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ABSTRACT

Teacher attrition is a major problem facing education today. Some literature reports as many as half of all teachers leave the profession within the first five years. The current study sought to examine the role of resources as moderators to the impacts of job stress and job satisfaction on quit intention in early career teachers. Drawing from conservation of resource theory, findings from this study show that high levels of job stress and low levels of job satisfaction are related to increased quit intention. However, results from this study showed no difference in the stress, satisfaction, and quit intention relationship for early career teachers compared to mid-career or veteran teachers. Additionally only the resources of informal mentoring and communities of practice were moderate the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, and quit intention. Finally, rewards were found to be the resource with the strongest relationship to quit intention. Practical and theoretical implications for reducing quit intention through the presence of valid resources are discussed.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Background

Schools serve to educate children to become productive citizens. The K-12 public school systems in the United States serve all youth, regardless of background, home life, and prior ability. The most formative years of the development of American youth are spent in the care of education professionals. Given the magnitude of the importance schooling plays in the lives of young people, there is serious concern over the finding that close to half of all early career teachers leave the profession within the first five years (Ingersoll, 2012).

In 2014, there were approximately 3.6 million individuals working in preschool, elementary, middle, and high schools in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016), with projections for employment to grow in this area by an average of 6% by the year 2024. Teachers leaving the profession early do so at significant cost to their school districts. School districts with high turnover report costs incurred when replacing an experienced teacher with one with less experience, and in cultivating professional growth in a new teacher (Milanowski & Oddwn, 2007; Watlington, Shockley, Guglielmino, & Felsher, 2010). Students are also affected as achievement often declines when students are taught by new teachers in successive years (Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004).

Although the rate of turnover among early career teachers has risen alarmingly in recent years, the root problems leading to the current problems have long existed. In the 1980s, Calabrese (1986) noted that teaching was a profession with poor working conditions that offered minimal job satisfaction. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, the national attrition rate for teachers of all levels was 5.6% in 1989 and 8.4% in 2005 (NCES, 2013). This problem is also widespread globally in countries with western systems of education. Studies
show that approximately one third of teachers in developed nations leave the profession within the first 5 years citing feelings of isolation, poor communication, poor working conditions, and high workloads as areas of high frustration (Buchanan, Prescott, Schuck, Aubusson, Burke, & Louviere, 2013). Years of job experience, job satisfaction, and burnout were found to be predictors of stress experienced by teachers (Fisher, 2011). Burnout, the result of a continual buildup of stress (Maslach & Jackson, 1981), and the associated stressors can lead to job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit (Wang, Hom, & Allen, 2014).

Findings from a study of novice (first year) teachers suggest burnout in this population is the result of job dissatisfaction due in large part to a lack of social integration into the work environment (Gavish & Friedman, 2010). New teachers must feel integrated into the organization with working knowledge of school rules. Without an understanding of the organizational structure of the school, early career teachers are unlikely to possess, have access to, or awareness of the resources necessary to manage factors such as classroom management and the bureaucracy of school systems (Kremer-Hayon & Ben-Peretz, 1986; Kuzmic, 1994).

**Research Context: The State of Education in Louisiana**

The population focus of this study are K-12 teachers in the state of Louisiana. In order to understand the dire need to retain qualified teachers in this state, the current climate of public education must be examined. The state of Louisiana spends over three million dollars less on public elementary and secondary education than the U.S. average (NCES, 2016). This occurs while Louisiana students in grades 4 and 8 score below the U.S. average on scaled national assessment scores in math, reading, science and writing (NAEP, 2011). In national ACT rankings (a measure of college readiness), Louisiana high school students ranked 42nd with an average score of 19.5- well below the national average of 21 (ACT, 2017). With consistently low
performing public schools, the state’s two major cities—Baton Rouge and New Orleans—struggle with having enough trained and educated workers necessary to fill skilled jobs (Rothwell & Berube, 2011), therefore making teacher retention of critical importance to the state’s education system.

Following a 2012 legislative bill which resulted in policy changes to teacher tenure laws, overall teacher attrition rate in Louisiana increased by 1.5% (Strunk, Barrett, & Lincove, 2017). These policy changes, designed to remove ineffective teachers from the classroom, were controversial in the metrics used to do so—namely standardized test scores and administrator evaluations. Among already-tenured teachers a primary concern of these new changes were centered on the loss of job security. Additionally, teacher attrition was highest in schools rated as “F” (Strunk, Barrett, & Lincove, 2017). The Louisiana Department of Education’s (LDOE) own website noted that in the year 2012-2013 46% of teachers who left the profession were rated as either Effective: Proficient or Highly Effective (LDOE, 2013). When almost half of teachers who leave the profession are deemed effective by the state’s own evaluation system, how does this translate to success for state schools?

While one cannot argue against removing ineffective teachers from the classroom, any move that disproportionately removes teachers from schools that already struggle to recruit and retain teachers may be counterproductive. Many factors contribute to the burnout faced by early career teachers. The job demands of teachers are many, and when not mediated by resources, they can result in job dissatisfaction and intention to leave the profession. This research takes a theory-driven and evidence-based approach to investigating the antecedent to quit intentions among early career teachers in an under resourced state such as Louisiana. In many cases induction-planned, intentional socialization of new teachers— is used to help reduce potential
early career teacher attrition. While inadequate funding and personnel can restrict a state’s capacity to implement a full-scale induction program, the planned process of the entry and support new teachers receive within the school environment still may provide long-term retention benefits. The proposed theoretical model aims to identify minimalistic and cost-effective approaches to induction that can produce the best results for school districts with limited induction resources.

**Experiences of Early Career Teachers**

Early career teachers face many challenges in and out of the classroom. As in any profession, there are basic competencies and duties expected of teachers. Individual states- and in some cases individual municipalities- have derived competency standards/expectations for teachers. There is no rulebook on basic expectations of teachers, as such are relative to individual school systems. A basic local district evaluation form notes the following as competencies/behaviors expected of teachers: proper design and planning of instruction; engaging learning environment with proper classroom management and a respectful environment; standardized classroom instruction; and other school responsibilities including staff development, community involvement, professional growth, and mentoring (Pointe Coupee Parish School System, 2006). In short, there are a wide variety of parameters in which early career teachers must operate with minimal training and often-limited support.

The quality of instruction provided by teachers is critical to the academic progress made by students (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002). National data on the impact of teacher experience from the Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research suggests that the first few years on the job are important to the role development of early career teachers. Among math students in New York City, the largest gains attributable to teacher experience
occurred when teachers attained one full year of experience (Rice, 2010). This statistic is a profound example of the importance experience plays in teacher effectiveness on student achievement outcomes. According to Ladd (2008), teachers with 5 years experience and 20 years experience are similarly effective in the classroom, while both are more effective than teachers with no experience.

Research examining student perception of beginning teacher quality found that these teachers perform better with the less complicated aspects of teaching—learning climate and clear instruction (Maulana, Helms-Lorenz, & Van de Grift, 2015). In contrast, behavior management, advanced classroom instruction techniques, differentiating instruction, and teaching learning strategies are areas in which beginning teachers struggle (Maulana, Opdenakker, Stroet, & Bosker, 2012; Maulana et al., 2015). If teachers are not provided with adequate resources to become successful in the more nuanced aspects of teachers, it is reasonable to assume their overall job outlook may become diminished—potentially leading to their leaving the profession.

**Job Stress and Job Resources**

Stress can be simply described as “…a deviation from some norm or steady state” (Lazarus, 1993, p. 4). From a psychobiological perspective, any event or situation that creates this deviation (i.e. stressor) results in the production of a physiological response (i.e. coping) (Lazarus, 1993). Coping involves both behavioral and psychological strategies to mitigate stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Kyriacou (2001) described teacher stress as a situation that arises when there is a lack of balance between the negative emotions arising from the demands of teaching—anger, frustration, anxiety— and the resources provided. With regard to the present study, resources provided to early career teachers may serve as means to deal with the resource depleting effects of negative job stress.
Job resources are “…those physical, psychological, social or organizational aspects of the job that may be functional in achieving work goals, reducing job demands,…and stimulating personal growth and development” (Jackson & Rothmann, 2005, p. 109). High levels of job resources have been shown to act as a buffer to the stress that results from high job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Reinforcement of skills and awareness of on-the-job supports are job resources that are ideally presented to early career teachers during the first years of orientation and/or onboarding in the profession. The formal term for this early career professional development process for educators is called “teacher induction.”

**Teacher Induction**

Teacher preparation and certification programs serve to prepare future teachers for the profession. These programs, however, do not serve the same purpose as induction programs. Induction is the term used to describe the planned process of the entry and support new teachers receive within the school environment (Veenman, 1984). Induction programs are needed to provide on-the-job, continuous, task reflective knowledge. This instructional and evaluative feedback along with class management skills helps teachers to be successful in the classroom (Ingersoll, 2012). Induction is a form of organization-specific socialization used to provide on-the-job support and knowledge to teachers entering the workplace. Early socialization through induction can ease early career teacher transition to the workplace by improving well-being, clarifying roles, increasing self-efficacy, and providing social acceptance (Ariffin, Hashim, & Yusof, 2014). In a longitudinal study of teachers entering the profession in the early 1990s, 85% of teachers who received induction stayed in the teaching profession, while only 74% of teachers
who did not receive induction remained in the profession (Henke, Chen, & Geis, 2000). This finding suggests that to a quality induction program may be a key to mitigating high turnover rates among early career teachers.

Induction is not a singular process. It is a combination of multiple interacting processes that comprise the socialization experience. The purpose and process of induction is rooted in organizational socialization theory (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) which holds that organizations play a role in the development of knowledge and skills necessary to perform an organizational role. The organizational socialization process includes learning appropriate workplace customs and behaviors as well as gaining familiarity with organizational culture. The goal of this process is to increase familiarity so that tensions within employees can be reduced when unfamiliar situations arise (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). The individual components of teacher induction have theoretical bases in mentoring (Kram, 1985), situated learning and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger, 1998), organizational support/perceived organizational support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986), and andragogy (Knowles, 1968). Woven together, these theoretical streams emphasize the importance of the social learning and social support processes that introduce job-relevant knowledge and skill, reflect real-time early career experience, and provide instruction, feedback and emotional support as a means to develop a new teacher to reach his/her full professional capacity.

New teacher induction programs vary greatly in purpose and scope. The availability of resources within school districts often determines if and how induction programs are implemented (Ingersoll, 2012). Some school districts may implement structured formal programs with specified curriculum and schedules for feedback while others use the collective culture of the schools to serve as an informal induction for new teachers to gather school values, roles and
norms (Kearney, 2015; Papatraianou & Cornu, 2014). Although research findings on the use and effectiveness of induction programs are inconsistent, there is consensus on the factors that must be present for proper socialization of beginning teachers.

Mentoring programs, adequate communication between teacher and administrators/school leadership, instructional support and evaluations, peer collaboration opportunities, specialized professional development, and reduced course load are research-backed components of effective socialization programs for beginning teachers (Kearney, 2015; Papatraianou & Cornu, 2014; Potemski & Matlach, 2014; Ingersoll, 2012; and Glazerman, Isenberg, Dolfin, Bleeker, Johnson, Grider, & Jacobus, 2010). Induction provides the means for early career teachers to adjust to their new roles and schools cultures, and increases the likelihood of career successes and professional satisfaction (Enneking & Kleiner, 2015).

There are three main stages to the organizational socialization process, “…how an individual is prepared to occupy his or her position in an organization; how the individual discards his or her old view and adopts a new one for a new role; and how the individual adapts to the value of his work group and organization, learns his or her role perfectly, and performs his or her job successfully” (Fletcher, Chang, & Kong, 2008, p.5). Research suggests that through the use of formal programs, supportive environments, and the development of social networks through collaboration organizations can positively foster socialization in new employees (Holton, 2001; Payne & Huffman, 2005; Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006; Slaughter, Selvaijan, & Anderson, 2006). The afore mentioned components of teacher induction—mentoring, communication, support and evaluation, collaboration, professional development, and course load—serve to provide proper socialization programs to early career teachers.
The literature is unclear, however, on the relative importance of factors and whether in combination they provide cumulative effects. Investigation into the role of these support factors might explain which factor or factors are most essential to significantly improve job satisfaction and reduce quit intention, particularly among early career teachers. A systematic assessment of current induction experiences might also point to additional factors that contribute to positive early career outcomes and those that benefit teachers throughout the duration of their careers.

**Theoretical Framework**

Conservation of resource theory. Conservation of resource (COR) theory maintains that stress is a reaction to a threat in which resources are threatened, lost, or not available to the individual (Hobfoll, 1989). Early research on stress found that when there is an imbalance between the environment and the availability of resources necessary to react to the environment, physical and mental well-being are negatively affected (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; McGrath, 1970). Resources include factors and characteristics such as physical objects, socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and living conditions. These factors provide a physical and mental framework for individuals to draw on in stressful situations.

Applying the view of COR to teacher induction, it is a socialization process engaged by the new teachers, existing teachers, school and district administration, and the community that aims to strengthen the early career professional’s access to resources needed to successfully perform one’s job. Induction programs should serve to provide the organizational and social resources needed to help early career teachers combat resource loss obtained by the stress of a new work environment. Proper support from school administration, the availability to develop peer collaborative networks, the use of mentoring programs, open communication between
teachers and administration, and individual professional development and support through evaluations are mechanisms to provide early career teachers with the social and environmental resources needed to mediate the depleting effects of job stressors. This leads to a second framework, the Job-Demands Resource Model (Demerouti, Bakker, Jonge, Janssen, & Schaufeli, 2001).

**Job demands-resource model.** Early research related to burnout found that job demands were highly correlated with mental and physical exhaustion and resources were associated with engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The creation of the Job Demands-Resource Model (JD-R Model) (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) provided a structural framework to the empirical relationship between job demands and job resources. Ultimately, the JD-R Model became a unified model of all job demands, job resources, and burnout relationships (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

The JD-R Model (Demerouti et al., 2001) makes the following claims relative to the present study: job characteristics are either demands or resources; the balance between demands and resources can either increase or decrease the pathway to burnout through stress; and resources can buffer the effects of demands. Based on the model, the job resources provided through induction processes should provide a buffer to the negative stress effects of job demands experienced by new teachers on the job. In particular, this study will examine resources as they delineate into two categories: control and support.

**Job demands-control/support model.** The Job Demand-Control (JDC) model proposed that both job demands and job control influenced worker well-being (Karasek, 1979). An individual engaging in a job with high demand and low control (latitude) would exhibit the highest level of psychological stress. Expanding on the JDC, the Job Demand-Control-Support
(JDCS) model brought in the concept of environmental support to JDC (Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989).

The JDCS suggests that a work situation with high demands, low control, and low social support will be most harmful for worker well-being (Hausser, Mojzisch, Niesel, & Schulz-Hardt, 2010).

