accountability measures that were leading to punitive consequences. Furthermore, public school teachers are now starting to experience more autonomy in the classroom. The ability to use a variety of skills in the classroom may have increased and they now have the freedom to move beyond the pressures of teaching for standardized test results. As such, caution should be taken for future policies that attempt to impact student achievement through controlling curriculum and instruction.

Considering the findings in this study, school leaders should bear in mind that teachers value the culture of their place of employment (i.e., public school or private school) and influences their job satisfaction. In addition, teachers value the opportunity to choose content, assessment, and instructional strategies in their classroom (Jennings & Rentner, 2006; Murnane & Papay, 2010). For these reasons, to potentially increase teacher job satisfaction levels, school leaders (e.g., principals) should provide an environment that promotes the values of their teachers, as well as an opportunity to collaborate with the development of policies and procedures.

Limitations

As with all research, findings should always be interpreted through the study's limitations. The limitations identified in this study are the low response rate, the use of a summative score for the job satisfaction survey (i.e., JDI), the use of the curriculum control and teachers professional discretion survey as covariates, and the independent variable private and public school teachers. The identification of the limitations of this study helps to make suggestions for future research opportunities in the area of teacher job satisfaction.

The total sample was adequate to conduct a multiple regression analysis with a lower propensity of type 1 or type 2 error; however, because of a low response rate, the findings may not be representative to the full population of public school and private school teachers in Georgia. In preparation for this study, a power analysis was conducted and the results concluded that 127 participants were needed to conduct a multiple regression for eleven covariates and one independent variable. Research supported the use of electronic delivery for surveys for professions that consistently used electronic devices for work and communication (Kaplowitz et. al., 2004). Nonetheless, in this study the exclusive use of an electronic survey did not produce a

high return rate. Therefore, one should limit the generalization of this study to 8.45% percent of the teaching profession in public and private schools in Georgia.

The use of the summative score for the JDI limits generalization of job satisfaction even though it had a high Cronbach' Alpha reliability rating of .947. Chapter two explains that job satisfaction can be described by facets. Facets assist in explaining individual components of the job. For example, the JDI is sub categorized into six facets: 1) people on your present job, 2) job in general, 3) work on present job, 4) pay, 5) opportunities for promotion, and 6) supervision. Therefore, future research could be conducted for specific facets and the facets influence on teacher job satisfaction.

Public and private school teachers were also a limitation. The sample group was taken from a broad group of teachers. This studies sample group was chosen from teachers that worked at elementary, middle, and high schools. Additionally, these teachers could be teaching subjects that are not influence by high stakes accountability such as elective course (e.g., physical education, art, music) and are generally more satisfied. Furthermore, future research could sample specific levels (e.g., public high school teachers and private high school teachers). Also, future research could look at the job satisfaction levels of teachers that teach only the core subject areas of math, science, social studies, and reading/language arts.

Another limitation that should be considered is the availability of school demographic and achievement data in private schools. School demographics such as student SES, percentage of minority students, and student's achievement data can potentially influence teacher job satisfaction. Although the data needed to operationalize these factors in a study are publicly available for public schools, private school data is not open sourced and cannot be gathered from online data warehouse. Therefore, it is recommended for future researchers to incorporate school demographic variables when conducting studies that compare private schools to public schools.

A focus of this study was the effects of policy and procedures on teacher's perception of curriculum control and instructional decisions in the classroom. To assist in operationalizing these two covariates a two-part survey was used (Archbald & Porter, 1994; May, 2010). Within the analysis, the results determined that curriculum control and teacher's professional discretion in the classroom were statistically significant; however, these significant findings in the regression did not make a distinction between public and private schools. As such, a recommendation for future research could be using the curriculum control and teacher's professional discretion survey as the dependent variable.

Lastly, the demographics of gender and race were limitations. Female teachers accounted for 77% of the study's participants. When reviewing teacher job satisfaction literature, researchers indicated that female teachers are said to be more satisfied than male teachers (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992; Klassen & Anderson, 2009; Perie & Baker, 1997). Additionally, White participants accounted for 82% of the participants, and research also indicated that white teachers are more satisfied with teaching when compared to minority races (Masters, Sun, & Loeb, 2016). Although the proportion of female and white teachers are aligned with the national data in terms of teacher characteristics as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, high proportions of these individuals could have influenced the results. Future researchers could potentially balance these two dichotomies (gender and race) to reduce the effects of groups of people historically found to have higher levels of job satisfaction.

Conclusion

The present study is intended to add to the limited empirical research of comparing public and private school teacher's level of job satisfaction. This study makes an effort to explore the different characteristics of both public and private schools to address their impact on teachers'

levels of job satisfaction. With the use of inferential statistics, this research concluded that Georgia public school teachers were more satisfied with their job than Georgia private school teachers. Additionally, the analysis determined that the covariate curriculum control was statistically significant and had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. The covariate teachers' professional discretion in the classroom was statistically significant and had a negative relationship with job satisfaction.

References

Abrams, Paula. (2009). *Cross Purposes: Pierce V. Society of Sisters and the struggle over compulsory public education*. University of Michigan Press.

Akhtar, S. N., Hashmi, M. A., & Naqvi, S. I. (2010). A comparative study of job satisfaction in public and private school teachers at secondary level. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4222-4228. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.668

Archbald, D. A., & Porter, A. C. (1994). Curriculum control and teachers' perceptions of autonomy and satisfaction. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *16*(1), 21. doi:10.2307/1164381

Argyris, C. (1964). *Integrating the individual and the organization*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

AU, W. (2007). High-stakes testing and curricular control: A qualitative metasynthesis. *Educational Researcher*, *36*(5), 258.

Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2013). The effects of school principals' leadership styles on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *13*(2), 806-811.

Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction a literature review. *Management Research and Practice*, *3*(4), 77-86.

Babin, B. J., & Boles, J. S. (1996). The effects of perceived co-worker involvement and supervisor support on service provider role stress, performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing*, *72*(1), 57-75. doi:10.1016/s0022-4359(96)90005-6

Baines, L. (2006). Does Horace Man Still Matter? *Educational Horizons*, *84*(4), 268-275.

Ballou, D. (2001). Pay for performance in public and private schools. *Economics of*

    Education Review, *20*(1), 51-61. doi:10.1016/s0272-7757(99)00060-6

Balossi, M., & Hernandez, N. R. (2016). On Teacher Quality in Independent

    Schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *91*(5), 672-690.

    doi:10.1080/0161956x.2016.1227192

Balyer, A. (2012). Transformational leadership behaviors of school principals: A qualitative

    research based on teachers' perception. *International Online Journal of Educational*

    Sciences, *4*(3), 581-591.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American*

    Psychologist, *37*(2), 122-147. doi:10.1037//0003-066x.37.2.122

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the

    vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, *18*(3), 19-31. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-s

Becker, T. E., Atinc, G., Breaugh, J. A., Carlson, K. D., Edwards, J. R., & Spector, P. E.

    (2015). Statistical control in correlational studies: 10 essential recommendations for

    organizational researchers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*(2), 157-167.

    doi:10.1002/job.2053

Berryhill, J., Linney, J. A., & Fromewick, J. (2009). The effects of education accountability

    on teachers: Are Policies too stress provoking for their own good? *International*

    Journal of Education Policy & Leadership, *4*(5), 1-14.

Bidwell, C. (2005). A Sociological Agenda for Research on Education. In Hedges L. &

    Schneider B. (Eds.), *Social Organization of Schooling, The* (pp. 15-36). New York:

    Russell Sage Foundation.

Bogler, R. (2002). Two profiles of schoolteachers: a discriminant analysis of job

    satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*(6), 665-673. doi:10.1016/s0742-

    051x(02)00026-4

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational*

    Administration Quarterly, *37*(5), 662-683. doi:10.1177/00131610121969460

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic

    and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(3), 367-

    409. doi:10.3102/0034654308321455

Bowling, N. A., Eschleman, K. J., & Wang, Q. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of the

    relationship between job satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Journal of*

    Occupational and Organizational Psychology, *83*(4), 915-934.

    doi:10.1348/096317909x478557

Bozeman, T. D., Scoggin, S., & Stuessy, C. (2013). Job satisfaction of high school science

    teachers: Prevalence and association with teacher retention. *Electronic Journal of*

    Science Education, *17*(4).

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived

    self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*(2),

    239-253. doi:10.1016/s0742-051x(99)00057-8

Buckman, D. G. (2017). Job satisfaction: a study of the relationship between right-to-work

    policy and public school teachers' perceptions. *Education Leadership Review*, 18(1),

    52-66.

Buckman, D. G., Tran, H., & Young, I. P. (2016). Does collective bargaining influence the

pay satisfaction elementary school teachers? *AASA Journal of Scholarship and*

Practice, *13*(1), 37-51.

Bui, H. T. (2017). Big Five personality traits and job satisfaction. *Journal of General*

Management, *42*(3), 21-30. doi:10.1177/0306307016687990

Burke, M. J., Borucki, C. C., & Hurley, A. E. (1992). Reconceptualizing psychological

climate in a retail service environment: A multiple-stakeholder perspective. *Journal*

of Applied Psychology, *77*(5), 717-729. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.77.5.717

ByBee, J. S. (1996). *Substantive Due Process and Free Exercise of Religion: Meyer, Pierce*

and the Origins of Wisconsin v. Yoder (352). Retrieved from Scholarly Works

website:

http://scholars.law.unlv.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1363&context=facpub

Byrne, B. M. (1994). Burnout: testing for the validity, replication, and invariance of causal

structure across elementary, intermediate, and secondary teachers. *American*

Educational Research Journal, *31*(3), 645. doi:10.2307/1163231

CAPE | Private School Facts. (2018). Retrieved from http://www.capenet.org/facts.html

Chalofsky, N., & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, commitment, and engagement: The

intersection of a deeper level of intrinsic motivation. *Advances in Developing Human*

Resources, *11*(2), 189-203. doi:10.1177/1523422309333147

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ:

Lawrence Erlbaum.

Coleman, J., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1982). Cognitive outcomes in public and private

schools. *Sociology of Education*, *55*(2/3), 65. doi:10.2307/2112288

Coleman, J. S., Hobson, E. Q., McPartland, C. J., Mood, J., Weinfeld, A. M., & Robert, L.

    (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (2). York.

Couch, J. F., Shughart, W. F., & Williams, A. L. (1993). Private school enrollment and

    public school performance. *Public Choice*, *76*(4), 301-312. doi:10.1007/bf01053301

Crossman, A., & Harris, P. (2006). Job satisfaction of secondary school

    teachers. *Educational Managment Administration and Leadership*, *34*(1), 29-46.

Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement. *Journal of*

    Educational Administration, *46*(5), 562-580. doi:10.1108/09578230810895492

Cucina, J. M., & Bowling, N. (2015). Robert Hoppock: Early job satisfaction and vocational

    guidance pioneer (PDF Download Available). Retrieved from

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282295269_Robert_Hoppock_Early_Job_S

    atisfaction_and_Vocational_Guidance_Pioneer

Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A., & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay satisfaction and

    organizational outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*(3), 613-640. doi:10.1111/j.1744-

    6570.2005.00245.x

Darling-Hammond, L., Marks, E. L., United States, & Rand Corporation. (1983). *The new*

    federalism in education: State responses to the 1981 Education Consolidation and

    Improvement Act. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Dee, T., & Jacob, B. (2009). The impact of No Child Left Behind on student

    achievement. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *30*(3), 418-446.

    doi:10.3386/w15531

Diamond, J. B. (2007). Where the rubber meets the road: Rethinking the connection between

      high-stakes testing policy and classroom instruction. *Sociology of Education*, *80*(4),

      285-313. doi:10.1177/003804070708000401

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode*

      Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-*

      Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Duncan, A. (2009, October 30). *Teacher preparation: Reforming the uncertain profession*

      [Remarks of Secretary Arne Duncan at teachers college, Columbia University].

Eldridge, B. (2016). Building effective assessment strategies for millennials in the

      workforce. *ICERI2016 Proceedings*. doi:10.21125/iceri.2016.1850

Elementary and Secondary Education Act · The Legislation. (2018). Retrieved from

      http://acsc.lib.udel.edu/exhibits/show/legislation/esea

Ellis, N. H., & Bernhardt, R. G. (1992). Prescription for teacher satisfaction: Recognition and

      responsibility. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and*

      Ideas, *65*(3), 179-182. doi:10.1080/00098655.1992.10114196

Elmore, R. F. (1993). The role of local school districts in instructional

      improvement. *Designing coherent education policy: Improving the system*, 96-124.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education. (2018). Retrieved from

      https://www.ed.gov/esea

Fairchild, S., Tobias, R., Corcoran, S., Djukic, M., Kovner, C., & Noguera, P. (2012). White

      and black Teachers' job satisfaction: Does relational demography matter? *Urban*

      Education, *47*(1), 170-197. doi:10.1177/0042085911429582

Fan, W., & Yan, Z. (2010). Factors affecting response rates of the web survey: A systematic

review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *26*(2), 132-139.

doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.10.015

Farber, B. A. (1991). *Crisis in education: Stress and burnout in the American teacher*. San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Federal Role in Education. (2017, May 25). Retrieved from

https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html

Ferguson, L. W. (1963). *The Heritage of Industrial Psychology*. Hartford, CT: Finlay Press.

Friedman, I. A. (1991). High and Low-Burnout Schools: School Culture Aspects of Teacher

Burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *84*(6), 325-333.

doi:10.1080/00220671.1991.9941813

FY2016 Private School Data Collection. (2018). Retrieved from

http://www.gadoe.org/Technology-Services/Data-Collections/Pages/FY2016-Private-

School-Data-Collection.aspx

Gaidar, Y. (2007). *The Soviet Collapse: Grain and Oil*. Retrieved from American Enterprise

Institute for Public Policy Research website:

https://web.archive.org/web/20090725114959/http://www.aei.org/docLib/20070419_

Gaidar.pdf

Gamoran, A. (1996). Student Achievement in Public Magnet, Public Comprehensive, and

Private City High Schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *18*(1), 1.

doi:10.2307/1164227

Goldring, R., Taie, S., Riddles, M., & US. Department of Education. (2014). *Teacher attrition and mobility Results from the 2012-2013 follow up survey*. National Center for Education Statistics.

Gonzalez, R. A., & Firestone, W. A. (2013). Educational tug-of-war: internal and external accountability of principals in varied contexts. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *51*(3), 383-406. doi:10.1108/09578231311311528

Grande, Todd. (2015a). Multiple Linear Regression in SPSS with Assumption Testing. Available from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ueNrP5TyZaE

Grande, Todd. (2015b). Understanding and Identifying Multicollineartity in Regression using SPSS. Available from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pZsOn6wnGSO

Grissom, J. A., Nicholson-Crotty, S., & Harrington, J. R. (2014). Estimating the effects of No Child Left Behind on teachers' work environments and job attitudes. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *36*(4), 417-436. doi:10.3102/0162373714533817

Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *76*(2), 173-208. doi:10.3102/00346543076002173

Gillet, B., & Schwab, D. P. (1975). Convergent and discriminant validities of corresponding Job Descriptive Index and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*(3), 313.

Gius, Mark. (2015). A Comparison of Teacher Job Satisfaction in Public and Private Schools. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 19*(3).

H.R.3941 - 97th Congress (1981-1982): Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of

    1981. (1981, July 2). Retrieved from https://www.congress.gov/bill/97th-

    congress/house-bill/3941

Hackman, J. R., & Oldman, G. R. (1975). Development of job diagnostic survey. *Journal of*

    Applied Psychology, (60), 159-170.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldman, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a

    theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* (16th ed., pp. 250-279).

Hackman, J. R., & Oldman, G. R. (1980). Work redesign.

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement

    among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, *43*(6), 495-513.

    doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001

Hale, E., & Rollins, K. (2006). Leading the way to increased student learning. *Principal*

    Leadership, *6*(10), 6-9.

