The Impact of Generational Differences on Teacher Job Satisfaction and Perceptions of Principal Leadership

Emily A. Gill

B.A., Kansas State University, 2001

M.S., Baker University, 2006

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Harold B. Frye

Harold B. Frye, EdD
Major Advisor

James Robins

James Robins, EdD

Kathleen M. Collier

Kathleen M. Collier, EdD

Date Defended: December 15, 2022

Abstract

This study examined the impact of generational differences on teacher job satisfaction and teacher perceptions of principal leadership. One survey instrument, Church and Simmering's 2021 Kansas Teacher Retention Initiative (KTRI) survey, was utilized in this study to collect data on teacher perceptions of overall satisfaction with teaching and principal leadership as related to the generation of the teachers. The population included Kansas public school teachers from kindergarten through 12th grade. The final sample was 18,247 teachers. At the time of the study, generations were defined as Generation Z (ages 7-24), millennial (ages 25-38), Generation X (ages 39-54), and baby boomer (ages 55-73). A two-step analysis was conducted with one-factor ANOVAs and Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test post hoc to determine if teachers' level of overall satisfaction with teaching and satisfaction with their principal's leadership were impacted by their generation. Results indicated a statistically significant difference in overall satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations. The findings showed that while teachers are satisfied overall with their chosen profession of teaching, when the data were disaggregated by generation, teachers of the millennial generation were found to be significantly less satisfied overall with teaching than members of the Generation X or baby boomer generations. In addition, results indicated a statistically significant difference in teachers' satisfaction with the support of their principal in the area of student discipline among teachers who were born into different generations. Specifically, findings showed that teachers from the baby

boomer generation were more satisfied with their principal's support as it relates to student discipline than teachers from the millennial or Generation X generations.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my supportive and loving family. To my children, Anna and Samuel, you inspire me daily. My life is better with you in it; the world is a better place with you in it. To my husband Brent, thank you for always believing in me and taking over more than your share of the household tasks to get this project completed. To my parents, your support knows no bounds. From you I have learned how to love and lead. To my in-laws, Cindy and Terry Gill, thank you for your help as well. This project would not have been possible without the emotional and logistical support from my family, who spent many Tuesday nights and weekends helping me to balance family and work time. Thank you.

I also dedicate this dissertation to my friends who have supported me throughout the process. Marie Hooker, Erin Lutz, and Mike Torkelson, your daily humor and encouragement gave me the confidence to complete this goal. You are truly amazing teachers, parents, and friends. Leigh McCabe, you are a wonderful and supportive person. Your love for students, family, and friends is inspirational. Thank you.

Acknowledgments

Many people played a part in my journey to complete this dissertation, especially the Baker faculty and my committee members. To Dr. Frye, my major advisor, thank you for working with me throughout the process. You provided time, expert guidance, and supportive feedback. I admire your kindness and commitment to philanthropical causes, especially your work with music and schools. It was your leadership in my Master's program that led me back to Baker for my doctoral degree. A sincere thank you is also expressed to my data analyst, Dr. Peg Waterman, for sharing your time and expertise. Your knowledge of descriptive statistics is second only to your support of others. Thank you to Dr. James Robins and Dr. Katie Collier for sitting on my committee for this dissertation. Your time and attention to this project is much appreciated.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Bret Church and Dr. Luke Simmering, authors of the Kansas Teacher Retention Initiative Survey as well. Your focus on measuring, understanding, interpreting, and disseminating insights regarding the driving factors of teacher retention within school districts across the state of Kansas is awe-inspiring. From meetings in Humbolt, Kansas to Zooms at all hours to review data, I have been impressed with your work every step of the way. Your projects will positively impact the field of education for years to come.

Finally, I would like to thank all of the members of Cohort 26B. You made Tuesday nights feel special. Thank you for your comradery, enthusiasm, and encouragement.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Today the United States is facing a teacher shortage. The Kansas National Education Association and Kansas Association of School Boards reported in a joint statement that Kansas is "facing a potential critical shortage of educators in the state" (Kansas Association of School Boards, 2021). Determining the reasons behind the shortage of teachers is of interest to those in educational settings as well as in the communities served by the schools. The issue has a long history of being studied. For years, researchers have suggested the importance of studying teacher job satisfaction because of its effect on teacher retention (Bogler & Berkovich, 2002). Over 100 years ago, *Phi Delta Kappan* published initial findings from a survey conducted to "uncover why the most capable high school graduates weren't pursuing careers in education" (Gray et al., 1921, p. 12). The findings from that early study showed the following reasons had the greatest impact on people choosing not to enter the teaching profession: low salaries, lack of community respect for the profession, and those in the profession did not present themselves as positive examples for students. Concerns about a lack of potential candidates in the teaching profession remains today. Districts across the country are growing concerned with not only the shortage of teachers entering the profession, but also the number of teachers vacating their teaching positions.

Study results have indicated employee satisfaction to be a reliable predictor of retention (Bobbitt et al., 1991; Meek, 1998). School boards, legislatures, and policy makers could promote teacher retention by ensuring that teachers have a positive school environment, adequate support, and small class sizes (Perrachione et al., 2008). In

addition to supporting increased teacher salary and changes in educational policy, it is important for school districts to understand the localized factors teachers perceive as impactful in the area of job satisfaction, such as principal leadership. Perrachione et al. (2008) found investing money for programs and policies that advance teacher job satisfaction "should not only slow the exodus of teachers but also promote the building of successful learning environments" (p. 34).

The researcher of this current study sought to understand the impact that teachers' generational cohorts have on their overall satisfaction with teaching and their perceptions of principal leadership. The level of teacher satisfaction with teaching and satisfaction with principal leadership may differ depending on teacher age and generational cohort. In today's schools, staff members span four generations. "For the first time in modern history, workplace demographics now span four generations. Twenty-five-year-old new hires find themselves working side-by-side with colleagues who are as much as fifty years older than they are" (Arnsparger & Murphy, 2010, p. 1). According to Lancaster and Stillman, (2009), there are four "clash points caused by generational differences which indicate a potential need for new patterns of leadership" (p. 20).