Figure 1. JDCS model (Karasek, 1979; Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989)

**Job Demands**

Job demands are physical, psychological, social, or organizational demands of a job that are associated with both physical and psychological costs (Jackson & Rothmann, 2005). Literature separates job demands into two categories: hindrance and challenge demands. Hindrance job demands include situations which contain excessive or undesirable constraints that affect an individual’s ability to achieve goals (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000; Bakker and Demerouti, 2017). Challenge job demands are those that require resources but have the potential for a positive outcome (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; Bakker and Demerouti, 2017). Interestingly research does suggest that in different contexts the same demands can be seen as hindrances and challenges (Webster, Beehr, & Love, 2011; Searle & Auton, 2015).
There is little agreement on the actual demands experienced by early career teachers. For the purposes of this study, demands are categorized as any characteristic of a job that causes stress or strain when it is beyond the ability of the teacher to control. Since the literature has not concretely identified the specific job demands relative to early career teachers, this study will examine the outcome of an imbalance in job demands-stress.

**Purpose of This Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine how the presence of resources moderates the relationship(s) between job stress, job satisfaction and quit intention among early career teachers in particular. This study seeks to identify early career teachers’ level of stress, job satisfaction, the level of job control and support experienced by these teachers, and relate these to the outcome variable quit intention. Although this study is cast amidst the backdrop across the career span of K-12 teachers, particular emphasis is given to early career teachers, who are most vulnerable to high rates of turnover in the profession.

**Study Objectives**

1. Describe the relationship between job stress and quit intention in early career teachers.
2. Describe the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention in early career teachers.
3. Describe the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction in early career teachers.
4. Determine if job resources moderate job stress and job satisfaction to decrease quit intention in early career teachers.

This particular approach to this model is important because previous research has focused mostly on the induction programs as the independent variable.
Literature has examined induction vs. no induction; components of effective induction; and effectiveness of longitudinal induction. However, few researchers adopt the view of induction as a resource. Rather than examining the absence or presence of an induction program this study aims to more nuanced view of how the individual components of induction provide resources and support to early career teachers. Additionally, this approach adds in the control element which according to the JDCS Model is an important factor in determining stress level in high demand situation by interacting with the support variable (Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989). This research views induction processes as resources to help early career teachers achieve a goal of job satisfaction and intent to remain in the job—not simply a mechanism to educate new teachers about policies and procedures of the school.

**Contributions to Practice and Science**

In practice, this research creates a model in which the loss of resources due to high job stress and low job satisfaction can be reduced through the interaction of high job control and social support. In particular, it seeks to understand which resources are most essential to predicting retention among early career teachers. This study aims to provide guidelines for school systems to develop comprehensive induction programs that provide most-essential resources for early career teachers to increase their professional skills and organizational knowledge.

Currently schools in the state of Louisiana do not engage state-mandated formalized induction programming. In that light the immediate contribution of this study is to determine exactly which components should be addressed in order to create an efficient, data-driven induction process in the absence of resources to create a comprehensive program.
The results of this study will provide evidence for how socialization processes that may or may not be part of a formal induction program can increase retention of early career teachers in suburban and rural schools. The goal of this research is to highlight the effectiveness of induction components both individually and collectively as part of the organizational socialization process, and correlate those efforts with overall job satisfaction and quit intention of early career teachers. In other words, the findings from this study may detail no-cost (or low cost) mechanisms that schools can utilize to increase teacher retention without having to implement comprehensive induction programs in financially strapped schools.

There are multiple scientific models that seek to explain the relationship between job stress and job resources (Karasek, 1979; Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989; Demerouti et al., 2001; Tremblay & Messervey, 2011). It can be argued that the stresses experienced by early career teachers are individual situations that arise from a combination of personal disposition, organizational culture, and work situations--all of which are factors in job satisfaction (Saari & Judge, 2004).

Previous models examine general job demands, control, support, and resources. The present study contributes to the scientific literature by making a case that early career teachers are a unique population which faces stresses that be buffered by a specific set of job resources. Furthermore, the present study seeks to understand buffering effects that job resources offer to bolstering teacher job satisfaction and diminishing quit intention through the mechanisms of job stress and job resources.

**Definition of Terms**

- **Induction**: the planned process of entry and support received by new teachers (Veerman, 1984)
• **Early Career Teachers**: teachers who have completed one year-five years of teaching.

• **Perceived Job Stress**: the individual perception of the physical/mental effort required within a job

• **Job Resources**: control and supports available to individuals that allow them to better cope with job stresses by reducing the imbalance between job expectation and real experience

• **Organizational Socialization**: the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume and organizational role (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979)

• **Job Satisfaction**: the degree to which people like their jobs (Spector, 1997)

• **Quit Intention**: a continuous process of employee evaluation of the working situation resulting in a decision to remain in or leave the job (Mobley, 1977)
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This research seeks to draw a relationship between the ways schools socialize new teachers and whether or not they are satisfied with their jobs and/or choose to remain in their jobs. The purpose of this study is to explore the moderating effects that resources provided to early career teachers on the relationships that are proposed to exist among job stress, job satisfaction, and quit intention. Job stress and resources- in the form of formal or informal processes based in proper teacher induction- will be assessed through the lens of Conservation of Resource Theory (Hobfoll, 1989) as well as the more recent Job Demands-Control/Support Model (Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989) and Job Demands-Resource Model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli, 2001). This study will attempt to address a gap in the literature by examining the presence of varying ranges of induction processes rather than evaluating formal induction programs. Another literature gap will be addressed by applying the job-demands resource concepts to the field of education using induction as a resource.

Primary Outcome Variable: Quit Intentions

Calabrese (1986) ominously referred to teaching as a dehumanizing experience. Over 30 years ago he projected that teaching was a dying profession in much part due to shifting focus from teachers and students to “…financial considerations” (Calabrese, 1986, p. 255). In other words, when the focus of teaching becomes about factors other than teaching and learning, problems may arise. The experiences of early career teachers are important to teacher training and retention. There is much cause for concern, however, when these early career teachers never make it past the “early” phase of their careers.
Aside from any potential moral imperative to keep individuals employed, teachers leaving the profession are costly. Productivity gains in teaching effectiveness tend to be most significant within the first three years in the classroom (Maulana et al., 2015). When teachers leave within this time frame, before they reach their maximized efficiency, they do so at educational costs to students and financial cost to the school systems teacher (Milanowski & Odden, 2007; Watlington, Shockley, Guglielmino, & Felsher, 2010). In a study testing the development of a cost assessment tool for teacher turnover Shockley, Guglielmino, & Watlington (2006) found that not only are costs associated with teacher turnover high, but they vary significantly between school districts. One county in south Florida lost approximately four thousand dollars per lost teacher while another lost approximately twelve thousand dollars per lost teacher. Attrition in these school districts resulted in total district losses for 2004-2005 of two million and fifteen million dollars, respectively (Shockley, Guglielmino, & Watlington, 2006). Nationally, the cost to replace teachers in U.S. public schools rests around 2.2 billion dollars per year (Borman & Dowling, 2008). These financial losses are due to investments made in hiring (advertising, recruitment, application, etc.), training (orientation, mentoring, in-service, etc.), and separation (exit tasks). The previous research suggests the importance from both a human resources and economic standpoint to understanding the causes of teacher attrition.

Early teacher attrition research noted that both life cycle events (marriage, childbirth, retirement, migration) and career patterns (better job opportunities, advanced degrees, and vertical movement within education) influence teacher attrition (Grissmer & Kirby, 1987). Additionally, teacher attrition does not apply to only those who leave the profession. Attrition includes subgroups such as those who move to different schools/district, move into
administration or counseling, those who leave temporarily, those who leave involuntarily, and those who leave voluntarily. This review of literature will focus on those who voluntarily leave the profession altogether.

In Grissmer & Kirby’s Theory of Teacher Attrition (1987), higher rates of teacher attrition within the first 10 years were attributed to multiple factors including low-paying high stress assignments, the desire to work in a better location, and “…a mismatch between original expectation and actual experience…” (p. 12). This observation is important because the theory also notes that as more information about the job/expectations is obtained, furthermore revealing a mismatch between expectation and experience, it is easier to transfer to a new occupation during the early career period (Grissmer & Kirby, 1987). This idea may also explain much of what appears to be going on in the current phenomenon of teacher attrition. When new teachers enter the profession with incomplete information, and that lack of information is not improved through proper socialization, they may experience dissonance between their expectations and experiences thereby engaging in significant resource loss, which can result in a desire to leave the profession.

Findings from a longitudinal study of early career teacher mobility from the National Center of Education Statistics between 2007 and 2012 found that “…Among all beginning teachers in 2007-2008… 17 percent did not teach in 2011-2012” (NCES, 2013, p. 3). During the 2011-2012 school year, of the teachers who left the teaching profession, 80.1% left voluntarily-for reasons other than their contract not being renewed (NCES, 2013). Following the 2012-2013 school year approximately 20% of teachers with 1-3 years experience either left the profession
altogether or moved to another school/district (NCES, 2013). These current trends in teacher attrition support the finding by Ingersoll (2012) that nearly half of all public school teachers in the United States will leave the profession within the first five years.

The previous literature leads to the question of what factor(s) play a role in a teacher’s decision to stay in the profession or leave altogether. Teacher isolation, poor communication between teachers and administration, stressful working conditions, and workload are factors teachers identify as reasons for leaving the profession (Buchanan, Prescott, Schuck, Aubusson, and Burke, 2013). Individually and collectively these factors can result in the continual buildup of stress, which leads to burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). There is hope, however, as research suggests the stress experienced by early career teachers job demands can be mediated through the use of proper socialization techniques that serve as resources—which in the education verbiage is known as induction.

Hom and Griffeth (1995) describe employee turnover as occurring when an employee voluntarily leaves the workplace. Employee turnover affects organizations from both an economic and human resources perspective. When an employee leaves an organization the financial cost of hiring and replacement is anywhere from 90% to 200% of that employee’s salary (Allen, Bryant & Vardaman, 2010). Additionally an employee leaving one organization for another can provide a competitive advantage to the new place of employment (Agarwal, Ganco, & Ziedonis, 2009). The financial losses alone lend to the importance of understanding the factors at play when an employee makes a decision to quit.
Mobley (1977) derived a process model of how job dissatisfaction leads to turnover. This theoretical model depicted turnover as a linear event beginning with dissatisfaction→ thoughts of quitting → evaluation of subjective expected utility (SEU) of job search and costs of quitting → search intentions → evaluation of alternatives → comparison of alternatives and present job → quit intention → behavior of quitting (Hom, Lee, Shaw, & Hausknecht, 2017).

Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979) followed the process model with a content model that addressed the many possible causes of why individuals leave jobs. This model depicted how the SEUs of the job and alternatives coupled with job satisfaction determined the level of quit intention an individual would have. Mobley (1977) and Kraut (1975) introduced the relationship of quit intention to turnover theory, and we now accept that quit intention is the strongest antecedent to turnover (Hom et al., 2017).

In a path analysis evaluation of Mobley et al.’s (1979) turnover model, Michaels and Spector (1982) found support for the original model’s conception that organizational and individual factors lead to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which lead to quit intention. Quit intention is defined as a continuous process of employee evaluation of the working situation resulting in a decision to remain in or leave the job (Mobley, 1977) and has been studied as a preceding step toward attrition in a number of studies including Cronley and Kim (2017) and Park and Kim (2009). In this study quit intention is the primary outcome variable of interest. Quit intention, rather than actual turnover, is being studied with the intent of identifying the conditions that immediately precede high quit intention and low quit intention.
This information can then be used by schools to evaluate potential policies or interventions that may be used to keep teachers in the profession. If the conditions by which currently employed individuals can be altered, the hope is their intention to quit will be reduced.

For the purposes of this study only the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention will be examined. While there is research that examines the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quit intention; that relationship seems to be one in which job satisfaction influences both organizational commitment and turnover intention (Meyer et al, 2002).

Additionally, some research suggests that organizational commitment may be a predictor of job satisfaction (LaLopa, 1997; Sharma & Bajpai, 2010). Since the goal of this study is to examine the influence of job satisfaction due to the presence of resources on quit intention, organizational commitment will not be included as a variable due to the potential multi-directionality of this variable.

**Predictors and Antecedents to Quit Intentions**

**Perceived Stress**

The American Psychological Association defines stress as “…the pattern of specific and nonspecific responses an organism makes to stimulus events that disturb its equilibrium and tax or exceed its ability to cope” (American Psychological Association, 2017). In short, stress is a process of events that includes a stressor which then produces a reaction that requires use of resources to cope (Grawitch, Ballard, & Erb, 2014). According to Conservation of Resource Theory (Hobfoll, 1989), the stress individuals experience is a direct result of not having enough or adequate resources to handle the task or situation at hand.
Research has consistently demonstrated a relationship between stress and quit intention in the workplace. Numerous studies have shown that higher job stress leads to higher quit intention (Allisey, Noblet, Lamontagne, & Houdmont, 2014; Bowling, Alarcon, Bragg, & Hartman, 2015; Kazemi, 2015; Kim & Kao, 2014). In a study of postdoctoral students’ intentions to leave academia, the perceived imbalance between efforts and rewards led to strain, job dissatisfaction, and the intention to leave (Dorenkamp & Weib, 2018). According to Schaubroeck, Cotton, and Jennings (1989) stress-turnover intention model, work stressors increase turnover intention through an interaction with job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Hypotheses 1: Job stress will be positively associated with quit intentions.

**Job Satisfaction**

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from one’s job experience. Kalleberg (1977) defined job satisfaction as “…an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying” (p. 126). Both of these definitions take into account feeling and thinking (cognition). The construct of job satisfaction consists of two factors: perceived job characteristics and work values. Perceived job characteristics are the amount of satisfaction gained from work, and work values are the meaning assigned to these characteristics. Work values may be intrinsic (task), convenience (factors external to the task), financial (pay and benefits), relationships with co-workers, career (fairness and opportunities for promotion, resource adequacy (physical and mental resources for job) (Kalleberg, 1977). Over time and due to experiences both the perceived job characteristics and values placed on these characteristics may change, thereby causing a change in job satisfaction. In the following sections, the factors that influence job satisfaction will be reviewed.
Job satisfaction can be influenced by personal disposition, culture, or work situations (Saari & Judge, 2004). Staw and Ross (1985) were two of the first researchers to suggest a genetic component of job satisfaction. Further research demonstrated that 30% of the variance in job satisfaction scores could be attributable to genetics (personal disposition) (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989). This implies that to a certain degree some individuals will be dissatisfied in any job he or she may hold. Hofstede’s (1980, 1985) work on cross-cultural employee attitudes demonstrated four dimensions: (1) individualism-collectivism; (2) uncertainty avoidance versus risk taking; (3) power distance/distribution; and (4) masculinity/femininity or achievement orientation (Saari & Judge, 2004).

Taking Hofstede’s (1980, 1985) dimensions in the current context, cultural factors dependent upon the country (or in the present case region of a country) of origin may influence job satisfaction. Finally, the work situation can result in the strongest influence on job satisfaction. More so than compensation or supervision, interesting and challenging work is a crucial factor to job satisfaction. The nature of the work includes components of job challenge, autonomy, variety, and scope (Saari & Judge, 2004).