Hamilton, L. S., Stecher, B. M., & Yuan, K. (2008). *Standards-based reform in the United*

    States: History, research, and future directions (REC-0228295). Retrieved from

    Rand Corporation website:

    https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reprints/2009/RAND_RP1384.pdf

Hannaway, J., & Kimball, K. (1998). Big Isn't Always Bad: School District Size, Poverty,

    and Standards-Based Reform.

Hanushek, E. A. (1992). The trade-off between child quantity and quality. *Journal of*

    Political Economy, *100*(1), 84-117. doi:10.1086/261808

Heck, R. H., & Chang, J. (2017). Examining the timing of educational changes among

> elementary schools after the implementation of NCLB. *Educational Administration*

> *Quarterly*, *53*(4), 649-694. doi:10.1177/0013161x17711480

Helping America Reach High Standards. (1997). Retrieved from

> https://clintonwhitehouse4.archives.gov/WH/New/html/19970908-7174.html

Heneman III, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay satisfaction: Its multidimensional nature

> and measurement. *International journal of Psychology*, *20*(1), 129-141.

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to work*. New York: Holy Wiley & Sons.

Herzberg, F. (1968). *One more time: How do you motivate employees?* Boston, MA: Harvard

> Business Press.

Hewitt, T. W. (2008). Speculations on a Nation at Risk: Illusions and realities. *Phi Delta*

> *Kappan*, *89*(08), 575-579.

Hinsdale, B. A. (1898). *Horace Mann and the common school revival in the United States*.

> Place of publication not identified, NY: Charles Shribner's Sons.

Home | U.S. Department of Education. (2018). Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. Oxford, England: Harper.

Horn, J. E., Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. (2004). The structure of

> occupational well-being: A study among Dutch teachers. *Journal of Occupational*

> *and Organizational Psychology*, *77*(3), 365-375. doi:10.1348/0963179041752718

House, R. J., Shapiro, H. J., & Wahba, M. A. (1974). Expectancy theory as a predictor of

> work behavior and attitude: A re-evaluation of empirical evidence. *Decision*

> *Sciences*, *5*(3), 481-506. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5915.1974.tb00632.x

Huck, S. W. (2012). *Reading Statistics and Research*. Addison Wesley Longman.

Hulin, C. L. (1966). Effects of community characteristics on measures of job

      satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *50*(2), 185-192. doi:10.1037/h0023082

Hulin, C. L., Drasgow, F., & Komocar, J. (1982). Applications of item response theory to

      analysis of attitude scale translations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*(6), 818.

Hulin, C. L., & Mayer, L. J. (1986). Psychometric equivalence of a translation of the Job

      Descriptive Index into Hebrew. *Journal of applied psychology*, *71*(1), 83.

Ingersoll, Richard M. (2001). *Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of*

      schools. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of

      Washington.

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989).

      Construction of a Job in General scale: A comparison of global, composite, and

      specific measures. *Journal of Applied psychology*, *74*(2), 193.

Jennings, J., & Rentner, D. S. (2006). *Ten Big Effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on*

      Public Schools. Retrieved from Center on Education Policy website: http://www.cep-

      dc.org

Johns, G. (1978a). Attitudinal and nonattitudinal predictors of two forms of absence from

      work. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 431–444.

Johns, G. (1978b). Task moderators of the relationship between leadership style and

      subordinate responses. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 319–325.

Johnson, S. M., Smith, P. C., & Tucker, S. M. (1982). Response format of the Job

      Descriptive Index: Assessment of reliability and validity by the multitrait–

      multimethod matrix. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*(4), 500–505.

Jones, S. L. (2008). *Religious schooling in America: Private education and public life*. Praeger Publishers.

Judge, T. A., Hulin, C. L., & Dalal, R. S. (2009). Job satisfaction and job affect. In S. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Judge, T. A., & Locke, E. A. (1993). Effect of dysfunctional thought processes on subjective well-being and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(3), 475-490. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.78.3.475

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional cause of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *19*, 151-188.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(1), 17-34. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.83.1.17

Judge, T. A., Parker, S., Colbert, A. E., Heller, D., & Remus, I. (2001). Job Satisfaction: A Cross-Cultural Review Volume 2. In *In N. Anderson, D.S. Ones, H.K. Sinangil, C. Viswesvarn (Ed.), Handbook of industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology volume 2* (pp. 25-52). London, United Kingdom: Sage Publications.

Kaplowitz, M. D., Hadlock, T. D., & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *68*(1), 94-101. doi:10.1093/poq/nfh006

Kauffman, D., Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Liu, E., & Peske, H. G. (2002). "Lost at Sea": new teachers' experiences with curriculum and assessment. *Teachers College Record*, *104*(2), 273-300. doi:10.1111/1467-9620.00163

Kennedy, M. M., Birman, B. F., & Demaline, R. E. (1986). *The effectiveness of Chapter 1 services*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Dept. of Education.

Kennedy, R. (2004). Top 4 Reasons to Teach in a Private School. Retrieved from https://www.thoughtco.com/reasons-to-teach-in-a-private-school-2773330?utm_source=emailshare&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=shareurlbuttons

Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the job descriptive index: a review and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, *87*(1), 14.

Kim, I., & Loadman, W. E. (1994). *Predicting teacher job satisfaction*.