Background

Educational researchers have examined the phenomenon of teacher job satisfaction, attrition, and retention since the early 1900s. State and federal policy makers have developed policy recommendations that include such suggestions as salary increases, housing incentives, scholarship programs, and training opportunities to increase educator job satisfaction and retention (Podolsky et al., 2016). Since the 2014–2015 school year, teacher shortages have been growing across the country, "reaching

crisis proportions in some teaching fields, such as mathematics, science, and special education, especially in locations where wages and working conditions are least attractive" (Podolsky et al., 2016). While attention to the issues of teacher job satisfaction, attrition, and retention are an important focus at the policy level, there are also research-evidenced strategies and systems of support that can be put in place at the building and district level to help alleviate the problem.

This study sought to gain insight into teacher perceptions of job satisfaction. Two of this study's research questions investigated the potential impact of generational differences on teacher job satisfaction and perceptions of principal leadership. While generational research is a somewhat recent area of study, with a majority of the research being conducted in the last 20-25 years (Bourne, 2015), it is important for school districts and building principals to understand the perceived needs of teachers of all ages throughout their career span. When teachers experience a high level of job satisfaction, morale is improved and student learning increases (Markow et al., 2013).

Statement of the Problem

Teacher job satisfaction and retention is an obstacle facing school districts today. Lack of satisfaction can lead to job burnout especially in an era of unprecedented demands upon educators (Barth et al., 2016; Markow et al., 2013). Retaining and engaging teachers in the profession is imperative to the success of a school system. Sorensen and Ladd (2020) found:

> High teacher turnover imposes numerous burdens on the schools and districts from which teachers depart. Some of these burdens are explicit and take the form

> of recruiting, hiring, and training costs. Others are more hidden and take the form of changes to the composition and quality of the teaching staff. (p. 5)

While there are a substantial number of reports and studies on the topics of teacher retention and job satisfaction, much of the literature focuses on principal or teacher perceptions of teacher qualities that motivate teachers to remain in their positions or school districts. There is very little research on teacher perceptions of the problems disaggregated by the age of the teachers. Even fewer research studies were found that examined teacher job satisfaction or perceptions of principal leadership as impacted by teacher age or generational cohort.

Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of this quantitative research study was to determine the extent to which teachers are satisfied overall in the area of teaching. The second purpose of the study was to determine the extent of the differences in the overall satisfaction in teaching among teachers from different generational cohorts. The third purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which teachers are satisfied with the leadership of their principal. The final purpose of the study was to determine the extent of the differences in teacher satisfaction with the leadership of their principal among teachers from different generational cohort designations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

Significance of the Study

This study is significant as it contributes valuable insights to a body of literature on the topics of teacher job satisfaction and teacher satisfaction in the area of principal leadership. District administrators in the state of Kansas are concerned with national and

local teacher attrition trends. As more teachers vacate their job positions prior to retirement eligibility, more positions are left open for administrators and principals to fill. Such information could be beneficial to school districts as they attempt to find solutions to the problems of teacher attrition.

Additionally, this study is significant because it explored differences among teachers from different generational cohorts as related to job satisfaction and principal leadership. Understanding the potential impact the generation of a teacher has on job satisfaction and perceptions of principal leadership could provide states or districts insight into how to meet the needs of teachers in four separate generations: Generation Z, millennials, Generation X, and baby boomers. Finally, the findings of this study may help school districts and educational administrators identify factors at the building level that could positively impact the job satisfaction and retention of teachers.

Delimitations

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) defined delimitations as self-imposed boundaries established by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study. This quantitative research study was delimited as follows:

1. Data were collected from 229 public school districts in the state of Kansas.
2. The sample for this research study was delimited to teachers in the state of Kansas employed for the 2021-2022 school year.
3. The research study was delimitated to a period of data collection that occurred from October, 2021 to December, 2021.
4. Data were collected through the use of an online survey.

Assumptions

According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), assumptions are "postulates, premises, and propositions that are accepted as operational for purposes of the research" (p. 135). The study was conducted with the following assumptions in mind:

1. The surveyed teachers understood the vocabulary and concepts on the survey.
2. The surveyed teachers responded honestly.
3. The survey data accurately reflected the perceptions of the respondents.
4. The sample participating in the study was typical of the total population of public-school teachers in grades kindergarten through 12.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed to determine levels of teacher satisfaction with teaching and principal leadership:

RQ1

To what extent are teachers satisfied overall with teaching?

RQ2

To what extent are there differences in overall teacher satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73)?

RQ3

To what extent are teachers satisfied with their principal's leadership?

RQ4

To what extent are there differences in teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73)?

Definition of Terms

For accurate interpretation of this study's purpose and findings, key terms have been identified and defined. As exact age cut-offs for generations can vary, definitions and delineations were provided. In addition, a distinction was made between teacher attrition, teacher retention, and teacher turnover to aid the reader in an accurate interpretation of this study.

Baby Boomers

The baby boomer generation, also called boomers, is an age group born between 1946 and 1964 (Pew Research Center, 2015). This generation was between the ages of 55 and 73 at the time this study was conducted.

Generation X

Generation X is an age group born between 1965 and 1980 (Pew Research Center, 2015. This generation was between the ages of 39 and 54 at the time this study was conducted.

Generation Z

Generation Z is an age group born between 1997 and 2012 (Pew Research Center, 2015). This generation was between the ages of 7 and 24 at the time this study was conducted.

Millennials

The millennial generation, also known as Generation Y, is a generation born between 1981 and 1996 (Pew Research Center, 2015). This generation was between the ages of 25 and 38 at the time this study was conducted.