According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction results from the difference between expectation and reality of the job and the extent to which a job fulfills individual needs and matches individual values. Spector (1985) developed the job satisfaction survey, measuring job satisfaction across nine dimensions: pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. Given that this measurement instrument will be used in the present study, the following section will examine each of the nine dimensions relative to early career teaching.
**Teacher Pay, Benefits, and Contingent Rewards.** Teaching is a profession that has the potential to offer multiple areas of compensation. Pay (public school teachers are salaried), benefits (most states/municipalities offer health and retirement benefits), and contingent rewards (performance-based pay and opportunities for increased professional development) all have the potential to influence teacher job satisfaction.

**Pay.** Pay satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) occurs when an individual makes a comparison between his or her personal pay and the pay of others (Nelson, Stone, Frye, Chown, 2008). Although most school districts contain salary schedules with brackets for years of service and degree level, merit-pay systems have been implemented in many districts with the goal of improving student achievement (Horne, Foley, Flora, 2014).

The idea behind merit-based pay is rooted in agency theory and the notion that a compensation system must compel the worker to be willing to take risk and/or engage in hard work (Jensen, 1983). In the State of Louisiana merit pay is offered by some school districts and is based on effectiveness per the state evaluation system, demand (shortage areas), and experience (LDOE, 2017). It is important to note, however, that while legislation requires school districts to implement merit compensation, the state does not regulate what that compensation should be.

**Benefits and Contingent Rewards.** Fringe benefits such as health insurance and pensions can act as a substitute for lower wages that may in turn increase job satisfaction, particularly when these benefits are coupled with a reduction in their income tax rate (Artz, 2010). These extra “fringe” benefits can include variables such as insurance, retirement pension, paid vacation and sick leave, profit sharing, and employer-provided training and education (Artz, 2010).
Although employed by local municipalities, teachers do fall into the category of state (public) employees. Nationally there are over 7 million individuals working in the nation’s schools as state employees (McNichol, 2012). As state/public employees, all teachers in public schools are provided health insurance coverage as well as a retirement plan, and sick/vacation days (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2017). Additionally some teachers may receive contingent rewards such as additional professional development and employer funding for continuing education- although this is often dependent on the individual locale.

**Promotion.** To many the word promotion is often associated with more responsibility, more prestige, and more money. Research shows that individuals have an expectation of career advancement particularly between the ages of 25-29, 30-34, and 45-49 (Lashbrook, 1996).

In the education field, promotions may occur in a variety of ways including the department level, the administrative level, the district level, or other positions (instructional coach or content specialist) within the school.

States vary in their requirements for promotion- and some requirements are strictly job-dependent. For the purposes of this review promotion opportunities and qualifications in the State of Louisiana will be reviewed. In order to receive a promotion to the administrative level, an individual must meet the requirements to be certified as an educational leader (LDOE, 2018). There are a variety of pathways to achieving this certification, the most common being the traditional master’s degree program. For those already possessing a master’s degree an alternative certification program may be completed in conjunction with a partnering college or university. Finally, there is a residency program for individuals who hold a bachelor’s degree and complete the required number of residency hours per the state department of education.
**Supervision.** In a study of the relationship between environmental variables and job satisfaction, teacher satisfaction with their supervisor was positively correlated with work satisfaction, staff satisfaction, and general job satisfaction (Tillman & Tillman, 2008). These results imply that teacher satisfaction with their supervisor has the ability to influence other areas of the teacher’s job outlook. During the 2011-2012 school year 95% of teachers who reported being satisfied with their jobs felt their administration was supportive (NCES, 2016). The previous literature demonstrates the important role teacher supervisions/school administration play in overall teacher job satisfaction.

**Operating procedures.** School operating procedures include working conditions at the school level that include the quality of communication, the match of school improvement plans with teacher views of where school improvement should occur, and feedback from school to teachers on the progress of improvement (Leithwood & McAdie, 2010). In the current context, operating procedures may also include school calendar/events, daily schedule, and school rules.

There has been very little literature on the relationship between operating procedures and job satisfaction, in general with little to none stemming from the United States. Literature searches of key words ‘operating procedures’ and ‘job satisfaction’ return no usable research. Changing the key words to ‘organizational knowledge’ and ‘job satisfaction’ did, however, return relevant literature.

In a study examining the effects of organizational knowledge as a resource for job satisfaction in service sector jobs in Pakistan, knowledge of organizational knowledge-sharing practices were positively related to job satisfaction, indicating the importance of organizational
procedural knowledge to employees (Malik & Kanwal, 2018). In another study of counselors in Australia, organizational knowledge was found to be a predictor of intrinsic job satisfaction (Brown & Wallace, 2004).

**Co-workers.** Co-workers have the capability to provide multiple levels of support that can play a role in job satisfaction. Harris, Winskowski, and Engdahl (2007) found that social support in the form of mentoring and task support was associated with job satisfaction. Mentoring is a support mechanism that pairs a more experienced individual with a less experienced individual in the workplace. Task support would be support gained through interaction with coworkers through Communities of Practice (CoP).

**Nature of work.** As previously noted the job demands of teachers are plentiful and vary greatly by school district. Aside from the typical tasks associated with teaching and student management, many teachers report additional tasks such as paperwork and time management to be significant stressors (Stauffer & Mason, 2013). Teaching involves political and education structures, instructional factors, student factors, parent and family factors, and school climate (Stauffer & Mason, 2013).

The nature of the work consists not only of the daily routines of instruction and classroom management, but also the person-job and person-organization fit. In a study of public school teachers in the State of Texas, person-job fit was positively correlated with job satisfaction- and both were correlated to student achievement (Westfall, 2012). Ellis, Skidmore, and Combs (2017) found that when teachers received honest and accurate previews of the nature of their prospective job, the greater the likelihood of their expectations being met, and the better person-job and person-organization fit.
Communication. As organizations become increasingly more complex, effective communication is key for effective operation. In a study of communication and satisfaction of university employees in northeast Tennessee, Sharma, Lampley, and Good (2015) found a positive, strong ($r=.83$) correlation between communication climate and job satisfaction. Additionally horizontal and informal communication was also strongly correlated ($r=.82$) with job satisfaction. These results indicate that communication satisfaction is an integral component of job satisfaction. This idea, translated to the education sector, indicates that communication both about the school and within the school, through all levels of employment, should be efficient and timely to achieve maximum impact to job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction effects. Boswell, Boudreau, and Tichy (2005) described the initial positive feelings upon securing a new job followed by a reduction in job satisfaction over time as the “honeymoon-hangover” effect. The main idea behind this reduction in satisfaction seems to be that as affective habituation (Leventhal, Martin, Seals, Tapia, & Rehm, 2007) sets in- the employee begins to engage in more routine, mundane job activities- the initial upswing in job satisfaction and job attitudes begins to normalize (Boswell, Shipp, Payne, & Cullbertson, 2009). Wang, Hom, and Allen’s (2017) model posits that resources provided to new employees through socialization can actually buffer against that decreasing job satisfaction trajectory. Without this buffer job satisfaction trajectory is inversely related to quit intention (Wang, Hom, & Allen, 2017) indicating that as job satisfaction decreases, intention to quit increases.

Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction will be negatively associated with quit intention.

Job Stress and Job Satisfaction

The physical and mental effort exerted due to high job demands can become stressors that if not rectified may be linked to long-term strain, anxiety, and depression (Diestel & Schmidt,
According to the JD-C Model (Karasek, 1979), individuals in work situations of high demands and low latitude (control), would exhibit high strain or stress. Due to the nature of the teaching profession- time pressured to produce certain learning outcomes- in many cases the assumption can be made that teachers fall into the high demand, low control category.

The literature has demonstrated that job stress can have an influence on job satisfaction (Brief, 1998; Pignata, Boyd, Gillespie, Provis, & Winefield, 2014). Additionally, job satisfaction and job stress have an inverse, highly correlated relationship (Coomber & Barriball, 2007, Zangaro & Soeken, 2007). Job satisfaction has also shown to serve as a mediator in the relationship between stress and turnover intention (Chung, Jung, Sohn, 2017). The more satisfied an individual is in their job, the more resources seemingly are available to help cope with stress. Job satisfaction is an affective reaction to the change in perceived characteristics and work values (Kalleberg, 1977). As previously noted, a change in perception and/or a change in values can result in a change in job satisfaction.

At times stressors may be a trigger to diminish the perception, and at other times job satisfaction can serve as a buffer against the negative effects of stress (Chung, Jung, & Sohn, 2017).

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction and job stress will be inversely related.

**Moderator Variable: Job Resources**

This study proposes job resources as a variable that moderates the relationships between key predictor variables (job satisfaction and job stress) on the primary department variable (Quit Intentions). While the total amount of job resources available to an early career teacher is
thought to buffer negative aspects of the job, the study holds that the type of job resource can have different moderating effects, thus pointing to the need to consider job control resources (JR-Control) and social support resources (JR-Social Support) separately.

According to social learning theory, people engage in behaviors and interactions with other individuals and their environment in order to receive positive reinforcement (Bandura, 1977). The COR model (Hobfoll, 1989) builds on social learning theory to suggest that reinforcement is a resource and an individual’s ability to obtain and/or retain resources is dependent on their ability to “…seek to create and maintain personal characteristics and social circumstances that will increase the likelihood of receipt of such reinforcement” (Hobfoll, 1989, p. 516).

COR finds resources to be the main determinant in whether or not an individual will experience stress. Stress is defined as a condition in which there exists an imbalance in the relationship between a person and his/her environment that exceeds the resource capability of the individual and results in psychological and/or physiological malady (Lazarus, 1966; McGrath, 1970; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Hobfoll (1989) defines resources as “… those objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies that are valued by the individual or that serve as a means for attainment of these objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies” (p. 516). Resources serve to achieve work goals, reduce job demands, and stimulate personal growth and development (Demerouti et al., 2001). Literature suggests although resources may be internal or external, internal resources are difficult to measure as they are not always stable constructs and are often dependent on the job context (Richter & Hacker, 1998; Demerouti et al, 2001). According to the JDCS (Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989), job control and support
provided through the work environment interact to determine the level of individual stress. Therefore, this study will focus on external resources provided to teachers through their interaction with the organization, administration, and colleagues.

**Control.** The Karasek (1979) model of JDC uses the term job latitude to describe control. Karasek (1989) defined job control as a two-dimensional construct including an individual’s authority to make decisions and the breadth of skills used by the worker. Research that is more recent has shown control to be a moderating variable between job demands and exhaustion in Physical Education teachers (Brouwers, Tomic, & Boluijt, 2011). Additionally, the relationship between job control and job strain has shown to be mediated by social support (Blanch, 2016).

A historical analysis of job satisfaction literature finds that not only is autonomy related to job satisfaction (Armstrong, 2006), but employees who possess little job autonomy display high degrees of social alienation (Blauner, 1964). This is supported by the JDCS Model under which an individual who has a high level of control, a high level of social support, and a high level of job demands will exhibit overall good health and positive personality development (Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989).

Control, influence, authority and participation in decision-making are factors that influence the level of autonomy an employee feels (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1975). Early research to teacher autonomy suggests that although teachers do have authority over their students, they “…often lack authority over their schoolwide environments and over themselves” (Kreis & Brockopp, 1986, p. 110).

Rotter (1990) described locus of control (LOC) as an individual’s belief about the extent to which outcomes are related to internal (personal) or external (environmental) factors. In the
case of teacher autonomy, LOC would be determined by teacher perception of how much control the teacher has over his or her work environment. Research suggests that schools that nurture a sense of teacher control create more effective working environments for teachers (McCormick & Barnett, 2008).

Teacher autonomy affects teaching function within two realms: teaching pedagogy and classroom operations (LaCoe, 2006; O’Hara, 2006; Rudolph, 2006; Blase & Kirby, 2009) and school wide autonomy (Ingersoll, 1994). In many cases, teachers feel they are most knowledgeable about, and therefore most qualified, to make decisions about their classroom procedures. In the current educational climate, however, bureaucratic procedures (local, state, and federal) institute accountability measures that have placed constraints on teacher autonomy within the classroom.

In a study of the effect of school accountability on teacher turnover Ingersoll, Merrill, and May (2016) found that classroom teacher autonomy was “…especially powerful in ameliorating the effects of accountability in low-performing schools” (p. 48). Teacher autonomy in these schools included the ability to select instructional materials, choice over content and skills to be taught, the evaluation and grading of students, teaching techniques, the scope of homework to be assigned, and discipline of students. Performance problems related to accountability systems may be reduced when teachers have control over the instructional decisions in their classrooms (Ingersoll, Merrill, & May, 2016).

**Social support.** Social support is important for well-being. The buffering hypothesis proposes that support provides mental protection against the negative effects of stress (Cohen & Willis, 1985). Cohen and Willis’ (1985) early work on social support also found that the supports
provided must be relevant to the stress being experienced to provide adequate resources to avoid stress per COR (Hobfoll, 1989). The following section will detail specific resources literature suggests are integral to early career teachers.

**Job security.** Teacher tenure laws were created in the early 1900s as a means to protect teachers from losing jobs to political appointments (Henrion, 2016). Along with a means of job protection, tenure laws were also initiated to allow for academic freedom in the classroom. Teacher tenure laws provide job security, but with the increase in effectiveness ratings due to current accountability systems—particularly those tied to student performance—as well as reductions in force due to budget constraints, teachers are not nearly as comfortable with their long-taken-for-granted job security.

**Rewards.** Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) is rooted in the idea that individuals engage in interactions with other individuals as well as their environment. COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989) would add to this and say these interactions are intended to result in a net gain of resources. These exchanges of interactions may thereby result in real or perceived obligations (Emerson, 1976). Birtch, Chiang, and Van Esch (2016) found that when employees are rewarded with appropriate job resources, they feel their psychological contract is fulfilled which may result in increased organizational commitment and increased job satisfaction.

Reward resources for teachers can manifest in a variety of ways. In an examining of education staffing Rice, Roellke, Sparks, and Kolbe (2009) detailed policies related to teacher staffing. Each of these policies includes a potential reward component that is initiated by the school or school district and results in teacher retention. First and foremost, increasing financial compensation and/or offering a variety of economic rewards can be used to both recruit and retain teachers (Odden & Kelley, 2002). Other economic compensations can include things such
as tuition grants and funds for professional development. Additionally, improvements in teacher working conditions such as increased workload and mentoring may provide psychological rewards that reduce job dissatisfaction (Rice et al, 2009).

The resources provided through organizational support of teachers provide a sense of autonomy and control, a sense of organizational commitment through job security, and a positive social exchange experience through rewarding of effort.

**Evaluation and feedback.** Evaluation and feedback are two parts of a function designed to provide employees with a measure of knowledge, skill, and ability level whilst providing direction for growth and improvement. Evaluations have little merit to the employee if not followed by constructive feedback.