Klassen, R. M., & Anderson, C. J. (2009). How times change: secondary teachers' job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in 1962 and 2007. *British Educational Research Journal*, *35*(5), 745-759. doi:10.1080/01411920802688721

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *102*(3), 741-756. doi:10.1037/a0019237

Klecker, B. (1997). *Male Elementary School Teachers' Ratings of Job Satisfaction by Years of Teaching Experience*.

Knapp, M. S., United States, & SRI International. (1989). *Local program design and decisionmaking under chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public Goods, Private Goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, *34*(1), 39. doi:10.2307/1163342

Langelaan, S., Bakker, A. B., Van Doornen, L. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *40*(3), 521-532. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.009

Lauermann, F., & König, J. (2016). Teachers' professional competence and wellbeing: Understanding the links between general pedagogical knowledge, self-efficacy and burnout. *Learning and Instruction*, *45*, 9-19. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.06.006

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research how leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.

Lemon v. Kurtzman. (2018). Retrieved October 21, 2018, from https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/403/602

Likert, R. L. (1961). *The human organization*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In *In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Lyons, R.G. (2007). Towards a Theory of Work Satisfaction: An Examination of Karl Marx and Frederick Herzberg.

Ma, X., & MacMillan, R. B. (1999). Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction. *The journal of educational research*, *93*(1), 39-47.

MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *12*(1), 73-83.

Malloy, W. W., & Allen, T. (2007). Teacher retention in a resiliency-building rural school. *The Rural Educator*, *28*(2).

Master, B., Sun, M., & Loeb, S. (2016). Teacher workforce developments: Recent changes in academic competitiveness and job satisfaction of new teachers. *Education Finance and Policy*, 1-23. doi:10.1162/edfp_a_00215

May, Donald, Jr. (2010). Curriculum Control and Teachers' Perceptions of Professional Discretion and Satisfaction. University of Central Florida. Orlando, Florida.

Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Beacon.

McCabe, D. J., Dalessio, A., Briga, J., & Sasaki, J. (1980). The convergent and discriminant validities between the IOR and the JDI: English and Spanish forms. Academy of Management Journal, 23, 778–786.

McGrath, D. J., & Princiotta, D. (2005). *Private school teacher turnover and teacher perceptions of school organizational characteristics*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Dept. of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

McNeil, L. M. (2000). *Contradiction of reform: The educational costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.

Melenyzer, B. J. (1990). *Teacher empowerment: The discourse, meaning, and social actions of teachers*. Paper presented at National Council on States on Inservice Education, Orlando, Florida.

Milkovich, G. T., & Newman, J. M. (2008). *Compensation* (8th ed.). Retrieved from

    http://sutlib2.sut.ac.th/sut_contents/H79841.pdf

Miller, K. I., Ellis, B. H., Zook, E. G., & Lyles, J. S. (1990). An integrated model of

    communication, stress, and burnout in the workplace. *Communication*

    Research, *17*(3), 300-326. doi:10.1177/009365090017003002

Minor, J. B. (1995). *Administration and Management Theory*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2005). Corrective action in low performing schools: Lessons for

    NCLB implementation from first-generation accountability systems. Vol. 13 No.

    48. *Education policy analysis archives*, *13*, 48. doi:10.14507/epaa.v13n48.2005

Moore, C. M. (2012). The role of school environment in teacher dissatisfaction among U.S.

    public school teachers. *SAGE Open*, *2*(1), 215824401243888.

    doi:10.1177/2158244012438888

Morgeson, F. P., Garza, A. S., & Campion, M. A. (2012). Work design. In I. B. Weiner,

    W. C. Borman, D. R. Llgen, & S. Highhouse (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology*.

    Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Murnane, R. J., & Papay, J. P. (2010). Teachers' views on No Child Left Behind: Support for

    the principles, concerns about the practices. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *24*(3),

    151-166. doi:10.1257/jep.24.3.151

Murphy, J., Louis, K. S., & American Educational Research Association. (1999). New

    consumerism: Evolving market dynamics in the institutional dimension of school.

    In *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American*

    Educational Research Association (2nd ed., pp. 405-419). San Francisco, CA:

    Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Nasri, W., & Charfeddine, L. (2012). Motivating salespeople to contribute to marketing

    intelligence activities: An expectancy theory approach. *International Journal of*

    Marketing Studies, *4*(1). doi:10.5539/ijms.v4n1p168

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). Archived: Table of contents.

    Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html

National Defense Education Programs. (1963). *Congressional Digest*, *42*(2), 40.

Nestor, P. I., & Leary, P. (2000). The relationship between tenure and non-tenure track status

    of extension faculty and job satisfaction. *Journal of Extension*, *38*(4), 8-13.

Nichols, E., & Sedivi, B. (1998). 1998 Proceedings of the sections of survey research

    methods. *American Statistical Association,* 266-371.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002). *P.L. 107-110*. U.S.C. § 6319.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). Sampling designs in qualitative research:

    making the sampling process more public. *The Qualitative Report*, *12*(2), 238-254.

O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and Organizational culture: A

    profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of*

    Management Journal, *34*(3), 487-516. doi:10.5465/256404

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An

    organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*(6), 963-974.

    doi:10.1037//0021-9010.77.6.963

Owens, S. J., Georgia Department of Education. (2015). Georgia's teacher dropout crisis: A

    look at why nearly half of Georgia teachers are leaving the profession. Retrieved

    from https://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-

    Policy/communications/Documents/Teacher%20Survey%20Results.pdf

Park, C., Lovrich, N. P., & Soden, D. L. (1988). Testing Herzberg's Motivation Theory in a comparative study of U.S. and Korean public employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *8*(3), 40-60. doi:10.1177/0734371x8800800304

Parker, D. F., & Dyer, L. (1976). Expectancy theory as a within-person behavioral choice model: An empirical test of some conceptual and methodological refinements. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *17*(1), 97-117. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(76)90055-6

Pepper, K. (2010). Effective principals skillfully balanced leadership styles to facilitate student success: a focus for the reauthorization of ESEA. *Planning and Changing*, *41*(1/2), 42-56.