Teacher attrition

Teacher attrition is the percentage of teachers at a given level of education leaving the profession in a given school year. (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2022). While the definition of attrition may include teachers changing positions within the field (i.e., special education teacher moving to a general education position), the definition of attrition for this research is teachers leaving the profession.

Teacher retention

Teacher retention, as defined by Arroyo (2021), is the proportion of teachers in one year who are still teaching in the same school the following year.

Teacher turnover

Teacher turnover is the rate at which personnel whose primary function is classroom teaching leave or separate from the district, or change from their classroom teaching to another position from one school year to another. This rate is determined by comparing the number of classroom teachers reported in the current year against those reported in the previous year (Colorado Department of Education, 2022).

Organization of the Study

This quantitative research study is organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the background of this quantitative study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, definition of terms, and organization of the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature, which includes job satisfaction theory, job satisfaction in the field of education, contributing factors related to teacher job satisfaction, principal leadership, and generational cohorts. Chapter 3 includes the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations. Chapter 4 provides an overview of the results of the study, including descriptive statistics, and hypothesis testing. Chapter 5 includes the interpretation and recommendations, study summary, major findings, findings related to the literature, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

This review of literature presents information relevant to teacher job satisfaction, principal leadership, and generational cohorts. The topics are presented in three sections. An overview of teacher job satisfaction, attrition, and its impact on the field of education is presented in the first section. An overview of principal leadership in the areas of communication, instruction, and student discipline is presented in the second section. An overview of generational cohorts as related to the work place is presented in the third section.

Job Satisfaction Theory

Job satisfaction is widely studied within the fields of industrial and organizational psychology (Hora et al., 2018). Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as "how people feel about their employment and the amount they like or dislike their jobs" (p. 2). Indicators of job satisfaction are evident if a person demonstrates favorable or optimistic behaviors toward their work (Armstrong, 2020). The theories and research on job satisfaction overlap with theories explaining motivation. By studying the factors that impact job satisfaction and employee motivation, employers can gain a better understanding of staff issues and develop positive solutions for change (Business Health Group, 2020). This review of literature found four major classic theories of employee motivation: Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1943), Theory of Acquired Needs (McClelland, 1961), Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg et al., 1959), and Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960).

When identifying factors related to job satisfaction, understanding a person's needs is imperative. Maslow (1943) introduced the concept of a hierarchy of needs that suggested people are motivated to fulfill their basic needs before they can move on to more advanced needs. Maslow believed people are born with a desire to be self-actualized, or to rise to their own potential. The hierarchy of needs is a five-tier model that is divided into five categories of needs, starting with the most basic and moving to the most advanced. Maslow (1943) stated needs are met through the following hierarchy: Physiological (e.g. food, water, rest), safety (i.e. a sense of security), love and belonging (e.g. intimate relationships, friendships, family connections), esteem (i.e. a feeling of accomplishment), and self-actualization (i.e. achieving one's full potential). Maslow (1943) found the order of needs was not entirely fixed for each person and may be flexible based on the differences or external circumstances of the individual. Later in life, Maslow (1987) clarified his original findings and found that satisfaction of needs is not a hardline phenomenon, admitting his previous research may have given the "false impression that a need must be satisfied 100% before the next need emerges" (Maslow, 1987, p. 69).

Modern studies of Maslow (1943) show how the Hierarchy of Needs relate to the workplace. Physiological needs, at the foundation of the pyramid, include such things as salary, sufficient break schedules, and adequate space in which to work (Kaur, 2013). Safety needs are within the second level of the hierarchy and refer to an employee's need for a secure working environment free from any harm or threats (Kaur, 2013). Maslow's (1943) third level was the need for a sense of love and belonging. Kaur (2013) found those social needs included an employee's desire to be affiliated with and accepted by

other people at work. Kaur (2013) further explained activities such as picnics, bowling, or other company social gatherings have a positive impact on the employee's sense of belonging. Kaur (2013) showed the need for esteem refers to an employee's need for self-respect and approval from others, noting events such as awards banquets or other forms of praise to have a positive impact on esteem. The final need in the hierarchy (Maslow, 2013) is self-actualization, where employees have the desire to "become all that one is capable of being to develop one's potential" (Kaur, 2013, p. 2). Employees with this top-level of need fulfilled have become self-actualized and represent valuable assets to the company (Kaur, 2013).

Herzberg et al. (1959) found there are two separate sets of mutually exclusive factors in the workplace that either cause job satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their two-factor theory. Herzberg et al. (1959) demonstrated that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposites because the two concepts are not on the same continuum. Therefore, they separated needs into two categories: satisfiers and dissatisfiers. In category one, the following satisfiers, or motivators, were found to have a significant impact on job satisfaction: performance, recognition, job status, responsibility, opportunities for advancement, personal growth, and work itself (Herzberg et al., 1959). The second category is comprised of dissatisfiers, or hygiene factors, which were found to significantly decrease job dissatisfaction: salary, working conditions, physical workplace, relationship with colleagues, relationship with supervisor, quality of supervisor, and policies and rules (Herzberg et al., 1959).

Herzberg et al. (1959) concluded if employers want to motivate individuals about their work, it is imperative that motivational factors be related to the work itself. If

employers put motivators in place in this way, the work could become internally rewarding and increase job satisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). In their findings, Herzberg et al. (1959) linked motivators with a significant impact on positive job attitudes because motivators satisfy the worker's need for self-actualization (Maslow, 1943). Dion (2006) found the two-factor theory (Herzberg et al., 1959) to be one of the most commonly used theoretical frameworks in job satisfaction research.

After Maslow (1943) and Herzberg et al. (1959) were first published, McGregor (1960) followed with his Theory X and Theory Y. Each of these are based on a separate set of assumptions. Theory X assumes the average human being has an inherent dislike of work and needs to be threatened before they will work hard. Theory X also assumes the average human prefers to be directed, dislikes responsibility, and desires security above all else in the workplace (McGregor, 1960). In contrast, Theory Y mirrors a large portion of Maslow's findings of the self-actualization level of motivation. Theory Y assumes if a job is satisfying, then the result will be commitment to the organization; the average person accepts and seeks responsibility under the proper conditions (McGregor, 1960).