One component of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 was to support effective instruction and leadership through the development of teacher evaluation and support systems (Cherasaro, Brodersen, Reale, & Yanoski, 2016). While there is no nationally-mandated teacher evaluation system, individual states have developed systems as a means of providing feedback with a goal of improving teaching and learning practices, which should lead to better student performance (Kane & Staiger, 2012).

The State of Louisiana adopted a new performance evaluation rubric based in three overarching domains: planning and preparation, the classroom environment, and instruction (LDOE, 2017). During formal and informal classroom observations teachers are ranked on components within each domain from 1-4; Ineffective (1), Effective: Emerging (2), Effective: Proficient (3), Highly Effective (4). The evaluation rubric provides detailed attributes that must be present in order to receive a particular ranking, and allows the observer to provide additional feedback.
Supervisor social support. According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) supervisory support occurs when an employee perceives their supervisor cares for their well-being. The human resource literature notes that managers (in this case known as supervisors or administrators) play a role in the well-being of employees. Increased employee well-being may then result in increased capabilities and job satisfaction (Pfeffer, 1998). In a business world study of the effects of organizational commitment and perceived supervisory support, Kang and Kang’s (2016) results mimicked earlier findings that perceived supervisor support is a resource that has a positive effect on well-being and stress reduction (Jokisaari & Nurmi, 2009; Lewicka & Krot, 2015; Monnot & Beehr, 2014; Schopman, Kalshoven, & Boon, 2015).

Supervisors have the ability to provide support to teachers that helps to build their instructional capacity. Some methods of doing so include careful assignment of teaching duties to take into account special individual situations and consideration, promoting teacher teamwork, differentiating roles for expert teachers to utilize their expertise, and development of a career-based pay system (Johnson, 2012).

Mentoring. Kram (1985) defines mentoring as a relationship between an individual with more experience and an individual with less experience. Furthermore, mentoring can be career-related (organizational operations and personal advancement), or psychosocial (development of identify and self-efficacy) (Allen, Eby, Chao, & Bauer, 2017; Kram & Isabella, 1985).

Mentoring is a process not new to education. Effective teacher mentors must be people-oriented, flexible, emphatic, and collaborative (Freeman, 1993; Ostovar-Nameghi & Sheikhamadi, 2016). Additionally, an effective mentor should “…(1) be able to articulate the art of teaching; (2) have strong interpersonal communication skills to establish rapport and trust, and (3) act as a patient and active listener” (Ostovar-Nameghi & Sheikhamadi, 2016, p. 201).
In a qualitative analysis of strategies that support early career math and science teachers, the mentee teachers reported being hesitant to seek out more experienced teachers for help, however felt comfortable asking their assigned mentor because of the nature of their relationships (Friedrichsen, Chval, & Teuscher, 2007). Ingersoll and Strong (2012) found that early career teachers who participated in a mentoring program displayed higher levels of job satisfaction and lower intention to leave their job. Additionally, early career teacher mentoring has been shown to translate into higher scores on academic achievement measures of students (Ingersoll & Strong, 2012). Mentoring provides a long-term, consistent relationship in which an early career teacher has a stable source of support directed at navigating the organizational socialization process.

Communities of practice. Learning communities have become popular within organizational development in which the organization encourages collective sharing of knowledge between its members (Wenger, 1998). The idea behind communities of practice (CoP) is that learning can occur in a social, collaborative context, in which people who have common interests and goals work together (Wenger & Snyder, 2000). The common lingo for CoP in education are professional learning communities (PLCs).

Specific to early career teachers, the goals of CoPs or PLCs is to develop a collaborative community in which these individuals both learn and establish relationships that help to bring these new teachers into the mainstream of the organization (Kearney, 2015). As CoPs, PLCs are meaningful and purposeful. Following Wenger’s (2007) CoP framework the members of a PLC should share a common interest, they should collectively pursue that interest, and the result is a
shared practice. PLCs thereby have the ability to “… develop a unique and somewhat personal set of resources, experiences, and ways of addressing recurring issues” (Macphail, Patton, Parker, & Tannehill, 2014, p. 42).

The assumptions behind school PLCs are that knowledge can be gained through daily shared experiences and that shared knowledge can then enhance student learning (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). PLCs have shown to result in more student-centered teaching practices, flexibility in classroom arrangement, and diversification of instruction to accommodate student learning levels (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008).

PLCs are also useful in changing the school culture to one more supportive in nature. As a collaboration effort, PLCs assist teachers with sharing lessons, decision making protocols, and collectively generating new ideas for practice (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). These practices are particularly beneficial to early career teachers. Utilizing a cohort method of teachers (ex. 1st year, 2nd year, 3rd year) these individuals will have access to engage and share with individuals going through similar daily experiences as they are socialized to the new work environment. Additional PLC groupings by content (ex. science) and/or grade level can be similarly beneficial for dealing with practices and issues relevant across multiple contexts.

According to COR (Hobfoll, 1989) when resources are lost due to demands, resource replacement is the most common mechanism for avoiding the stress due to resource loss. In the work place, whether or not these lost resources are replaced has a direct influence on job satisfaction and quit intention of employees.

**Resources as Moderators**

Conservation of resource theory notes that as resources are depleted, stress increases; and more resources are then needed to buffer against the negative effects of stress (Hobfoll, 1989).
According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a buffer is a variable in a scenario that serves as a moderator between two other variables. In the present study, resources serve as a buffer in the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. Tremblay and Messervey (2011) noted that “…under demanding work conditions, employees who are provided with sufficient job resource are said to be more capable of dealing with these job-related demands” (p. 2). Further research has demonstrated that resources such as a perceived supportive environment, perceived helpfulness of workplace training, and supervisor recognition of employees provided benefits to employees, which helped to counter the physical and psychological demands of the workplace by using a multidimensional approach to increase job satisfaction (Jang, Lee, Zadrozny, Bae, Kim, & Marti, 2017).

In order to gain a more in depth understanding of the existence of resources, the specific types of resources, and the effects of the will be examined using three categories. JR-Cumulative (cumulative resources) will be the summation of all resources (control and social support) available to teachers. JR-Control (control resources) will be comprised of the variable measures of job security and autonomy. JR-Social Support (social support) consists of the variable measures of rewards, evaluation and feedback, supervisor support, mentoring, and communities of practice. Resources were delineated as such based on the Job Demand-Control-Support Model (Karasek, 1979; Johnson & Hall, 1988; Johnson, Hall, & Theorell, 1989) which noted that job control and support interact in individuals. Situations in which control is high and support in high should result in a job with low strain and/or an active job providing good health and individual development. Based on this model the present study examined control resources, social support resources, and looked for the cumulative interaction by combining the two into a cumulative resource variable.
Hypothesis 4: Greater access to general job resources (i.e., JR-Cumulative) will moderate the effects of job stress and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4 a): The positive relationship between job stress and quit intention will weaken such that teachers will be more likely to express quit intention when JR-Cumulative are minimal compared to when job resources are plentiful.

Hypothesis 4 b): The negative relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention will strengthen such that teachers will be more likely to express quit intention when JR-Cumulative are minimal compared to when job resources are plentiful.

Hypothesis 5: Greater access to JR-Control will moderate the positive relationship between job stress and quit intention such that teachers who experience higher levels of stress will express greater quit intention when JR-Control is minimal compared to when JR-Control is plentiful.

Hypothesis 6: Greater access to JR-Social Support will moderate the negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction such that teachers who experience higher levels of stress will express less job satisfaction when JR-Social Support is minimal compared to when JR-Social Support is plentiful.

**Chapter 2 Summary**

In summary, using the job-demands resource model and the job demands-control-support model, this study seeks to determine how the presence of job resources moderate the relationships between job stress, job satisfaction, and quit intention.

The relationship of job satisfaction and quit intention was discussed in the context of factors that influence both: rewards, promotion opportunities, supervision, school operating procedures, relationships with coworkers, the nature of the work, and workplace communication.
Next resources as an independent variable was broken down into two domains of control and support. These resources were then discussed relative to the specific job characteristics of teachers with particular interest in the experience of early career teachers.

Finally, a review of the research-backed relationship between job stress, job resources, and job satisfaction ensued. In short, while both job stress and job satisfaction can independently influence quit intention; the greater effect occurs when resource serve as a buffer against the mentally depleting effects of job stress and/or low job satisfaction. The proposed conceptual model is depicted in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Proposed model of job stress, job satisfaction, resources and quit intention
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

The goal of this research is to highlight the effectiveness of induction components both individually and collectively as part of the organizational socialization process, and correlate those efforts with overall job satisfaction and quit intention of early career teachers. This section describes the sample population, data collection procedures, measures, and data analysis plan.

Population Sample

The target population for this study is pre-K-12 public school teachers from Louisiana. Initial plans called for participation from teachers in five suburban/rural parishes within 50 miles of the Baton Rouge, Louisiana capital area, excluding East Baton Rouge schools. East Baton Rouge parish schools were not included in this study mainly because of the size of the parish. There are more schools and students in East Baton Rouge than all other parishes combined. This population differential could have potentially skewed results greatly. The final analysis included only teachers from Pointe Coupee Parish, West Feliciana Parish, Iberville Parish, and West Baton Rouge Parish. Although initial contact and request for participation was made with St. James Parish, further attempts to contact the superintendent did not result in a response and as a result this group was not used in the sample.

These particular school districts were chosen because they are similar in their suburban/rural area demographics, all had between five and ten schools in the parish, and all had no more than two high schools in the parish, thereby limiting the possibility that teachers from a district with many schools could skew results. Because there is no mandated induction program by the state, it was difficult to gauge in advance what- if any- formal programming existed in these districts. This study proceeded on the assumption that there was little to no funding for formal induction programming; therefore, any resources provided were done so solely with the
resources and under the guidance of the individual districts. One of these districts is a higher funded district while one is on the lower end of funding with the other two falling toward the middle/upper end. The goal was to avoid using an extremely low-funded district to try to avoid that confound of a severe lack in financial and human resources. Superintendents from each school district were contacted in June 2018 and vowed initial support for this project at that time. This total population targeted for this project included 1,172 teachers from 34 schools.

Descriptive statistics for the sample included 205 individuals who completed the online survey, indicating a response rate of 17.5%. 167 surveys were submitted fully complete, while 38 responses were missing data and therefore were retained in listwise analysis. These responses were retained in the event that some individuals chose to skip certain question due to personal reasons. Any complete scales were important to this study. Females made up the majority of respondents, n=173 (84.4%) Figure 3.1 displays the racial breakdown of respondents with whites making up the largest category (n=174; 84.8%). According to the NCES the racial breakdown of teachers in Louisiana is approximately 74% white (NCES, 2012). This population, is slightly over representative of the demographic proportions in the state, however it is reflective of the teacher demographics for race given this study did not include urban areas in which larger minority populations would be found. In order to evaluate the difference in early career teachers and those later in their careers experience levels were recoded into three variables: 0-5 years coded as 1(early career); 6-15 years coded as 2 (mid-career); 16 + years coded as 3(veteran).The mean age report of 3.94 indicates a mean age of respondents in the 31-35 years old category, although it is important to note the largest age category by number was those ages 46+ (n=52; 25.9%). The mean age is in line with what one could expect if a full teaching career is 20-30 years beginning at age 22.
The smallest category of respondents by age were those ages 21-25 \((n=23; \text{11.2\%})\). This finding will be addressed later with regards to the sheer volume of early career teacher participants. Table 3.1 presents the breakdown by participating parish. Figure 3.1 presents the race demographic breakdown of participants. It is important to note in post-collection analysis there was no between subjects difference on independent or dependent study variables based on parish, age, gender, race, grade(s) level taught, or educational attainment. This indicated no need for control variables for any of the demographic variables.

Table 3.1. Participant breakdown by parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Feliciana</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Coupee</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Baton Rouge</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not report</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1. Respondent race
Procedures

Following dissertation proposal approval, IRB approval (Appendix B) was obtained and superintendents were contacted again in late September 2018. Superintendents from the four participating parishes all agreed to disseminate the surveys through their own email medium to encourage participation in the study. Data collection began at the beginning of October 2018 using the online Qualtrics data collection program. Superintendents sent an initial email invite with an explanation of the study and a survey link (http://lsu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bQu4zl4MITqKPaJ). A second email request was sent out two weeks later and data collection ended October 22, 2018. The majority of responses (229) came following the first email. The second email only resulted in three additional responses. The incentive (gift cards) did seem to affect responses as 79 individuals went on to enter their email in the attached SurveyMonkey survey for the gift card drawings.

At that point data was downloaded from Qualtrics and formatted into an excel spreadsheet for cleaning. First, incomplete data was marked as 0 - a number not appearing in any other scale item in the data. All responses were included in the final analysis. Questions not completed due to the lack of presence of a resource (e.g., mentoring and communities of practice) were marked as 0. Items from the JSS, TIS-6, Perceived Stress Scale, and Job Insecurity Scale were reverse coded as presented by scale scoring instructions. Initial statistical analysis began in early November, 2018.

A correlation matrix of measures (Table 3.2) includes inter-item correlations and reliability using Cronbach’s alpha. Evaluation and feedback—displayed a poor level of reliability, \( \alpha = .52 \). In that light, this scale will not be used in further analysis as a moderating variable.
Table 3.2. Correlation matrix of measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yrs Experience</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Quit Intention</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Job Insecurity</th>
<th>Evaluation &amp; Feedback</th>
<th>Supervisor Support</th>
<th>Formal Mentoring</th>
<th>Informal Mentoring</th>
<th>Communities of Practice</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yrs Experience</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>-.71*</td>
<td>-.64*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quit Intention</td>
<td>(.60)</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>(.52)</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Mentoring</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Mentoring</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(table cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Yrs Experience</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Quit Intention</td>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>Formal Mentoring</td>
<td>Informal Mentoring</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>111.24</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Prior to analysis the data was transformed for missing values by finding and replacing them with 0- a number that does not appear in any measure within the data set. Items from the JSS, perceived stress scale, turnover intention scale, and the job insecurity scale were reverse coded as directed by the individual scale scoring instructions. Finally, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to examine whether this study’s conceptualization of JR as a cumulative measure and/or two subcomponent measures (control and social support) was supported by the data.

EFA with varimax rotation were conducted on JR-Cumulative scales (Table 3.3), JR-Control scales (Table 3.4) and JR-Social Support scales (Table 3.5). First, all JR items were entered into one EFA with varimax rotation to take into account multicollinearity across the items. Next, EFAs were conducted for the sub-components of JR-Control and JR-Social Support. Based on these three EFAs, the conceptualization of the JR variable (i.e., cumulative and two subcomponents) did not demonstrate a factorial consistent with the component structure theoretically proposed in this study. As detailed in the following review of these results, the data do not support analyzing JR as three components (cumulative or two subcomponents), therefore the proposed hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 will be analyzed looking at each resource separately.