Perie, M., & Baker, D. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics and teacher compensation*. Retrieved from U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics website: http://www.ed.gov/NCES

Podgursky, M. (2003). Fringe Benefits. *Education Next*, 71-76.

Rain, J. S., Lane, I. M., & Steiner, D. D. (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: Review and future considerations. Human Relations, 44, 287–307.

Ravitch, D. (2013). *The death and life of the great American school system*. Capital Reader and Shamrock Ne Media, Inc.

Resnick, L. B., & Resnick, D. P. (1992). Assessing the thinking curriculum: New tools for educational reform. *Changing Assessments*, 37-75. doi:10.1007/978-94-011-2968-8_3

Rice, R. W., Gentile, D. A., & McFarlin, D. B. (1991). Facet importance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(1), 31-39. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.76.1.31

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative science quarterly*, 150-163.

Rogelberg, S. G. (Ed.). (2007). *Encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology: Volume 1*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

*Ronen, S. (1977). A comparison of job facet satisfaction between paid and unpaid industrial workers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 582–588.

Rudow, B. (1999). Stress and burnout in the teaching profession: European studies, and research perspective. In R. Vandenberghe, K. U. Leuven, & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A sourcebook of international* (pp. 38-58). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American educational research journal*, *50*(1), 4-36.

Ruthankoon, R., & Olu Ogunlana, S. (2003). Testing Herzberg's two-factor theory in the Thai construction industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, *10*(5), 333-341. doi:10.1108/09699980310502946

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job

    attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*(2), 224-253.

    doi:10.2307/2392563

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future

    student academic achievement.

Sandfort, J., & Moulton, S. (2015). *Effective implementation in practice: Integrating public*

    policy and management.

Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review*, *51*(1),

    1-17.

Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job

    stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology*, *57*(s1), 152-171.

    doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359.x

Sergiovanni, T. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of

    teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *5*(1), 66-82.

Shakeel, M. D., & DeAngelis, C. (2016). Who is More Free? A comparison of the decision-

    making of private and public school principals. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

    doi:10.2139/ssrn.2795138

Sheehan, K. B., & Hoy, M. G. (1999). Using E-mail to survey Internet users In the United

    States: Methodology and assessment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated*

    Communication, *4*(3), 0-0. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.1999.tb00101.x

Short, P., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of

    level empowerment within the school enviroment. *Educational and Psychological*

    Measurement, (52), 951-961.

Singh, P., & Loncar, N. (2010). Pay satisfaction, job satisfaction and turnover

   intent. *Relations Industrielles*, *65*(3), 470. doi:10.7202/044892ar

Singh, R. (2016). The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators on employee engagement

   in information organizations. *Journal of Education for Library and Information

   Science Online*, *57*(2), 197-206. doi:10.12783/issn.2328-2967/57/2/11

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of

   relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(4), 1059-1069.

   doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001

Smith, M. L. (1991). Put to the test: The effects of external testing on teachers. *Educational

   Researcher*, *20*(5), 8. doi:10.2307/1176396

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). Job Descriptive Index—Coworker

   Satisfaction Scale. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1037/t00314-000

Soper, D. (2018). Free a-priori sample size calculator for multiple regression - free statistics

   calculators. Retrieved from

   https://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc/calculator.aspx?id=1

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*.

   Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Spradlin, T. E., & Prendergast, K. A. (2006). Emerging trends in teacher recruitment and

   retention in the No Child Left Behind Era. *Center for Evaluation and Education

   Policy*, *4*(12).

Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to

   job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *70*(3), 469-480. doi:10.1037//0021-

   9010.70.3.469

Stevenson, Z., & Sims, C. (2002). No Child Left Behind: Standards and assessments.

    Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/sai/standasissues.pdf

Strickland, C. E. (1985). Sputnik reform revisited. *Educational Studies*, *16*(1), 15-21.

    doi:10.1207/s15326993es1601_2

Swanson, C. B., & Stevenson, D. L. (2002). Standards-Based Reform in Practice: Evidence

    on state policy and classroom instruction from the NAEP state

    assessments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *24*(1), 1-27.

    doi:10.3102/01623737024001001

Tasios, T., & Giannouli, V. (2017). Job Descriptive Index (JDI): Reliability and validity

    study in Greece. *Archives of Assessment Psychology*, *7*(1), 61-91.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. MA: The Plimpton Press

    Norwood.

The National Education Goals Report. (1999). Retrieved from:

    https://govinfo.library.unt.edu/negp/reports/99rpt.pdf

Truell, A. D., Bartlett, J. E., & Alexander, M. W. (2002). Response rate, speed, and

    completeness: A comparison of Internet-based and mail surveys. *Behavior Research*

    Methods, Instruments, & Computers, *34*(1), 46-49. doi:10.3758/bf03195422

Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T., & Erdogan, B. (2016). *Psychology and work: Perspectives on*

    industrial and organizational psychology. Routledge.