McClelland (1961) underscored Maslow's self-actualization. McClelland argued that people have three fundamental needs that are learned or acquired throughout life: achievement, power, and relationship. In this theory, employers meet achievement needs by providing challenging assignments, rewards, and competitions to their employees for excellent work. McClelland (1961) further explained how employees can get their three fundamental needs met. The need for power can be met through giving employees increased responsibility and opportunities for advancement. Relationship needs may be met by cultivating a collaborative environment that is safe and respectful for all staff

members. McClelland (1961) concluded these needs are fundamental to job satisfaction, but the importance of each need is dependent on the individual's cultural context and priorities.

When considering factors about job satisfaction, employers should also consider the causes of job dissatisfaction (Aziri, 2011). When employees' needs are being met, job satisfaction is indicated through favorable and positive attitudes. Unfavorable and negative attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2020). Mobley (1977) found job dissatisfaction leads to employee turnover. While working on his model, Mobley (1977) theorized that job dissatisfaction led employees to think about quitting, which then led to an intention to quit, and eventually resulted in employee turnover.

Job Satisfaction in the Field of Education

While the role of a teacher's work for student outcomes is widely recognized, the question of whether teachers are satisfied with their working environment can be overlooked within the field of educational practitioners (Bascia & Rottmann, 2011; Liang & Akiba, 2017). Research on teacher job satisfaction started in the 1930s and it reached its highest level in the 1960s (Iverson & Currivan, 2003). Teaching is considered to be a historically stressful profession (Dunham & Varna, 1998; Johnson et al., 2005; Travers, 2017), but recent surveys show teachers' stress levels and job dissatisfaction have increased since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (Will, 2021). Today, school districts and educational groups are scrambling to find more research as teacher job satisfaction levels appear to have hit an all-time low in 2022 (Merrimack College & EdWeek Research Center, 2022). Popular education initiatives, such as recruitment programs for

new teachers, will not solve the staffing problems of schools if districts do not also address the organizational sources of low teacher job satisfaction and focus on retention (Ingersoll, 2001).

Relationship Between Teacher Job Satisfaction and Attrition

One measure that can be used to examine why teachers are leaving the profession is the construct of job satisfaction. Teacher job satisfaction has been identified by researchers as a factor in both the stability of the teaching force (Harris, 1992) and teachers' organizational commitment (Shin & Reyes, 1991; Kushman, 1992). Many studies indicate job satisfaction is an antecedent of attrition (Ingersoll, 2012; Kassen & Chiu, 2011; Renzulli et al., 2011; Skaalvik E. & Skaalvik S., 2011; Toropova et al., 2020). The relationship between job satisfaction and teacher attrition has been directly linked. Boe, et al. (1993) found teacher attrition to be an element of teacher turnover, or changes in teacher employment status from year to year. With districts struggling to keep up with teacher turnover, job satisfaction must be studied to ensure resources spent on preventative measures are effective.

As districts attempt to increase their hiring rates to navigate the current teacher shortage, Sutcher et al. (2016) found it is equally important to focus on how to keep experienced teachers in the classroom. Their evidence showed teacher shortages are not felt uniformly across all communities and classrooms, with high-poverty and high-minority settings disproportionately impacted. The study notes in 2013-2014, high-minority schools had four times as many uncertified teachers as low-minority schools. Sutcher et al. (2016) recommended more research needs to conducted in the following areas of variations in shortages: state-level, subject-area, and equity concerns. In addition

to equity concerns, the evidence showed short-term approaches and solutions to teacher attrition may get open teaching positions filled, but may exacerbate the problem over time. An example of a short-term solution would be for states to dramatically lower the teacher certification requirements. While a position would no longer be vacant, there is substantial stress put on the colleagues and administrators to train the new hire (Sutcher et al., 2016). It is recommended that the United States adopt a long-term approach to mitigate current teacher attrition issues and shortages and establish a systematic and comprehensive set of strategies to build a strong teaching profession (Sutcher et al., 2016).

Impact of Teacher Attrition on Schools

The impact of teacher attrition causes districts to incur substantial costs due to retraining and recruiting new hires (Dahlkamp et al., 2017). Haynes (2014) documented America spends one to two billion dollars annually on teacher replacements. Because faculty members are both the largest cost and the largest human capital resource of a school system, understanding factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction is essential to improving the information base needed to support a successful educational system (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). Teacher turnover costs school districts across the country over 7.2 billion dollars each year (Carroll, 2012) and has increased the burden on veteran teachers who must devote time and additional resources to support new teachers (Sass et al., 2014).

In addition to monetary costs, teacher attrition adversely affects academic achievement (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Ronfeldt et al. 2013). In fact, Ronfeldt et al. (2013) found that students (within the same school and during the same year) test scores were

lower in math and English Language Arts by 6% to 9.6% when substantial teacher turnover had occurred. Ronfeldt et al. (2013) did not determine if the low achievement was a result of the teacher attrition or if the low achievement caused the teacher attrition. In addition to student achievement, the study found teacher turnover had an overall negative impact on all school communities, regardless of size or time in operation.

Teacher turnover and attrition stresses the educational system as well, putting additional workloads on school districts across the country. Replacing teachers adds pressure on other teachers, staff members, and the overall system of a school district. Sass et al. (2011) found high teacher turnover to have an impact on the job satisfaction of veteran teachers who, in addition to their own teaching responsibilities, must continually provide support for the newer additions to the teaching staff. As experienced teachers devote time to novice counterparts, less time is available for their own productivity and overall well-being. This has an impact on the overall morale of a school. Sass et al. (2011) found that veteran teachers were less likely to intend to stay when they had multiple years of newer counterparts to train.