**JR-Cumulative EFA.** An EFA for all resource variables proposed to be JR-Cumulative (Table 3.3) was run resulting in a 10-component matrix. Items were considered to load onto a component if they had a loading of at least .50. Component 1 factor loadings ranged from .933 to .674, accounting for 34.87% of the variance. Component 1 represented the complete job autonomy/decision making scale. The factor loadings for component 2 ranged from .840 to .558, accounting for 13.16% of the variance. Although this component did not consist of one complete scale, it was composed of the pay and fringe benefits sub scales of the JSS (Spector, 1985) as
well as other items from the JSS. Component 3 factor loadings ranged from .936 to .509, accounting for 9.36% of the variance. Items within this component were part of the formal mentoring scale. Component 4 factor loadings ranged from .868 to .637, and accounted for 6.99% of the variance. These factors loaded onto a component consistent with the communities of practice scale items. The factor loadings for component 5 ranged from .922 to .874, accounting for 5.40% of the variance and consisting of items that make up the informal mentoring scale. Component 6 consisted of factor loadings ranging from .898 to .601. The four items in this component consist of the four job insecurity items, and accounted for 3.89% of the variance. Component 7 factor loadings ranged from .712 to .576, accounting for 3.33% of the variance. The three items in this component were three of the four items that composed the contingent rewards subscale within the JSS (Spector, 1985). Component 8 only consisted of one item with a factor loading of .784, and accounted for 2.98% of the variance. This one item was part of the job satisfaction scale and asked about chance for promotion within the job. Component 9 also consisted of one item with a factor loading of .615, accounting for 2.3% of the variance. This item was also part of the JSS (Spector, 1985) promotion subscale, and cross-loaded onto component 8 at .487. Finally, component 10 only consisted of two items; however, both loaded under .50- the acceptable loading to be considered part of a component. These items ranged from .449 to .402, accounted for 2.20% of the variance, and were both part of the job autonomy/decision making scale. In sum, the total variance explained by this 10-component model of JR-Cumulative was 84.45%.

Overall, these items did not load into one component indicative of a JR- Cumulative measure. In the final analyses, each of these components will be analyzed as individual moderators to the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction and quit intention.
Table 3.3. JR- Cumulative EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
<th>Component 5</th>
<th>Component 6</th>
<th>Component 7</th>
<th>Component 8</th>
<th>Component 9</th>
<th>Component 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17_7</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_9</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_8</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_6</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_5</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_4</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_2</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_3</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_1</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_29</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_22</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_13</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_28</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_1</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_10</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_11</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_32</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_4</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.401</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_33</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24_2</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24_3</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24_5</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24_1</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont'd)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
<th>Component 5</th>
<th>Component 6</th>
<th>Component 7</th>
<th>Component 8</th>
<th>Component 9</th>
<th>Component 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q24_4</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22_2</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22_1</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22_4</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29_5</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29_3</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29_4</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>-.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29_6</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29_1</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26_3</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26_1</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26_2</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_1</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_2</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_4</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_3</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_23</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_14</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_5</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_2</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22_3</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_20</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**JR-Control EFA.** The JR-Control scales results in a two-component matrix (Table 3.4) that indicates the items from each scale-job autonomy/decision making and job security-were consistently reflected as two independent components instead of one singular JR-Control variable. The factor loadings for component 1 ranged from .917 to .723, and accounted for 52.22% of the variance. This component loadings load accurately as the job autonomy/decision making scale. The factor loadings for component 2 ranged from .907 to .773, accounting for 22.02% of the variance, all meeting an acceptable range for component consistency (.5 and above). In addition, these item load to the job insecurity scale, however this result does not provide evidence for a one-component variable of JR-Control. The total variance explained by the 2-component model of JR-Control was 74.24%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17_5</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_8</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_6</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_7</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>-.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_9</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>-.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_4</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_3</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_2</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17_1</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_1</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_2</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_4</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18_3</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JR Social Support EFA.** The EFA on the JR-Social Support scale with Evaluation and Feedback removed due to low scale reliability resulted in a six-component matrix (Table 3.5). As with previous EFAs, a loading of .50 was seen as acceptable to be used as part of a component.
The factor loadings for component 1 ranges from .842 to .574, and accounted for 40.25% of the variance. Items from component 1 were part of the JSS (Spector, 1985). Component 2 factor loadings ranged from .876 to .633. This component accounted for 14.77% of the variance and items in this component were reflective of the communities of practice scale. Component 3 factor loadings ranged from .916 to .674 and accounted for 7.87% of the variance. The five items in this component are reflective of the formal mentoring scale. The factor loadings for component 4 ranged from .782 to .533, accounting for 6.20% of the variance. These items consisted of a mix of three items from the supervisor support scale and three items from the job satisfaction measure. The JSS (Spector, 1985) items asked about promotion and job recognition, which may have related to the supervisor support items asking about perceived well-being. Component 5 factor loadings ranged from .902 to .857. These items were all from the informal mentoring scale and accounted for 5.40% of the variance. Finally, component 6 factor loadings ranged from .763 to .718, accounting for 4.00% of the variance. The two items were from the JSS (Spector, 1985) contingent rewards subscale. In sum, the total variance explained from this 6-component model of JR-Social Support was 78.12%.

Table 3.5. JR-Social Support EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
<th>Component 5</th>
<th>Component 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11_29</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_22</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_13</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_28</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_19</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_33</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_1</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_11</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11_10</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>-.426</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont’d)
Instrument and Measures

The final survey amounted to 14 pages beginning with the demographic survey questions. All but the last question were quantitative measures described below. The final question was an open-ended qualitative measure that is not analyzed as a part of the present study, but will be used as supporting evidence and for future analysis. The survey could be completed on average in 10 minutes. Each measure will be discussed including the reliability- internal consistency- of the measure. Table 3.2 displays the correlation matrix for study variables.
Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction refers to the pleasurable emotions experienced as a result of a job. These emotions are relative to both perceived job characteristics and work values. In this study, job satisfaction will be measured using an adapted version of the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1985). In the JSS (Appendix C) attitudes of employees are measured using 36 items aggregated into nine individual scales measuring attitudes towards pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. A sample item from the JSS is “I like doing the things I do at work” (Spector, 1985). Each item on each scale is assessed on a continuum from low to high (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree) on a 5 point Likert scale.

It is important to note that this scale does not provide a numerical value for satisfaction or dissatisfaction, rather individuals scores are compared to determine who is more/less satisfied. To score response items are numbered from 1 (strongest disagreement) to 6 (strongest agreement). Negatively worded items were reverse scored as such: 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1. The reported internal consistency score for the JSS total scale is 0.91 (Spector, 2001). Because the measure of job satisfaction includes all parts of the scale, the whole measure was utilized.

The range of scores on this measure fell between 52 and 167. The scale mean was 111.24, and the standard deviation was 20.50. This scale does not provide specific cut points for high/low satisfaction; rather individuals are compared to each other with higher scores indicating higher job satisfaction and lower scores indicating lower job satisfaction.

In order to effectively compare means job satisfaction scores were split using the mean, 111.24, and median, 111.00. Individuals with a mean job satisfaction score of 110 or less were
coded as low job satisfaction. Individuals with a mean job satisfaction score of 111 or above were coded as high job satisfaction. 93 scores fell into the low range and 95 scores fell into the high range.

**Quit intention.** Quit intention- also known as turnover intention- is a measure of an individual’s intent to either stay with or leave an organization. Turnover intention has been measured in literature in a variety of methods from larger (15-item) scales to a one-item question. In an attempt to avoid an overabundance of lengthy questionnaires, quit intention was measured in this study using the Turnover Intention Scale (TIS-6) (Appendix D), a six-item scale adapted by Roodt (2004). This six-item questionnaire is measured by a 5-point Likert scale from never (1) to always (5). A sample item from this questionnaire is “How often have you considered leaving your job?” (Roodt, 2004). A recent scale validation of the TIS-6 by Bothma and Roodt (2013) found that this scale to reliably measure turnover intention ($\alpha = 0.8$). This scale also demonstrated the ability to distinguish actual turnover demonstrating significant differences between stayers and leavers (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). While this study is not examining actual stayers and leavers, the criterion-predictive and differential validity of this measure lends to the validity for use in this study.

Descriptive statistics from this study results in a TIS-6 mean of 17.27 with a minimum score of 6 and a maximum score of 29. The standard deviation for this measure was 4.27, and in analyzing reliability $\alpha=.60$. Again, there were no points of measure within the scale. A higher score indicated greater quit intention while a lower score indicated lower quit intention.

The TIS-6 (Roodt, 2004)- a previously validated scale- exhibited an uncharacteristically low reliability of .60. In further scale reliability analysis it was shown that one item of this scale,
when removed, increased scale reliability to .83. This item, question number 4, stated, “How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?”

In examining this item and referring to prior literature, it seems that many who go into teaching do not do so to satisfy traditional needs of financial security and comfort. According to a report from the Bill and Melinda Gate foundation, 85% of teachers go into the profession to make a difference in children’s lives, compared to 14% who report wanting to have the summer’s off, and only 4% report going into teaching for the earning potential (Scholastic Inc. and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014). These statistics indicate that teachers do not teach to suit traditional personal needs, which may explain the lack of reliability of this item in the TIS-6.

**Job stress.** Perceived job stress is the perception of physical/mental effort required by the environment/tasks associated with a job. The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) (Appendix E) was created to measure the extent to which an individual appraises events in his/her life as stressful. Developed by Cohen, Kamarck, and Mermelstein (1983), this adapted 10-item scale addresses feelings of stress in the past month. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1-5 (never, almost never, sometimes, fairly often, very often). Items 4, 5, 7, and 8 must be reverse coded as follows: 1-5; 2-4; 3-3; 4-2; 5-1. Scores should be totaled and analyzed as follows: 0-13= low stress; 14-26= moderate stress; 27-40= high stress. An altered version of this scale was used as items will be reworded to directly address the job of the individual, for example, “In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and stressed” will be reworded to say “In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and stressed in your job.” In a psychometric evaluation of the
PSS, the 10-item version demonstrated a Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .78 (Lee, 2012) and .72 (Khalil, Sirati, Ebadi, Tavallai, & Habibi, 2017). Additionally, internal consistency of scale items in a recent study through repeated measures was 0.93 (Khalil, et al., 2017).

This measure resulted in a mean of 30.11, minimum score of 10 and maximum score of 46. Standard deviation for this measure was 8.10 and $\alpha=.89$. The mean of 30.11 indicates that on average teachers indicated perceiving high stress levels, as directed by the previously mentioned survey scoring instructions. In order to delineate between low stress and high stress responses were split using mean, 30.11, and median, 29.50 and categorized as either high stress- 30 and above- or low stress- 29 and below. 88 participants were categorized as low stress and 88 participants were categorized as high stress.

**Job Resources**

As described in the protocol, a preliminary analysis exploring the fit of the 8 JR resources into the conceptualized three components (cumulative and two subcomponents) did not demonstrate a factorial structure consistent with this conceptualization. As a result, each JR will be analyzed as an independent moderator in the proposed hypotheses 4-6.

**Autonomy & decision making.** To measure job control/autonomy and decision making, 9 items based on the ‘autonomy’ section of the Work Design Questionnaire (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006) will be used (Appendix F). These items are grouped into three sub-scales measuring work scheduling autonomy ($\alpha=.85$), decision-making autonomy ($\alpha=.85$), and work methods autonomy ($\alpha=.88$). All items are positively worded and rated on a scale from 1-5 (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree). A sample item from this scale is “This job allows me to make decisions about what methods I use to complete my work.”
The autonomy scale mean was 26.55, range was 36-9, and standard deviation was 9.14. In interpreting this scale, a higher score indicated feelings of greater autonomy in the job, versus a lower score indicating feelings of less autonomy in the job. The scale reliability was $\alpha=.95$.

**Job insecurity.** Job insecurity is essentially the anticipation of involuntary changes to one’s job. Job insecurity was measured to determine how secure teachers feel in their present position. This measure is particularly important to early career teachers in Louisiana because budget cuts in many districts have caused reductions in force over the past decade. Job insecurity was measured with four items adapted from the Job Insecurity Scale by De Witte (2000) (Appendix G). These items were also be measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1-5 (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree). One item (#2) will be reverse coded as 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1. Item totals were calculated as the higher total score, the more insecurity felt by the respondent. In a recent psychometric evaluation of this scale, the alpha coefficient for job insecurity among multi-national individuals was .82.

Descriptive analysis of survey responses showed a scale mean of 14.82 with a minimum score of 8 and a maximum score of 17. The standard deviation was 1.705. The reliability coefficient for this measure, $\alpha=.86$, was higher than the proposed scale reliability previously stated.

**Rewards.** The literature suggests that the most notable tangible rewards for teachers include benefits of pay, pension, insurance and other fringe benefits including opportunities for promotion. Rewards are benefits given to employees that serve as a means of appreciation and incentive for performance. The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1985) includes sub scales measuring pay ($\alpha=.75$), promotion ($\alpha=.73$), fringe benefits ($\alpha=.73$), and contingent rewards ($\alpha=.76$). In total, 16 items were utilized from the JSS to specifically examine rewards.
(Appendix H). An example of a question from this scale is “I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.” Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1-5 (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree). Negative items were reverse coded as 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1. As with the total JSS, responses from these sub scales were used to compare differences in rewards between respondents.

The rewards scale results showed a mean of 41.58, a minimum score of 4 and a maximum score of 71. Standard deviation of this measure was 11.28 and the reliability was \( \alpha = 0.89 \). As there was no set value for amount of rewards, higher scores indicate greater access to rewards and lower scores indicated less access to rewards within the job.

**Evaluation and feedback.** Evaluation and feedback from supervisors is an important component of support for teachers, and is integral to the teacher evaluation system in Louisiana. The measure for evaluation and feedback (Appendix I) was constructed by the researcher to evaluate the usefulness of feedback received on job performance, whether or not annual evaluations are conducted, and whether or not teachers engage in annual conference to discuss their performance. These items were addressed with one simple yes (y=1) or no (n=0) question followed by three evaluation questions measured on a 5-point Likert scale. Subsequently, teachers were asked to indicate the number of observations (formal or informal) they receive within a given school year (never= 0; once a year =1; twice a year =2; 3-6 times a year= 3; monthly = 4; more than once a month = 5).

Scale results were a mean score of 12.06, with score values ranging from 3-15 and a standard deviation of 2.12. Higher scores indicated more useful feedback on evaluations, and
lower scores indicated less useful feedback. The reliability coefficient for this measure was \( \alpha=.52 \). As this measure was constructed, and reliability was lower than acceptable, more on this will be included in the discussion of results.