U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *Characteristics of Private Schools in the United*

    States: Results from the 2015-2016 Private School Universe Survey. Retrieved from

    National Center for Education Statistics website:

    https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017073.pdf

U.S. Department of Education: Office of Innovations and Improvement Office of Non-public
    Education. (2009). Retrieved from: https://oese.ed.gov/?s=non-public+education

United States General Accounting Office. (2000). *Title I program: Stronger accountability
    needed for performance of disadvantaged students: report to Congressional
    requesters*. Retrieved from The Office website:
    https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GAOREPORTS-HEHS-00-89/pdf/GAOREPORTS-
    HEHS-00-89.pdf

United States National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1984). *A Nation at Risk:
    The full account*. Cambridge, MA: USA Research.

Vandenberghe, C., & Tremblay, M. (2008). The Role of Pay Satisfaction and Organizational
    Commitment in Turnover Intentions: A Two-Sample Study. *Journal of Business and
    Psychology*, *22*(3), 275-286. doi:10.1007/s10869-008-9063-3

Vinovskis, M. A. (2015). *From a Nation at Risk to No Child Left Behind: National
    Education Goals and the Creation of Federal Education Policy*. New York: Teachers
    College Press.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation.

Warren, R. H. (1989). Motivation and productivity in the construction industry. Van
    Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Watson, D., & Slack, A. K. (1993). General factors of affective temperament and their
    relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision
    Processes*, *54*(2), 181-202. doi:10.1006/obhd.1993.1009

Weiss, H. M., & Adler, S. (1984). Personality and organizational behavior. In B. Staw & L.

 Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (6th ed., pp. 1-50).

 Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wisconsin v. Yoder 406 U.S. 205 (1972). (2018). Retrieved from

 https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/406/205/

"With Passage of Every Student Succeeds Act, Life after NCLB Begins - NEA Today".

 (2016, February 16). Retrieved from http://neatoday.org/2015/12/09/every-student-

 succeeds-act/

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-Efficacy: An Essential Motive to Learn. *Contemporary*

 Educational Psychology, *25*(1), 82-91. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1016

Appendix A:

Cover Letter for First E-mailing

Dear [teacher]:

As an educator in the state of Georgia, you are certainly aware of the many factors that impact the job satisfaction level of being an educator. The level of responsibilities brought on by expectations to deliver quality instruction, while also managing all of the other professional duties, are just a few of the factors that impact job satisfaction. Have you ever wondered how you level of job satisfaction compares to other educators in the state of Georgia?

The fact that you are an educator with experience makes your input in this survey tremendously valuable. That's why you have been chosen to be a part of this small group of teachers within the state of Georgia that can provide information about the teaching profession. Time is valuable to a teacher; however, your participation is needed to advance the research in understanding how teachers are affected by educational policies and workplace conditions.
In this e-mail, you will find a link to a survey. The survey will request responses pertaining to job satisfaction, biographical, and compensation information. Please complete the survey as candidly and completely as possible.

Confidentiality of your participation will be treated with the utmost respect and only group means will be utilized in the study. That is, job satisfaction information will not be reported for any particular individual. If you would like to receive a summary and implications of the results of this research, please correspond with a responding email.

Thank you for your time and significant contribution to this important topic. They are greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns (csmall13@students.kennesaw.edu).

Respectfully,

Chris Small

Kennesaw State University

Appendix B:

Cover Letter for Second E-mailing

Dear [teacher]:

A few days ago you receive a survey for a research project regarding job satisfaction of teachers in Georgia. If you responded to that e-mailing, I offer my deepest thanks. If you have not yet responded to that request, I ask you the favor of a few minutes of your limited valuable time in completing the surveys. **This study represents an important extension of the body of research related to Job satisfaction of teachers.**

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please rest assured that your participation in this study will be treated with the highest level of confidentiality and your anonymity will be completely respected in the findings. Below you will find a link to the survey.

Respectfully,

Chris Small

Kennesaw State University

Appendix C:

Cover Letter for Third E-mailing

Dear [Teacher]:

I need your help!

As an educator in Georgia, you are uniquely positioned to assist in ascertaining the factors that lead to explaining job satisfaction for teachers. Because of this unique status, you have been selected as one of a very small number of the teachers in Georgia to participate in a study focused on polices and workplace characteristics.

Two weeks ago you receive a survey asking information related to job satisfaction of teachers. If you have responded to this earlier mailing, you may discard this email and I offer you my sincere appreciation. If you have not yet responded to the survey, I ask you the favor of a few minute of your limited and valuable time in completing this survey. This study represents an important extension of the body of research related to the job satisfaction of teachers, and your contribution to the study is crucial. In the hope that you will choose to assist me in this study, I have provided a duplicate copy of the link to the survey.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. Confidentiality of your participation will be treated with the utmost respect and only group means will be utilized in this study. That is, no job satisfaction information will be reported for any particular individual. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Respectfully,

Chris Small

Kennesaw State University

Csmall13@students.kennesaw.edu

Appendix D:

Informational Survey

Please provide a response to the following questions by checking the appropriate box or by filling in the blank. The confidentiality of your responses is assured.