In 2007, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) completed an 18-month study on the cost of teacher turnover in five school districts of varying sizes and locations. Members of the district communities often believed high teacher turnover would save districts money by replacing veteran teachers with newer teachers at a lower salary per year (NCTAF, 2007). The results indicated this to be a false economy. Schools with higher turnover incurred significantly higher costs associated with constant recruitment, hiring, and training. The high turnover resulted in a drain on funding that offset any salary savings from hiring beginning teachers. From this data, the

NCTAF (2007) recommended districts allocate funding to collect accurate turnover and cost data to achieve a higher return on their teaching investments.

Contributing Factors Related to Teacher Job Satisfaction and Attrition

Pas et al. (2012) studied the factors that predict teacher efficacy and burnout. Schabracq et al. (2003) defined burnout as an occupational construct that develops over time from chronic stressors on the job. The results from Pas et al. (2012) indicated that both teacher efficacy and burnout increased over time, with the highest numbers for veteran teachers in both areas. Novice teachers also struggled to avoid burnout, reporting an imbalance between job demands, resources available, and overall well-being. Pas et al. (2012) concluded the relationship between burnout and attrition to be closely linked and the reason why many novice teachers leave the educational sector in the first five years of their career and why many experienced teachers retire early.

One step in reducing the burdens of teacher attrition and developing a high-quality teaching staff is to understand the factors associated with teaching quality and retention. A variety of factors, such as salary, promotion, supervision, coworkers, and workplace characteristics can impact a person's job satisfaction (Ostroff, 1992). Through a meta-analysis of 63 factors that attribute to teacher attrition in the United States, Borman and Dowling (2008) found that schools where teachers were offered administrative support, mentoring programs at early career stages, and opportunities for networking and cooperation, had lower attrition rates when compared to schools without these features. Evidence gathered by Borman and Dowling revealed attrition from teaching is:

> (a) not necessarily "healthy" turnover, (b) influenced by various personal and professional factors that change across teachers' career paths, (c) more strongly moderated by characteristics of teachers' work conditions than previously noted in the literature, and (d) a problem that can be addressed through policies and initiatives. (p. 372)

As shown in the literature, one of the of the top factors impacting teacher job satisfaction identified throughout research is supervision and support from administration. As teachers' direct supervisors are typically their building principal, a thorough review of the literature on principal leadership is warranted.

Principal Leadership

Principal support and leadership capabilities are closely associated with teacher job satisfaction (Griffith, 2004; Grissom, 2011; Moor, 2009; Petzko, 2004). Principals have significant influence on employee satisfaction as the leader of the school (Richards, 2005). Effective principals have the ability to create a culture of learning, mentoring, and improved teaching conditions within their school (Myers & Hitt, 2017; Moir, 2009), indicating principal support is a critical factor for retention and job satisfaction of teachers with all levels of experience (Brown & Wynn, 2009; Roberson & Roberson, 2009).

Impact of Principal Support on Teacher Attrition

Boyd et al. (2011) found that teachers' perceptions of school administrators have the greatest influence on teacher retention decisions due to the direct impact district leaders, principals, and assistant principals have on a teacher's day to day function and growth. Teachers exiting the profession cite a lack of administrative support as one of the

top five reasons for teacher attrition (Burkhauser, 2017). In addition, Ingersoll (2001) reported approximately one-third of teachers cited lack of support from administration as the cause of their job dissatisfaction. Teachers tended to report greater job satisfaction when principals involved them in decision making, established consistent behavioral expectations for students, and provided constructive feedback on their instructional practice (Blazar & Kraft, 2017; Leithwood et al., 1998; Supovitz et al., 2010).

Player et al. (2017) used data from over 300 teachers to investigate how principal leadership is associated with teacher mobility and attrition. The data utilized were from a sample of approximately 3,000 teachers who completed the Schools and Staffing Survey of 2011-2012 and the Teacher Follow-up Survey of 2012-2013. As hypothesized, teachers who reported strong or high-quality principal leadership were much less likely to leave their school of origin and move to another school. In addition, teachers who reported stronger principal leadership were less likely to switch from one school to another than teachers who reported weaker principal leadership. Principal leadership was not found to predict transitions out of the teaching profession. Player et al. (2017) also noted their results strongly suggest that certain principal leadership behaviors can directly impact teacher retention in a teacher's current school. The principal behaviors noted to have a positive effect were: communicating a vision for the school to their staff and working to achieve that vision, being supportive to teachers with regard to instruction and other issues, recognizing exemplary teaching performance, and enforcing rules related to student behavior and discipline (Player et al., 2017).

Boyd, et al. (2011) studied teacher attrition by modeling the relationship between teacher turnover and school factors, including teachers' influence over school policy,

effectiveness of school administration, staff relationships, student behavior, safety, and facilities. Of all the factors, the evidence showed that school administration played a particularly important role in the career decisions of teachers. The effect of administration on teacher perceptions and retention was consistent for first-year teachers and the full sample of teachers, confirmed by a survey of teachers who had left teaching in New York City (Boyd et al., 2011). The results showed that policies aimed at improving school administration may be effective at reducing teacher turnover, including mentoring programs and retention bonuses (Boyd et al., 2011).

Impact of Principal Communication on Teacher Job Satisfaction

A principal's communication style towards their teachers is a critical factor in job satisfaction as well. Korir and Karr-Kidwell (2000) found demonstrating an understanding of communication strategies and creating a collaborative work environment is essential to a principal's role. Tyler (2016) found five themes of communication in leadership that motivated teachers toward high-performing status: student-centered approach to decision-making, transparency of decision-making, shared decision-making between the principal and teachers, the role of faculty trust, and principal preparation. In addition, Tyler discovered specific communication behaviors that were successful in motivating teachers towards high-performing status. These included frequent face-to-face and personal communications, minimal use of whole-school meetings, and weekly principal participation in grade level meetings. The research concluded that communication skills are "necessary for building trust between school principals and teachers, with trusting relationships vital for leading teachers toward effective instruction" (Tyler, 2016, p. 2). In addition, Tyler's (2016) research showed that

poor communication can damage employee motivation and relations that lead to employee dissatisfaction. A conclusion was drawn that without strong communication skills, relationships could be difficult to establish (Tyler, 2016).