**Supervisor support.** In this study, supervisors include the direct, school level supervisors including but not limited to school principals, assistant principals, dean of students, and other administrative level school directors and/or specialists. Supervisor support is the extent to which the individual perceives care for personal and professional wellbeing from his/her supervisor(s). Four items (Appendix J) taken from the perceived organizational support scale (Eisenberger et al., 1986) were measured using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1-7 (strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, neither agree or disagree, somewhat agree, agree, strongly agree). While the original measure evaluated support from the organization, the wording of these four items were amended to evaluate support from the supervisor(s). Organization is replaced with supervisor(s).

The mean score for supervisor support was 15.22. The minimum score was 4 and the maximum score 20, with a standard deviation of 3.94. The reliability of this measure was \( \alpha=.87 \), indicating even though this measure was constructed by the researcher, there is a high level of reliability. Higher scores indicated greater perceived supervisor support, while lower scores indicate less perceived supervisor support.

**Mentoring.** This study is not intended to be an evaluation of a mentoring program, rather seeks to identify (a) does mentoring (formal or informal) exist; and if so (b) has this mentoring been effective to the early career teacher. Mentoring is a relationship developed between an individual of lesser experience and an individual of greater experience. Teachers were asked to indicate whether they have been involved in formal and informal mentoring relationships within
their current job. A response of ‘yes’ was coded as 1, a response of ‘no’ was coded as 0. They then responded to questions on the effectiveness of these relationships using a 5-point Likert scale of 1-5 (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree or disagree, agree, strongly agree) (Appendix K).

In this scale, higher scores indicate greater perceived effectiveness of the mentoring relationships, while lower scores indicated less perceived effectiveness of the mentoring relationships. The mean score for formal mentoring was 18.92, with a range of 5-25, and a standard deviation of 6.04. The reliability coefficient for the formal mentoring scale was α=.96. The mean for informal mentoring was 13.47, with a range of 9-15, and a standard deviation of 1.67. The reliability coefficient for this scale was α=.89.

Communities of practice (CoP). Similar to the measurement of mentoring, this study is not seeking to evaluate communities of practice on some pre-determined metric. Teachers were first asked to identify if any type of CoP exists within their current school. A response of ‘yes’ was coded as 1, and a response on ‘no’ was coded as 0. CoPs can include professional learning communities and/or teams, cohort groups, structured department meetings, and other forms of groups in which employees work toward a common goal. Teachers were asked to measure the engagement, common interest, collaborative ability, trust, and helpfulness of their given CoPs (Appendix L). Six items were rated using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-5 (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree or disagree, agree, strongly agree).

The scale mean for evaluating communities of practice was 21.83. The maximum score was 30 and the minimum was 6, with a standard deviation of 4.87. Lower scores on this scale indicated less effective perception of CoPs, while higher scores indicate greater effective perception of CoPs. The reliability coefficient for this scale was α=.89.
**Demographics Survey**

A demographic survey (Appendix M) was used to obtain information pertinent to the research objectives as well as identify any outlying variability that may be related to demographic differences. Participants were asked to identify their age, gender and race/ethnicity. They then identified the school district in which they teach, the grade level(s) taught, as well as the type of school they work in (early learning/primary; elementary; middle/jr. high; high school). Participants then identified their highest level of academic achievement, the subject areas in which they teach, and the total number of completes years of experience they have as a classroom teacher. The demographic survey ended by asking if teaching is their first career and the status of their family (single, married, children/no children).

The survey ended with an open-ended question (Appendix N) that was included to provide support for quantitative responses as well as for future qualitative in-depth analysis. Since the review of literature found no agreed-upon list of specific job demands, this question asked teacher to list the demands they felt they encountered in their current job.

**Chapter 3 Summary**

Chapter 3 describes the population, procedures, measures and descriptive statistics for scales included in the online survey. The population for this study involved over 200 public school teachers from grades pre-K-12 in four parishes near Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Electronic surveys were constructed using the Qualtrics program and sent via school district Superintendents. Survey dissemination occurred in October 2018 and data analysis began in November, 2018.

Results from three EFAs determined that items did not load onto single components as predicted; therefore, Figure 3.2 presents the revised conceptual model for this study.
Figure 3.2. Revised conceptual model
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the moderating effect of job resources on the relationship between job satisfaction, job stress, and quit intention in early career teachers. Specific goals included identifying the magnitude of resource available to early career teachers, if these resources differ between early career teachers and those in later stages of their career, and determine if these resources serve to reduce quit intention.

Data Analysis Strategy

Hypothesis 1 and 2- testing the relationship between job stress (hypothesis 1), job satisfaction (hypothesis 2) and quit intention were analyzed using an ANCOVA (analysis of covariance) using the GLM (general linear model). This analysis was chosen to first evaluate the experience of early career teacher while then comparing this experience to all teachers in order to determine if a difference exists among experience level. Hypothesis 3 utilized a simple correlation to describe the relationship between job satisfaction and job stress. Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 will all be tested using the Hayes PROCESS model of regression to examine the moderating variables of autonomy/decision making, job insecurity, rewards, supervisor support, formal mentoring, informal mentoring, and communities of practice.

Hypothesis 1

Hypotheses 1 proposed that job stress would be positively associated with quit intention. This relationship was analyzed with an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) using the General Linear Model (GLM) univariate analysis. Job stress was the fixed factor, quit intention was the dependent variable, and the categorical years of experience variable was used as a covariate to determine any specific differences in this relationship within early career teachers versus mid-level and veteran teachers.
Table 4.1 displays the results of the ANCOVA for the test of hypothesis 1. Consistent with previous research findings, there was a significant main effect of job stress on quit intention, $F(1, 1)= 83.23, p<.05$, which means that greater perceived job stress is predictive of higher quit intention. Individuals in the low stress category had a PSS scale mean of 23.46, while individuals in the high stress category had a mean of 36.73. The $\eta^2=.33$ indicates a small effect size of this relationship. This analysis did not indicate experience level to be a significant covariate in this model, which means although stress did predict quit intention, this result was not unique to the experience of early career teachers. This result implies that while teachers who experience high levels of job stress are more inclined to express quit intention, and there was no relationship between and individual’s career stage and quit intention. This means that early career teachers experience no stronger or weaker quit intention. These results support hypothesis 1 partially in that there is a significant relationship between the variables, however this finding is not unique to the population of early career teachers.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypotheses 2 proposed that job satisfaction would be negatively associated with quit intention. Again, an ANCOVA using the GLM was used to analyze this relationship. In this analysis job satisfaction was the fixed factor, quit intention was the dependent variable, and experience level (early, mid-career, veteran) was the covariate.

Table 4.2 displays the result of the ANCOVA. The main effect of job satisfaction on quit intention was significant, $F(1,1) = 71.66, p. <.05, \eta^2 = .29$. The mean JSS score for the low group was 94.86, and the mean JSS score for the high group was 127.27. This result, as predicted, shows that individuals with higher job satisfaction scores reported lower quit intention. Further examination of these results shows that experience level does not serve as a covariate in this
relationship. This finding indicates again that there is no difference quit intention between early career teachers and those with more years of experience. Again, hypothesis 2 was partially supported due to the significance of the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention, however no difference in quit intention was found for the sample of early career teachers.

Table 4.1. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) summary of job stress, years experience, and quit intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta Sq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>997.95</td>
<td>498.97</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>981.75</td>
<td>981.75</td>
<td>83.23</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *p<.05

Table 4.2. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) summary of job satisfaction, years experience, and quit intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta Sq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>920.01</td>
<td>460.04</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>904.38</td>
<td>904.38</td>
<td>71.65</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *p<.05

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 predicted that job satisfaction and job stress would be inversely related.

Table 3.2 displays the descriptive statistics for job stress and job satisfaction. A simple Pearson Product Correlation analysis was used to identify the direction and strength of the relationship between these two variables. The results of this correlation (Table 3.2) show a moderately strong inverse correlation between job stress and job satisfaction, \( r(174) = -0.637, p<.05 \).

This relationship indicates that as job stress of teachers increases their satisfaction with their job
decreases. Conversely since this correlation analysis does not indicate directionality of the relationship, it can be stated that as job satisfaction of teachers increases job stress decreases.

**Hypothesis 4, 5, & 6**

![Measurement model of resource moderators](image)

*\(p<0.05\)*

Figure 4. Measurement model of resource moderators

Hypothesis 4 proposed that greater access to general job resources (JR-Cumulative) would moderate the effects of job stress and job satisfaction on quit intention. Hypothesis 5 predicted that greater access to JR-Control would moderate the effects of job stress and job satisfaction in that higher levels of JR-Control would result in lower levels of quit intention.
Hypothesis 6 proposed that greater access to JR-Social Support would moderate the effects of high job stress and low job satisfaction in that higher levels of JR-Social Support would reduce quit intention in these situations. In an EFA conducted prior to data analysis none of the proposed theoretical resources were supported by EFA data, therefore each resource will be analyzed as a moderator to quit intention individually. Figure 4 displays a measurement model of the variables tested as moderators to job stress, job satisfaction, and quit intention.

**Job autonomy/decision making.** Model A of Table 4.4 displays the resulted of the multiple moderated regression analysis for job stress, job autonomy/decision making, and quit intention. In this model the relationship between job stress, job autonomy/decision making, and quit intention resulted in a significant model, $F(3,165)=54.62$, $R^2=.50$, $p<.05$. This indicates a moderate relationship between the model variables. Further analysis did not reveal a significant moderating effect of the job autonomy/decision making resources indicating the presence of this variable did not serve to reduce job stress and decrease quit intention.

Model B of Table 4.4 displays the results of the moderation analysis between job satisfaction, job autonomy/decision making, and quit intention. The overall relationship depicted in step 1 of the model was significant, $F(3, 165)=54.40$, $R^2=.50$, $p<.05$. Again, there is a moderate relationship between these variables. Additional tests for moderation effects did not result in a significant interaction between job satisfaction and job autonomy/decision making. This finding indicates that the presence of greater job autonomy and more participation in decision-making did not strengthen the positive effect of job satisfaction on quit intention.

**Job insecurity.** Model C of Table 4.4 displays a moderate significant relationship in step 1 between job stress, job insecurity, and quit intention, $F(3,161)=51.54$, $R^2=.49$, $p<.05$. 

A
Step 2 of Model C did not reveal a significant interaction between job stress, job insecurity, and quit intention. This indicates the lack of a moderating effect of lower job insecurity to reduce quit intention in times of higher stress.

A significant model of the overall relationship between job satisfaction, job insecurity, and quit intention was found (Model D, Table 4.4), \( F(3, 161)=58.13, R^2=.52, p<.05 \). The test of step 2 in Model D examined the potential moderating effect of job insecurity on the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention. This interaction was not significant indicating a lack of evidence for the moderation effect.

**Supervisor support.** Step 1 of the moderated regression analysis resulted in a significant overall model between the variables of job stress, supervisor support, and quit intention (Model E, Table 4.4), \( F(3, 162)=58.19, R^2=.52, p<.05 \). These results mimic those found in hypothesis 1 in which a significant relationship was found between job stress and quit intention. Further analysis, however, did not result in a significant moderating effect of supervisor support on the relationship between job stress and quit intention. This finding indicates that the presence of higher supervisor support did not reduce job stress and thereby reduce quit intention.

Model F of table 4.4 displays the significant relationship between job satisfaction, supervisor support, and quit intention, \( F(3, 163)=52.57, R^2=.49, p<.05 \). This moderate relationship suggests, as per hypothesis 2, that there is an inverse relationship between the job satisfaction and quit intention variables. Step 2 of Model F, however, did not reveal a significant interaction of job satisfaction and supervisor support on quit intention. These results do not support the idea that supervisor support as a resource moderates this relationship.

**Formal mentoring.** A moderately relationship between job stress, formal mentoring, and quit intention is displayed in Model G of Table 4.4, \( F(3,45)=25.38, R^2=.63, p<.05 \).
Table 4.4. Multiple moderated regression analysis with prediction of quit intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Quit Intention</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2_{Total} )</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>54.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Decision Making</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress x Autonomy/Decision Making Interaction</td>
<td>-.0009</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Decision Making</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction x Autonomy/Decision Making Interaction</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>51.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress x Job Insecurity Interaction</td>
<td>-.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction x Job Insecurity Interaction</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress x Supervisor Support Interaction</td>
<td>-.0081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>52.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0057</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction x Supervisor Support Interaction</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table cont’d)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>R²Total</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>25.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Mentoring</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress x Formal Mentoring Interaction</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>20.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Mentoring</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction x Formal Mentoring Interaction</td>
<td>.0028</td>
<td>.0055</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>.96*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>45.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Mentoring</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress x Informal Mentoring Interaction</td>
<td>-.0453*</td>
<td>.0231</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Mentoring</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction x Informal Mentoring Interaction</td>
<td>.0128</td>
<td>.0158</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>44.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress x Communities of Practice Interaction</td>
<td>-.0113*</td>
<td>.0193</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>49.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction x Communities of Practice Interaction</td>
<td>.0025</td>
<td>.0132</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table cont’d)
Further analysis of formal mentoring as a moderator between the relationship of job stress and quit intention did not result in significant findings indicating that for this sample formal mentoring did not serve as a resource to reduce job stress and quit intention.

Model H of Table 4.4 displays the results of the moderated regression analysis for the relationship between job satisfaction, formal mentoring, and quit intention. This model was also significant in step 1, $F(3,45)=20.39$, $R^2=.58$, $p<.05$. The moderation analysis of step 2 in Model H did not find a significant interaction between job satisfaction and formal mentoring indicating formal mentoring does not serve as a moderator of the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention.

**Informal mentoring.** The model of job stress, informal mentoring, and quit intention is depicted in Model I, Table 4.4. Step 1 of Model I displays overall model significance, $F(2,92)=45.28$, $R^2=.60$, $p<.05$. Further analysis in step 2 of Model I reveals a significant moderating effect of the presence of informal mentoring on the relationship between job stress...
and quit intention, $\beta = -.0435, p < .05$. This result means that in situations where participants experienced informal mentoring relationships the resource depleting effects of job stress were lessened such that the effect of job stress on quit intention was reduced.

Model J of Table 4.4 displays the relationship between job satisfaction, informal mentoring, and quit intention. Step 1 of Model J revealed significance to the overall model, $F(3, 92) = 34.62, R^2 = .53, p < .05$. The moderation tested in step 2 of Model J did not reveal a significant interaction between job satisfaction and informal mentoring on the outcome variable of quit intention.

**Communities of practice.** The relationship between job stress, communities of practice, and quit intention is shown in Model K of Table 4.4. The overall model of these variables was significant, $F(3, 141) = 44.84, R^2 = .49, p < .05$. The test for moderation in step 2 of Model K revealed a significant interaction between job stress and communities of practice on the outcome variable of quit intention, $\beta = -.0113, p < .05$. This result indicates that when participants experienced communities of practice within their jobs, this resource served to reduce job stress and quit intention.