1. Name of your School:_____

2. Which category best fits your school

   o Traditional Pubic School

   o Private School

3. Highest degree earned:

   o Bachelor's degree

   o Master's degree

   o Educational Specialist or credits above Master's degree

   o Doctorate degree

4. Number of years served as a teacher (e.g., 10):_____

5. Age (e.g., 38):_____

6. Current gender identity:

   o Male

   o Female

   o Transgender

   o Do not identify as female, male, or transgender

7. Your race:

   o African American/Black

   o Asian/Pacific Islander

   o Hispanic/Latino/Spanish

   o Native American

   o White/European American

- o Multiracial

- o Other

8. Current gross pay per year (e.g., 35000): $_____

9. Total number of contracted workdays (e.g., 190):_____

10. Describe the location of your school:

- o Urban

- o Suburban

- o Rural

The Job Descriptive Index Survey

People on Your Present Job: Think of the majority of people with who you work or meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people? In the blank beside each word or phrase below type <u>Y</u> for "Yes" if it describes the people with whom you work, <u>N</u> for "No" if it does not describe them, and <u>?</u> for "?" if you cannot decide.

1) _____ Stimulating

2) _____ Boring

3) _____Slow

4) _____Helpful

5) _____ Stupid

6) _____Responsible

7) _____Likeable

8) _____Intelligent

9) _____ Easy to make enemies

10) _____ Rude

11) _____ Smart

12) _____ Lazy

13) _____ Unpleasant

14) _____Supportive

15) _____Active

16) _____Narrow Interests

17) _____ Frustrating

18) _____ Stubborn

Job In General: Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, type: <u>Y</u> for "Yes" if it describes your job, <u>N</u> for "No" if it does not describe it, and <u>?</u> for "?" if you cannot decide.

1) _____ Pleasant

2) _____ Bad

3) _____ Great

4) _____ Waste of time

5) _____ Good

6) _____ Undesirable

7) _____ Worthwhile

8) _____ Worse than most

9) _____ Acceptable

10) _____ Superior

11) _____ Better than most

12) _____ Disagreeable

13) _____ Makes me content

14) _____ Inadequate

15) _____ Excellent

16) _____ Rotten

17) _____ Enjoyable

18) _____ Poor

Work on Present Job: Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, type: <u>Y</u> for "Yes" If it describes your work, <u>N</u> for "No" if it does not describe it, and **?** for "?" if you cannot decide.

1) _____ Fascinating

2) _____ Routine

3) _____ Satisfying

4) _____ Boring

5) _____ Good

6) _____ Gives sense of accomplishment

7) _____ Respected

8) _____ Exciting

9) _____ Rewarding

10) _____ Useful

11) _____ Challenging

12) _____ Simple

13) _____ Repetitive

14) _____ Creative

15) _____ Dull

16) _____ Uninteresting

17) _____ Can see results

18) _____ Uses my abilities

Pay: Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, type: Y for "Yes" if it describes your pay, N for "No" if it does not describe it, and ? for "?" if you cannot decide.

1) _____ Income adequate for normal expenses

2) _____ Fair

3) _____ Barely live on income

4) _____ Bad

5) _____ Comfortable

6) _____ Less than I deserve

7) _____ Well Paid

8) _____ Enough to live on

9) _____ Underpaid

Opportunities for Promotion: Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, type: <u>Y</u> for "Yes" if it describes opportunities for promotion, <u>N</u> for "No" if it does not describe them, and <u>?</u> for "?" if you cannot decide.

1) _____ Good opportunities for promotion

2) _____ Opportunities somewhat limited

3) _____ Promotion on ability

4) _____ Dead-end job

5) _____ Good chance for promotion

6) _____ Very Limited

7) _____ Infrequent promotions

8) _____ regular promotions

9) _____ Fairly good chance for promotion

Supervision: Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, type: <u>Y</u> for "Yes" if it describes the supervision you get on the job, <u>N</u> for "No" if it does not describe it, and <u>?</u> for "?" if you cannot decide.

1) _____ Supportive

2) _____ Hard to please

3) _____ Impolite

4) _____ Praises for work

5) _____ Tactful

6) _____ Influential

7) _____ Up- to-date

8) _____ Unkind

9) _____ Has favorites

10) _____ Tells me where I stand

11) _____ Annoying

12) _____ Stubborn

13) _____ Knows job well

14) _____ Bad

15) _____ Intelligent

16) _____ Poor planner

17) _____ Around when needed

18) _____ Lazy

Curriculum Control and Teachers' Perceptions of Professional Discretion Survey

Directions: rate how big an influence each factor below has in determining content (i.e., information, concepts, skills) of the subject you teach.	No Influence	Minimal Influence	Little Influence	Some Influence	Considerable Influence	Major Influence
	Please select one					
1. State curriculum guidelines	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. District curriculum guideline	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. School administrators decisions and guidelines	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. Department decisions and guidelines	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. Other teachers' decisions and guidelines	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. State tests	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. District tests	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. School/department common assessments	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. The main course textbook	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. My own beliefs about what topics are important	0	1	2	3	4	5
11. My own knowledge of particular topics	0	1	2	3	4	5
12. What my students are capable of understanding	0	1	2	3	4	5
13. What my students need for future study and work	0	1	2	3	4	5
Directions: Rate how much control you feel you have in your classroom over each of the following areas in your planning and teaching	No Control	Minimal Control	Little Control	Some Control	Considerable Control	Major Control
	Please select one					
14. Selecting textbooks/instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
15. Selecting content, topics, and skills	0	1	2	3	4	5
16. Selecting teaching techniques	0	1	2	3	4	5
17. Determining amount of homework to be assigned	0	1	2	3	4	5
18. Setting standards for grading and achievement	0	1	2	3	4	5