A principal has many responsibilities, including leading staff through times of change and new initiatives. Change can be difficult for staff members. Leaders must simultaneously clarify, synthesize, and challenge staff to move forward in a cohesive and efficient manner to make progress (Fullan, 2008). Principals who master the art of effective communication have teachers who perceive their communication skills as strong. Communication is an essential instrument in the motivation of teachers when implementing change (Luecke, 2003). Principals leading teachers through change must provide them with pertinent information, address teachers' questions and concerns, and investigate ways that a change might impact the teachers to increase inclusiveness and engagement (Green, 2004). Higher teacher engagement has been attributed to higher job satisfaction (Klassen & Chiu, 2011).

Impact of Principal Instructional Support on Job Satisfaction

In addition to the effectiveness of a principal's communication style and behaviors, the ability of a principal to support teachers instructionally has been found to be important as well. Workplace sources of support, especially by the supervisor, are considered the most significant factors in improving employees' negative outlooks (Fenlason & Beehr, 1994; Pas et al., 2012). Tatar (2009) found the most-used source of support for teachers is their colleagues, with the second-most-used source of support being the principal. Russell et al. (1987) found teachers who received support from

principals tended to be less emotionally exhausted, had more positive attitudes towards students, and experienced greater personal accomplishments.

The idea of instructional leadership and instructional support began with the effective schools movement of the 1970s (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds & Frederiksen, 1978; Lezotte, 2001). Elmore (2000) found that effective schools typically had principals who functioned as instructional leaders. Hallinger (2005) developed a model of instructional leadership through a meta-analytic review of literature. His model consisted of three underlying dimensions: defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate (Hallinger, 2005). The goal of these leadership behaviors was to engage staff in ways that inspired them to new levels of energy, commitment, and purpose. Hulpia et al. (2009) and Tillman and Tillman (2008) found teachers have increased levels of job satisfaction when receiving encouragement, instructional support, and assistance from their principals.

Principal Support for Student Behavior and Discipline

In addition to support in the area of instruction, teachers need support in the areas of student discipline and behavior. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, schools have seen an uptick in negative student behaviors. EdWeek Research Center (2022) found 44% of all school leaders say they are receiving more threats of violence by students now than they did in the fall of 2019. Two-thirds of the teachers surveyed reported students are misbehaving more often than in the fall of 2019. Public Agenda (2004) documented teachers generally identify student behavior as a significant problem to the overall work environment. When negative student behaviors are perceived as a frequent action, these

behaviors can take a toll on the overall stress levels of teachers and implementation of high-quality learning experiences during instructional time (Noguera, 2003).

Although no universal definition of student discipline exists, the National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments defined school discipline as the "rules and strategies applied in school to manage student behavior and practices used to encourage self-discipline" (2022, Discipline section). Each school approaches discipline in a unique manner, with variations attributed to budgets, strategic plans, and personalities of the individuals involved. Approaches can range from punitive (e.g., suspensions, expulsions, corporal punishment) to restorative practices (e.g., conflict-resolution training, peer mediations, schoolwide climate improvements). The principal plays a critical role in the implementation of school-wide discipline approaches and support for student behavior as the leader of the school.

Student behavior and discipline directly impact a teacher's work environment. Bascia and Rottmann (2011) found a relationship between working conditions in schools and teacher motivation and student opportunities to learn. A national dataset of over 6,000 elementary and secondary school teachers showed evidence that schools with higher levels of leadership support, better student discipline, and higher degrees of autonomy and decision-making opportunities had lower rates of teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 2001). Internationally, Sims (2017, 2018) used data from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) of 35 countries in 2013 to find student discipline and teacher cooperation were positively related to teacher job satisfaction in all countries.

Generational Cohorts

Supervisors in all organizations and businesses are challenged often to determine how to motivate, recognize, and reward workers from each generation in their workplace (Wiedmer, 2015). A person's age is one of the most commonly studied predictors of differences in attitudes and behaviors. The nature of age as a variable "allows researchers to employ an approach known as cohort analysis to track a group of people over the course of their lives" (Pew Research Center, 2015, "The Whys and Hows of Generations Research" section). In doing so, researchers can analyze changes in views over time. Generations are a way to classify age cohorts. Groups of people born over a span of 15 to 20 years typically make up one generation. Researchers at the Pew Research Center, track and analyze data from the same groups of people over time that may be impacted by several factors including demographics, attitudes, historical events, and popular culture. Prevailing consensus among researchers also aids in the definition of generations.

Generational Theory

Not all generations have the same year span. For instance, the baby boomer generation spans 19 years, while the Generation X and millennial generations only span 16 years. The differences can be attributed to how each generation is defined. Several factors determine when one generation ends and another begins. A generation "tends to span the length of approximately one phase of life (e.g., childhood), and when the oldest members of an age move into the next phase, a new generational division is created for the subsequent cohort being born" (Gerhardt et al., 2021, p. 24). Because the length of a phase of life is somewhat influenced by social factors, the definition of each generation can fluctuate, but tends to range between 15 to 20 years.

According to Strauss and Howe (1991), three central elements define a generation: age location in history, common beliefs and behaviors, and perceived membership. Age location in history means that a group of people have experienced impactful historical events, conditions, and trends during the same life stage. Strauss and Howe (1991) found that in large part, due to collective experiences, each generational cohort shares many similar beliefs, behaviors, traits, values, and motivations. The final element, perceived membership, is the feeling that one belongs to a specific group. Because a person belongs to a group of generational peers, one has a common bond (Strauss & Howe, 1991). The research from Strauss and Howe (1991) helped future scientists classify different generations.