Step 1 of Model L (Table 4.4) tests the overall model of job satisfaction, communities of practice, and quit intention and found it to be significant, $F(3, 141) = 49.84, R^2 = .51, p < .05$. Further analyses of the potential moderating effect of communities of practice on the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention did not show to be significant indicating that communities of practice did not serve to increase job satisfaction and reduce quit intention in this sample.
Rewards. The relationship between job stress, rewards, and quit intention is displayed in Model M of Table 4.4. The overall model was significant, $F(3,172)=59.83$, $R^2=.51$, $p<.05$. In a test of the moderation effect of rewards on quit intention, however, no significant results were found.

Model N of Table 4.4 displays the moderated regression analysis for the variables of job satisfaction, rewards, and quit intention. Again, the overall model was significant, $F(3,177)=72.69$, $R^2=.55$, $p<.05$. Step 1 of Model N tested the moderation effect of rewards on the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention. This relationship also showed to be not significant indicating no moderation effect.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

Why do nearly half of all teachers leave the profession within the first five years? What factors influence these teachers to quit? What can school districts and individual schools do to help curb attrition rates? These are all guiding questions for this study. The problem being addressed is teacher attrition. The proposed solution is that resources may moderate the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction and quit intention, and that if these resources are aligned with the demands of the job, quit intention will be lowered.

Specifically this study examined the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, and quit intention. These relationships were studied from multiple angles including direct prediction, correlation, and moderation. Rooted in Conservation of Resource Theory (Hobfoll, 1989) which poses the idea that stress occurs when resources are not available to an individual. The Job Demands-Resource Model (JD-R Model) (Demerouti et al., 2001) also provides theoretical backing to this study which propose moderating effects of job resources on reducing job stress and increasing job satisfaction to ultimately reduce quit intention. The overarching findings of this study are summarized below, followed by contributions to practice and science, study limitations and concluding remarks are given.

Explanation of Findings

Statistical analysis of study hypotheses showed full support for hypothesis 3, that job satisfaction and job stress would be inversely related. Partial support was found for hypothesis 1, that job stress would be positively associated with quit intention and hypothesis 2, that job satisfaction would be inversely associated with quit intention. Further tests of individual resources as moderators provided some support for the theoretical idea that resources provided to teacher do serve as moderators to the relationship between job stress and quit intention.
The following sections will synthesize an understanding of the results based on the test of hypotheses presented in the Results section in order to formulate a coherent interpretation of the knowledge generated in response to each study objective.

**Study Objective 1: Describe the relationship between job stress and quit intention in early career teachers.**

Numerous other studies have demonstrated that higher job stress leads to higher quit intention (Allisey et al., 2014; Bowling et al., 2015; Kazemi, 2015; Jim & Jao, 2014). Relative to this study, as predicted teachers who experienced higher levels of job stress also demonstrated greater intention to quit. This finding is important in the greater issue of teacher attrition in that quit intention has shown to be a preceding step towards actual attrition (Cronley & Kim, 2017; Park & Kim, 2009). The present sample of pre-K-12 teachers produce results similar to what can be expected in high stress situations. Conservation of Resource Theory explains this by noting that high levels of stress lead to a depletion in resources available for individuals to use. In practical terms the teachers in this study responded such that in situations where they experienced stress- caused by resource depletion- they were more likely to report intention to quit their job. One participant reported in the open-ended question “I feel that we suffer with psychological and physical demands. They continue to pour more work on us and force us to use certain things. We are not allowed to make decisions for what’s best for our students or use the degree we worked so hard for. It is very hard to be happy, not feel drained (physically or emotionally).” Another teacher wrote, “The hindrance demands that obstruct my goals are the number of hours required to effectively do this job. I spend 70+ hours per week at a teaching job. I am definitely considering a career change!”
One theory of teacher attrition (Grissmer & Kirby, 1987) notes that as teachers gain more information about their jobs through experience and this information does not match their initial expectation dissonance occurs which results in resource lost and ultimately stress. The quantitative results and qualitative reports from this study support this theory.

Although the main crux of this objective showed to be valid, there was no significant difference in the relationship between job stress and quit intention for early career teachers when compared to mid-career teachers and veteran teachers. Although previous literature suggests the high attrition rate for early career teachers, it may be possible that while early career teachers are more vulnerable to the attrition of the job due to a possible lack of organizational commitment and/or other feasible career options, that when all things are equal all teachers experience the same level of stress.

Organizational commitment was not included as a variable in this study because previous research was conflicting as to whether or not organizational commitment influences job satisfaction or is influenced by job satisfaction. That being said literature has also reported that increases in stress lead to increased turnover intention through the interaction of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Schaubroeck, Cotton, & Jennings, 1989). Additionally, prior research has found that when employees are provided rewards both organizational commitment and job satisfaction are increased (Birtch, Chiang, & Van Esch, 2016). With that in mind, and noting the finding of the present study of the importance of rewards, future research should include measures of organizational commitment of teachers and how that interaction with job satisfaction affects quit intention. This type of design could also analyze if and how organizational commitment varies among early career teachers versus veteran teachers.
Study Objective 2: Describe the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention in early career teachers.

The more satisfied a teacher is, the less likely he/she is to leave their job. As predicted, teacher job satisfaction and quit intention showed a strong direct relationship in which higher levels of job satisfaction resulted in lowered quit intention. Conversely, lower job satisfaction would be predictive of higher quit intention. These results are supported by Mobley’s (1977) theory detailing how dissatisfaction eventually leads to quit intention and ultimately actual turnover (Hom et al., 2017). The construct of job satisfaction includes factors such as values, rewards, relationships, and career factors including resources (Kalleberg, 1977). Interestingly, rewards was found to be the most highly correlated variable with job satisfaction. Teachers in this sample overwhelmingly reported that their satisfaction in their job is highly tied to their rewards- including pay, promotion, fringe benefits, and contingent rewards. Reports from the qualitative response indicate that for many teachers these reported rewards do not suffice-

- A lot of paperwork and hours outside of school [ ] that are not paid in salary.
- The pay for the amount of work needs to be improved.
- Teaching requires too much time and preparation outside of school hours for the amount of compensation received.

Consistent with the “honeymoon-hangover” effect (Boswell, Boudreau, & Tichy, 2005), over time the initial excitement and satisfaction with beginning a new job is reduced due to affective habituation (Leventhal et al., 2007). When satisfaction declines and no buffer such as resources are in place, quit intention increases (Wang, Hom, & Allen, 2017). In the present
study, those teachers who experienced higher job satisfaction were less likely to report intending to quit, while those who experienced lower job satisfaction were more likely to report quit intention. Again, results did not differ by career level.

The Job-Demands Control (JDC) Model (Karasek, 1979) would note in this situation that a high demand environment in which these individuals felt little control and received low support (rewards) would result in increasing stress. The results of this study add to this model by describing that low satisfaction also exists as a result of the afore mentioned conditions- which leads to study objective 3.

**Study Objective 3: Describe the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction in early career teachers.**

Prior research has consistently found an inverse correlation between job stress and job satisfaction (Coomber & Barriball, 2007; Zangaro & Soeken, 2007). The results of this study are in line with the literature. Teachers who experienced high levels of job satisfaction were more likely to experience low levels of perceived job stress. In contrast, teachers who experience low levels of job satisfaction were more likely to experience high levels of perceived job stress. This correlation does not imply predictability, directionality, or causality between the two, simply the fact that there is an inverse relationship between these variables. One possible explanation for this relationship is that both job stress and job satisfaction are related to job perception and job values.

As seen in the JDC Model example given prior, the factors that interact to produce high stress (high demands, unsupportive environment, low control) also contribute to reduced job satisfaction. This relationship was seen repeatedly in participant responses:
- Mental and physical drainage from the dealing with students with no support from administration. [ ] No one seems to care about what you are doing, how you are doing, and what you’re achieving. I leave work feeling a sense of worthlessness no matter how hard I know I’m pushing myself…

-I am required to teach students. I am required to improve test scores. I am very successful in my field and have great results; however the district keeps trying to adopt new curriculum and practices that are sometimes contradictory to my methods… This is frustrating.

A positive perception or positive values contribute to high job satisfaction that can serve as a buffer to stress (Chung, Jung, & Sohn, 2017). In other cases- such as those depicted above, high stress may be a trigger than diminishes job perception thereby resulting in decreased job satisfaction (Chung, Jung, & Sohn, 2017).

**Study Objective 4 sought to determine whether the relationships among job stress, job satisfaction, and quit intention are moderated by job resources in the forms of job control, social support, and cumulatively.**

Research on resources and job satisfaction has demonstrated that resources can help to counter the physical and psychological (stress) demands of the workplace and increase job satisfaction. (Jang et al., 2017). Literature suggests all tested resource should serve as moderators to the relationship between job stress and quit intention. The presence of resources should, in theory, have served as a buffer to reduce the depleting effect of stress in teachers (Hobfoll, 1989; Wang, Hom, & Allen, 2017). In the present study, moderating effects were only found between job stress and informal mentoring and job stress and communities of practice.
Given these findings a few explanations should be explored. First, more work should be focused on examining the resource variables of informal mentoring and CoP. These two resources have much in common, as they are highly “social” resources and their effectiveness depends on an individual’s ability to effectively interact with their colleagues. Additionally, these resources are only significant moderators when it comes to job stress, therefore a new model is proposed to test the resources of communities of practice and informal mentoring as moderators to the relationship between job stress and quit intention (Figure 5). Also of interest with respect to these resources would be to conduct an exploratory factor analysis to determine if these two resources, when measured reliably, are actually part of the same overarching construct.

With regard to informal mentoring the mechanisms by which these relationships are built, including network analysis, should be examined. Do larger informal mentor relationship networks necessarily indicate lower stress, or is it the intensity of these relationships? Does organizational commitment play a role in whether or not an individual engages in relationships that turn into informal mentorships? How does organizational culture impact the development of informal mentoring relationships?

The results for CoPs were interesting in that the quantitative results do not necessarily match the qualitative reports. Some participants listed PLCs (professional learning communities), meeting groups, and other communities of practice as a noted job demand.

- PLC meetings are too frequent with the expectation of bringing in so much data laid out.
- Constant data meetings…PLCs, PLCs, PLCs, PLCs
- I feel (…) others in my PLC are more interested in their agendas than in collaboration and group quality
Since CoPs were found to be a significant moderator to reduce quit intention in times of high stress the participant reports of CoPs as demands provides a potential interesting angle from which to examine this variable. It may be that although the teachers outwardly perceive the CoP to be negative they are still gaining resources from the social support provided through these groups. Future studies should examine CoPs for effectiveness by matching the objective of each CoP with the actual practices employed and correlating this relationship to teacher perception of the CoP. These qualitative results could simply have been those who were most dissatisfied with their CoPs and chose to speak out, rather than an actual explanation of what is going on with the majority of participants of CoPs.

Regarding the additional resources that turned out to not significantly moderate the predicted relationships; it is highly possibly the some of the measures were not valid measures of the actual resources of rewards, job autonomy/decision making, job insecurity, supervisor support, and formal mentoring with respect to the teacher population. Effort could be placed to examine what each of these resources looks like for the teacher, and reevaluate as both individual and cumulative (JR-Cumulative, JR-Control, and JR-Social Support) resources.

The fact that no resources moderated the relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention may indicate that other variables play a more important role in determining the job satisfaction of teachers. Mobley (1979) and Michaels and Spector (1982) suggested that the pathway from job satisfaction to quit intention also includes organizational commitment. It could be that instead of resources being a common thread to moderate the relationship between job stress/quit intention and job satisfaction/quit intention that its actual organizational commitment that serves as a mediator between job satisfaction and quit intention.
The function of organizational commitment—present in the job satisfaction and job stress literature—should be explored further in the relationships between both job stress and quit intention and job satisfaction and quit intention.

Figure 5. New model of moderation between job stress and quit intention

The qualitative reports may also provide some evidence as to why there were a lack of significant moderation findings in the present study—there may simply have been a lack of certain resources. A large portion of respondents noted autonomy as a resource that is severely lacking in their current job. The research on autonomy and control as a resource notes that teacher autonomy is centered on pedagogy and classroom operations (LaCoe, 2006; O’Hara, 2006; Rudolph, 2006; Blasé & Kirby, 2009). Further studies have found that teacher autonomy was critical in improving low performing schools (May, 2016). While none of the school districts who participated are severely low on accountability metrics, the state of Louisiana as a whole is lacking in preK-12 education relative to the rest of the country. The idea that so many teachers report a lack of autonomy is telling about the overall culture of schools and may be an indicator for why so many teachers are dissatisfied in their jobs. Future research should explore autonomy as an indicator of job stress, job satisfaction, and a predictor of quit intention in teachers among all career levels.

This study did not ask about the level of specific resources, rather sought to examine them in a more discreet manner. Possible restructuring of the identification of resources and a
more evaluative measure for each could yield difference results. The theoretical bases of this study were sound. The problem, it seems, is a lack of succinct measurements to accurately gauge the scope of what resources are critical to reducing stress and increasing satisfaction, and potentially what dosage is necessary to actually achieve an effect of reducing quit intention.

Development of a quantitative scale to measure teacher resources as a function of job demands would help achieve this needed measurement metric.

**Contributions**

**Implications for science.** The major theoretical contribution made from the results of this study are concerning precursors to teacher quit intention. Previous findings have consistently demonstrated the link between high job stress and high quit intention as well as high job satisfaction and low quit intention. Findings from the present study supported those findings. From a theoretical perspective, and based in Grissmer and Kirby’s Theory of Teacher Attrition (1987), stress and job satisfaction are two important factors that seem to affect the congruence between the job expectation and the actual experience of the teacher. One teacher noted that there are “…lots of expectations and no time to carry out those expectations.” This brings to light the idea that many teachers may feel that they not only do not meet their own expectations, but they fail to meet their supervisor expectations of job performance.

The main theoretical contribution from this study is that two social-in-nature resources of informal mentoring and communities of practice actually did moderate the relationship between job stress and quit intention. Given that stress is a process that requires resources to cope, these findings may provide evidence for the idea that social resources in which individuals have some freedom to act are the most beneficial to buffering against stress. Additional contributions to science may actually lie in the non-significant findings- that resources did not moderate the
relationships between stress, jobs satisfaction, and quit intention. This finding, if indicative of a lack of resources altogether, supports Grissmer and Kirby’s theory (1987) in that dissonance between expectations and experiences increases when proper socialization does not occur. As previously stated, many teachers reported a lack of autonomy, or control, in their work. If the explanation for lack of moderation was simply a lack of resources, this non-finding lends support to the notion that resources are integral parts of teacher socialization and when not present the relationship between stress and quit intention and job satisfaction and quit intention persists as predicted.

There is promise to build on the relationships that were found. The newly proposed model, focusing on that relationship between stress, informal mentoring, and communities of practice may also find more evidence for the importance of resources to teachers (Figure 5). The development of a teacher job demands-resource scale to identify and quantify actual demands and match them to actual resources would also provide a better metric for understanding the true role resources play in moderating quit intention.