The Pew Research Center (2015) noted in their report that because a range of factors go into determining generations "the lines that define the generations are useful tools for analysis, but they should be thought of as guidelines, rather than hard-and-fast distinctions" (Pew Research Center, 2015, "Defining Generations" section). People belong to certain generations based on the year they were born. Still, this alone does not fully represent who they are, what they believe, or why they act the way they do (Gerhardt et al., 2021). Generations are only one layer of a person's identity. Just as "knowing where a person grew up can help explain why they hold particular perspectives, knowing which generation they belong to can illuminate their points of view" (Gerhardt et al., 2021, p. 67).

Social factors and formative events help define generations as well. For example, the baby boomer generation was defined by the population growth following World War II in 1946. The cutoff for this generation occurred when the birth rates lowered again in

1964. Formative events are distinct historical events that shape a generational identity through collective memories (Parry, 2014). For example, 1997 marked the end of the millennial generation because most millennials were between the ages of five and 20 when the September 11 attacks on American soil occurred. Many millennials were old enough to comprehend the historical significance of that event, while most members of Gen Z have little or no memory of that event (Pew Research Center, 2015). This shared history of a generation results in what is defined as a "peer personality, a story representing an age cohort that results in being born during a common period in history and experiencing significant events at common life stages" (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 538).

Baby Boomer Generation

To understand the generational differences found by researchers, each of the four predominant generations employed in the educational system today must be analyzed. United States Census Bureau data from 2019 shows baby boomers, aged 55 to 73 at the time of this study, are the second-largest living adult generation. This generation was at its largest at 78.8 million in 1999 and is the oldest cohort included in this study. By 2050, this generation is projected to fall to 16.2 million (Fry, 2020). This generation's influential events and trends in the United States were the Cold War, spread of Communism, Vietnam War, sexual revolution, civil rights movement, and assassinations of political and cultural leaders (Grubb, 2017).

The baby boomer generation received its name based on the dramatic rise in births after service members returned home after World War II. Americans were eager to rebuild and reverse a downward trend in birth rates in the United States that had been on

the decline since the 1700s (Zemke et al., 2013). Baby boomers were a larger generation than any that had come before. This generation represented hope to parents who had been living through the stress of the war. “The Boom Babies were cherished by parents who had sacrificed and fought a war for the right to bear them, raise them, indulge them, and dream of a New Eden for them to live out their days in” (Zemke, et al., 2013, p. 42). After World War II, America was in a time of economic growth. The United States was focused on rebuilding, expansion, and growth to accommodate the growing population (Gerhardt et al., 2021). The “idealism and optimism of the baby boomers combined with the magnitude of their age cohort, resulted in several progressive shifts and important events in society during their formative years” (Gerhardt et al., 2021, p. 104). These events include the March on Washington, the Vietnam War and protests against it, passage of the Civil Rights Act, and the women’s movement (Gerhardt et al., 2021).

The baby boomer generation had a profound impact on the field of education. Forty five percent of today’s schools in America were built between 1950 and 1969. In 1953, 3.8 million baby boomers turned six and headed to school. Seventy-five million more followed in the next 17 years. From 1946 to 1956, the number of students in the first through eighth grade increased by 50 percent (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1997). Because more baby boomers went to college than any previous generation due to the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, also called the G.I. Bill, this generation placed importance on higher education (Johnson & Johnson, 2010). Johnson and Johnson (2010) concluded that by attending schools in crowded conditions, baby boomers quickly learned teamwork skills. It was during this time that report cards first included assessment on a student’s ability to play well with others. Johnson and

Johnson (2010) also noted the importance of landmark court cases on the educational experience of baby boomers, especially Brown v. Board of Education. The oldest baby boomers were seven when the court found in favor of Brown and schools were ordered to desegregate. Although the decision was not immediately implemented, the case had an impact on the education of this generation. Some states and school systems took decades to resolve the issues, with protests against desegregation becoming flashpoints in the daily experiences of many students across the country (Johnson & Johnson, 2010). A larger generation than the ones preceding it, this generation had to deal with change, navigate politics, and work in teams.

Through a series of case studies, Grubb (2017) found baby boomers to be generally formal, team-oriented, and optimistic. The research showed communication preferences to be done by phone, fax, or email. This generation was introduced to the internet as adults. Baby boomer work and career goals were long-term stability, clear hierarchies, and few to zero job changes. Workplace strengths included being team players and a willingness to put in extra effort. The results of the study also reflected the following workplace weaknesses: difficulty dealing with conflict and trouble thinking outside the box (Grubb, 2017).

In the field of education, research has shown the baby boomer generation displays a desire to continually learn (Coates, 2007; Marx, 2006). This stems from a more competitive college admissions process for the baby boomer generation, where there were not enough seats to accommodate all of the students (Coates, 2007). Even as baby boomers approach the age of retirement, they wish to continue to learn through professional development and other avenues (Coates, 2007). Because baby boomer

teachers are working parents and often grandparents, they wish to have the flexibility to manage their workload and personal time (Southard & Lewis, 2004). Baby boomer teachers worry about being embarrassed in front of peers, content that does not apply to their current job, and knowing there is work piling up at school when they are not there (Lovely & Buffman, 2007).

Prior research has found that baby boomers typically have higher levels of job satisfaction compared to Generation X and Generation Y (Bos et al., 2009; Young et al., 2013). Young's quantitative study examined differences in overall job satisfaction among Generation X, Generation Y, and baby boomers. The population included professionals who worked in the field of college recreational sports in the United States. The final sample size was 1,990. While members of the baby boomer generation were found to have a greater level of job satisfaction than the other generations, Young et al. (2013) found no statistically significant differences in overall job satisfaction between Generation X and Generation Y.