**Implications to practice.** From a practical standpoint, the results of this study should be used by school leaders to understand that reducing teacher stress and increasing teacher job satisfaction should be priorities to reduce teacher attrition. Additionally, school leaders should evaluate what resources they are providing to their teachers and in what dosage. Are early career teachers receiving support that is more specialized? Do mid-career and veteran teachers- who still need resources- have access to what they need to continue to be satisfied in their job? Results of this study showed the resource of rewards to have the strongest correlation with quit intention, $r(174)=-.541$, $p<.05$. This inverse relationship indicates that as levels of rewards
decrease, quit intention increases. With limited resources, the results of this study show teacher rewards to be the resource most worth expanding in the goal of reducing teacher attrition.

The measure of rewards in this study focused on the rewards subscales of the JSS (Spector, 1985). These metrics examined pay, promotion, fringe benefits, and contingent rewards. School districts should examine each of these sub metrics more specifically to determine which is most important and overall how each could potentially be addressed. Examining a more structured and rewarding reward system may be a bit radical for public school systems in which so much is standardized. However if rewards really are an important factor in reducing quit intention, it may be worth exploring the possibility of a robust incentive structure for teachers to excel in effort and productivity.

In addition, schools should evaluate the resources they are providing that seem to be a negative. Qualitative reports from teachers demonstrated that while communities of practice should in theory provide support as evidenced from the quantitative numbers, many teachers report them to be stressors that could contribute to increased stress and decreased job satisfaction. Extra time demands of PLCs and their actual effectiveness at improving teacher instruction and student learning should be evaluated.

Finally, the results, both quantitative and qualitative, from this study demonstrate that as a whole teachers do not feel they are cared for. They feel they are asked to give, give, give, getting little in terms of appreciation in return. If rewards are highly related to job satisfaction and job stress, schools should focus on rewarding teachers in more tangible ways. What rewards to teachers find most valuable? The literature suggests pay, pension, insurance, and opportunities for promotion are the most tangible rewards for teachers. Exploring which of these, or others
teachers *actually* want would be a wise use of time and effort. Meaningful appreciation for work well done may go a long way towards helping teachers better cope with the overwhelming demands of their jobs.

**Study Limitations**

Factors threatening validity and reliability in this study contribute to limitations of the generalizability of the results. The non-random sampling procedures employed were used due to easy accessibility of potential participants. Additionally participation was voluntary limiting the ability to generalize findings outside this particular sample. The initial survey was sent out by district superintendents. This in and of itself may have been a turnoff to some teachers who do not think favorably of their district leader, and who may have fallen into a category of being more dissatisfied than those who actually participated. The email dissemination of the survey may also have limited participation in that email is still seen as very non-personal by many. Some teachers may not have taken in seriously while others may have simply overlooked the email due to a large number of other messages. While electronic surveys help with anonymity, they may also lead to potential participants feeling less connected to the study and therefore choosing not to participate.

The self-report nature of the survey may contribute to reliability limitations, particularly for measures that were constructed by the researcher and not previously tested. In particular, the alpha coefficient measure of internal consistency reliability (Cronbach, 1951) for the measure of evaluation and feedback was $\alpha = .52$, indicating low reliability for this measure- which was also used as part of the constructs of JR-Cumulative and JR-SS. The problem with low reliability is that the measure was not consistent from person to person. The lack of consistent results leads to wondering if the metric was really addressing the nature of evaluation and feedback.
An additional limitation of measures centers on the mentoring and communities of practice measures. Not all individuals experienced these variables, yet they were counted in the final tally of resources. These varying numbers may contribute to unreliability of the actual resource values.

The overwhelming majority of participants in this study were white, and the majority were female. Given these demographic statistics, it limits generalization of results to populations outside of teachers who are white women. Even in light of this limitation, it should be noted that the race and gender demographic statistics of this sample are representative of the race and gender frequencies of the actual population. Having significant minority (race) or male (gender) voice is important in order to identify whether resource demands occur across all populations versus certain groups having a need for some unique set of resources.

**Implications for Future Research**

This study provides groundbreaking work that is just the tip of the iceberg in terms of trying to understand the factors that can influence, increase, and reduce teacher attrition. First and foremost, future studies should be dedicated to determining a reliable and valid teacher job demands scale. In order to truly understand the role of resources in reducing quit intention, the exact nature and characteristics of teacher-specific job demands must be identified, so that appropriate resources to counter those demands can be tested.

Another area for future research is to examine if resources affect quit intention differently in order to more succinctly identify the resources that are most integral to reducing job stress and increasing job satisfaction in teachers. The present study identified rewards to be the highest correlate to quit intention. Future research could delve more into precisely what rewards are most important to reducing quit intention. The hunch based on qualitative reports is that teachers feel
they are not paid adequately for the actual amount of work done. Most teachers are paid as 180 (9 month) employees with a workday of 7-8 hours. Most teachers also never completely leave the job behind at the end of their official workday. Teachers feel they should be compensated for the actual time they spend working, whether or not that occurs during the confines of the typical school hours.

Finally, future research should explore the function of the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in teachers. This study demonstrated that a relationship does exist, however knowing if there is a directionality and if there is another variable involved in the relationship may allow for the creation of new models involving job stress, job satisfaction, and quit intention in teachers. A new design should examine whether the relationship between teacher job stress and job satisfaction is linear or has a covariate.

Conclusion

The findings of this study are mixed. Some results were aligned with prior research and other results fell short of the assumptions made the hypotheses. At the end of the day, however, the biggest takeaway from this study is that teacher attrition is a problem and there is a plethora of work that needs to be done to figure out the best theories and practices needed to address this problem. The findings of this study address a small portion of the problem of teacher attrition. Increasing pressure from state departments of education, local school districts, school leadership, parents, and students are just some of the many demands teachers experience that contribute to increased stress and eventual burn out.

Of great significance is the idea that during the course of this study no measure of teacher job demands was able to be located. This is a critical piece of literature that is missing. The open-ended question at the end of this study begins to address the question of exactly what
are teacher job demands, and the hope is more can be parsed from these responses with a goal of beginning to categorize exactly what teachers experience in their work on a day-to-day basis.

The success of our schools, our students, and ultimately our country depend on the ability of schools to recruit and retain quality teachers.
APPENDIX A. LIST OF HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses 1: Job stress will be positively associated with quit intention.

Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction will be negatively associated with quit intention.

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction and job stress will be inversely related.

Hypothesis 4: Greater access to general job resources (i.e., JR-Cumulative) will moderate the effects of job stress and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4 a): The positive relationship between job stress and quit intention will weaken such that teachers will be more likely to express quit intention when JR-Cumulative are minimal compared to when job resources are plentiful.

Hypothesis 4 b): The negative relationship between job satisfaction and quit intention will strengthen such that teachers will be more likely to express quit intention when JR-Cumulative are minimal compared to when job resources are plentiful.

Hypothesis 5: Greater access to JR-Control will moderate the positive relationship between job stress and quit intention such that teachers who experience higher levels of stress will express greater quit intention when JR-Control is minimal compared to when JR-Control is plentiful.

Hypothesis 6: Greater access to JR-Social Support will moderate the negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction such that teachers who experience higher levels of stress will express less job satisfaction when JR-Social Support is minimal compared to when JR-Social Support is plentiful.
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**APPENDIX C. JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY (ADAPTED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I like the people I work with. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communications seem good within this organization. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Raises are too few and far between. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My supervisor is unfair to me. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me. 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I enjoy my coworkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX D. TURNOVER INTENTION SCALE (TIS-6)**

The following section aims to ascertain the extent to which you intend to stay at the organization.

Please read each question and indicate your response using the scale provided for each question: **DURING THE PAST 9 MONTHS**......

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often have you considered leaving your job?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1-----2-----3-----4-----5------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfying is your job in fulfilling your personal needs?</td>
<td>Very satisfying</td>
<td>1-----2-----3-----4-----5------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1-----2-----3-----4-----5------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1-----2-----3-----4-----5------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?</td>
<td>Highly unlikely</td>
<td>1-----2-----3-----4-----5------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you look forward to another day at work?</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1-----2-----3-----4-----5------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E. PERCEIVED STRESS SCALE
(ADAPTED)

The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during the last month relative to your job. In each case, you will be asked to indicate by circling how often you felt or thought a certain way.

1= Never  2= Almost Never  3= Sometimes  4= Fairly Often  5= Very Often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed” in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside of your control in your job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties in your job were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F. CONTROL AND DECISION MAKING (AUTONOMY)

Respond to the following based on the degree to which you experience each of the following:

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neither Agree nor Disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The job allows me to make my own decisions about how to schedule my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The job allows me to decide on the order in which things are done on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The job allows me to plan how I do my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The job provides me with significant autonomy in making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The job allows me to make decisions about what methods I use to complete my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The job allows me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G. JOB INSECURITY
(ADAPTED)

Respond to the following regarding your feeling on your current job.

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neither Agree nor Disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chances are I will soon lose my job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am sure I can keep my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel insecure about the future of my job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think I might lose my job in the near future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree or Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Raises are too few and far between.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I. EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

Are you observed at least once a year in your current position? ___ Yes   ___No

If you answered yes to the previous question please respond to the following items relative to the evaluation and feedback you receive from your supervisor(s).

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neither Agree nor Disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I receive useful feedback on my job performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I receive annual evaluations of my job performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I participate in an annual conference regarding my job performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the number of times you are observed within a school year. This may include both formal and informal observations. (numerical value will be inserted by participant)
APPENDIX J. SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

Respond to the following items relative to supervisor support. Supervisors include anyone directly responsible for some aspect of supervision of your job including principal, assistant principals, department chairs, and any other who provides direct supervision.

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neither Agree or Disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor cares about my opinion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work supervisor really cares about my well being</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor shows very little concern for me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K. MENTORING

Please respond to the following based on your experiences with a mentor in your current position.

Have you been involved as a mentee in a formal mentoring program within your current school?  
Yes or No

If you answered yes to the previous question please answer the following:  
Response scale for items is: strongly disagree, disagree, neither, agree, strongly agree

1= Strongly Disagree  
2= Disagree  
3= Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4= Agree  
5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My mentor was able to articulate effective teaching component to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor worked to establish trust with me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor was an active, patient listener</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor was well versed in the policies and procedures of the school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mentor helped me better navigate the nuances of my new job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have you developed any informal mentoring relationships with veteran teachers as your current school?

If yes, please answer the following:

1= Strongly Disagree  
2= Disagree  
3= Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4= Agree  
5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This person is a person I feel I can trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is well versed in the policies and procedures of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is an active, patient listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L. COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Does your current school utilize any type of CoP? This could include professional learning communities (teams), cohort groups, structured departmental meetings, and other forms of groupings in which employees work together to learn or towards a common goal?

If yes, please answer the following:

What type of CoP are you involved in? Please check all that apply:

___Subject area PLC
___Grade level PLC
___Departmental PLC
___School Advisory Council
___Behavior/Discipline Committee
___Other group/team

Response scale for items: strongly disagree, disagree, neither, agree, strongly agree

1= Strongly Disagree
2= Disagree
3= Neither Agree nor Disagree
4= Agree
5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My CoP in engaging</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The members of my CoP have common interests and goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of my CoP are collaborative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can trust the member of my CoP</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of my CoP are helpful to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My CoP helps me to better understand policies, procedures, and expectations of my current school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M. DEMOGRAPHICS SURVEY

1. Age: 21-25  26-30  31-35  36-40  41-45  46 or older

2. Gender: Male  Female

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   ___Asian or Pacific Islander
   ___Black/African American
   ___Hispanic/Latino
   ___White/Caucasian
   ___American Indian/Native American
   ___Other/Mixed Race

4. In which school district do you work?
   ___West Feliciana
   ___Pointe Coupee
   ___West Baton Rouge
   ___Iberville
   ___St. James

5. Identify the grade level(s) in which you currently teach. You may indicate more than one.
   ___pre-K & Kindergarten
   ___Grades 1-3
   ___Grades 4-6
   ___Grades 7-8
   ___Grades 9-12

6. Identify the type of school in which you currently teach.
   ___Early Learning/Primary Education
   ___Elementary School
   ___Middle School/Jr. High
   ___High School

7. What is your highest level of education?
   ___Bachelor’s degree
   ___Master’s degree
   ___Master’s plus 30
   ___Specialist degree
   ___PhD or other professional terminal degree (MD, JD, etc)
8. How many COMPLETED years of experience do you have as a classroom teacher. This may include teaching at schools other than your present place of employment.
   ___1 year
   ___2 years
   ___3 years
   ___4 years
   ___5 years

9. Is teaching your first career?
   ___Yes
   ___No

10. In which subject area(s) do you teach? Check all that apply.
    ___General Education (all areas)
    ___Physical Education
    ___Special Education (resource or self-contained)
    ___Gifted Education
    ___Art
    ___Music (band/choir)
    ___Theater/Drama
    ___Technical Courses (engineering, agriculture, welding, drafting, etc.)
    ___Other Electives
    ___English
    ___Math
    ___Science
    ___History/Social Studies

11. What is your current family status?
    ___Single
    ___Single Parent
    ___Married
    ___Married with school-aged children
APPENDIX N. OPEN-ENDED QUESTION

Job demands are the physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs. Job demands can be categorized as hindrance demands that obstruct goal attainment and challenge demands that support goal attainment. Based on the above descriptions, please list any and all job demands you feel you encounter in your current job. You may respond to this in sentence format or list format- whichever you feel comfortable.
APPENDIX O. PERMISSION TO USE TIS-6

RE: Permission to Use TIS-6

Roodt, Gerhard <groodt@uj.ac.za>
Tue 9/4/2018 2:52 AM

To: Leanna B Cupit <lbecne8@lsu.edu>

1 attachments (59 K)
Turnover intentions questionnaire - v4.doc;

Dear Leanna

You are welcome to use the TIS!

For this purpose please find attached the longer 15-item version of the scale. The six items used for the TIS-6 are highlighted. You may use any one of these two versions.

You are welcome to translate the scale if the need arises. I would like to propose the translate – back-translate method by using two different translators. First you translate from English into home language and then back from home language to English to see if you get to the original English wording.

This is the fourth version of the scale and it is no longer required to reverse score any items (on TIS-6). The total score can be calculated by merely adding the individual item scores. I would strongly recommend that you also conduct a CFA on the item scores to determine if any item scores should be reflected.

The only conditions for using the TIS is that you acknowledge authorship (Roodt, 2004) by conventional academic referencing. The TIS may not be used for commercial purposes.

I wish you the very best with your research project!

Best regards

Gert

Prof Gert Roodt
Dept Industrial Psychology & People Management

From: Leanna B Cupit [mailto:lbecne8@lsu.edu]
Sent: 03 September 2018 06:04 PM
To: Roodt, Gerhard <groodt@uj.ac.za>
Subject: Permission to Use TIS-6

Professor Roodt,

I am writing to request permission to use the TIS-6 as part of my doctoral dissertation. The goal of my study is to test the moderating impact of control and social support on job stress and job satisfaction and quit intention in
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