Generation X

Generation X, aged 39 to 54 at the time of study, is smaller than the baby boomer generation, with 65.2 million counted in the 2019 Census. Generation X is projected to outnumber baby boomers in 2028, when there will be 63.9 million Generation X and 62.9 million baby boomers (Fry, 2020). Generation X peaked in 2015 with a population of 65.6 million (United States Census Bureau, 2019). Generation X is a smaller generation, sandwiched between the two larger generations of baby boomers and millennials. The influential events and trends on this generation in the United States were the energy crises, political scandals, corporate downsizing, AIDS, environmental disasters, decline

of United States world supremacy, the Challenger disaster, and the introduction of the internet and e-mail (Grubb, 2017).

If baby boomers were viewed as the generation born into optimism and growth, Generation X was born into caution and skepticism (Gerhardt et al., 2021). Even when comparing major current events in the area of space exploration, the baby boomers saw a man land on the moon, while Generation X saw the Space Shuttle Challenger break apart on live television in classrooms across the country. Through their research, Gerhardt et al. (2021) found Generation X to have grown up with relatively high amounts of independence, even though there were formal national and local cautions against doing drugs, getting AIDS, and stranger danger. Generation X was the first generation to be raised by dual-career or single-parent households at a much higher rate than ever before (Gerhardt et al., 2021). The women's liberation movement of the baby boomers had opened doors for the members of Generation X to have more career possibilities and life choices as well. With baby boomers investing heavily in their careers to provide opportunities for their families, 60-to-70-hour workweeks became the norm in some industries (Gerhardt et al., 2021). This led to many children growing up with no adult at home after school and another term was created for Generation X: latchkey kids. Many school-aged Generation X children let themselves into empty houses after school for a few hours until parents returned home from work. This gave this generation an overall sense of independence and self-reliance, but also a sense of disillusionment and disengagement from the forces that motivated their parents (Gerhardt et al., 2021).

Through a series of case studies, Grubb (2017) also researched Generation X. Generally, members of Generation X traits were found to be self-reliant, cynical, and

informal. This generation was introduced to the internet as children and young adults. The research showed communication preferences of Generation X to be e-mail and texting. Work and career goals communicated by the subjects were to have work-life balance, job changes only when necessary, and flexible schedules. Workplace strengths demonstrated were adaptability and an ability to not be bound by structure. The results of the study also reflected the following workplace weaknesses: less personal investment in jobs and rejection of structure and rules (Grubb, 2017).

Teachers from Generation X are generally more goal oriented and independent than the baby boomers, which can translate into fragile loyalties and a likeliness to initiate moves from job to job (Southard & Lewis, 2004). In contrast to the baby boomers, Generation X professionals prefer presenters and supervisors who get to the point, are considered fun and informal, earn their respect, and provide frequent feedback (Coates, 2007). While this generation can be easily bored (Lovely & Buffman, 2007), there is an overall commitment to becoming educated to get ahead and continually working to provide a better quality of life (Coates, 2007).

Millennial Generation

Millennials, aged 23 to 58 at the time of this study, numbered 71.6 million in the 2019 Census. This generation is projected to peak in 2033, at 74.9 million (Fry, 2020). The influential historical events of this generation in the United States were the September 11 attacks, Iraq War, and school shootings (Grubb, 2017). Because they have grown up in a more dangerous world, society created an environment in which the millennials were x (Wilson & Gerber, 2008). This generation was impacted by the societal trends of busy schedules and social media (Grubb, 2017).

The millennial generation were parented by younger baby boomers who wanted more for their children, emotionally nurturing their self-esteem and development from an early age (Gerhardt et al., 2021). Early opportunities for enrichment and education began to trend in the 1980s as well. Twenge (2017) summarized her research on the millennials as "a generation of soaring expectations, raised on the mantra 'you can be anything you want to be'" (p. 193). Unlike the generations before them, millennials were the family focal point (Gerhardt et al., 2021). While Generation X had been coined latchkey kids, the parents of millennials were referred to as "helicopter parents" (Gerhardt et al., 2021, p. 39). This generation was seen as less independent from the generations prior to them. Millennials had more activities available with coaches, teachers, tutors, and other adults leading activities, afterschool clubs, and sports. As they grew older, this generation was ready to enter the workforce in the same manner as their childhood. Gerhardt et al. (2021) found that while millennials were the most highly educated generation in the history of the United States, they were also the most dependent on adults at a stage in life when society expected them to operate independently. Millennials entered the workforce expecting their voices would matter to the same extent as their bosses, which resulted in them being overwhelmingly labeled as entitled (Gerhardt et al., 2021). Gerhardt et al. (2021) offer a counter argument to this claim: from one perspective, millennials could be seen as indulged and sheltered, but from another they appeared proactive with high expectations for success.

Grubb's (2017) case study research showed other trends in beliefs and career aspirations of the millennial generation. Millennials were found to be feedback-oriented, community-oriented, and realistic with their expectations. The case studies showed

workplace preferences were to be given clear directions and to find entrepreneurial opportunities (Grubb, 2017). This generation tended to look for workplaces they found to be fun and engaging, showing a pattern of frequent job changes when their expectations were not met (Grubb, 2017). Strengths of millennials included being technologically adept and eager to make an impact on the world. The results of the study also suggested the following workplace weaknesses: lack of experience, unrealistic expectations for interesting work, and a need for structure, supervision, and validation (Grubb, 2017).

Researchers have studied the millennial generation in the field of education as well. In setting up his study on teacher perception of principal support and leadership capabilities, Melchiorre (2016) argued that while much has been written on the millennial generation and the need to adjust workplace conditions based on their profile, little research has been conducted to test it. He found millennial teachers did not fit a type of personality. The results indicated the quality of relationship the millennial teachers had with their principals was a greater predictor of turnover intention than any other factor (Melchiorre, 2016).

Buckley et al. (2015) found adverse life circumstances have negatively impacted the job satisfaction and available life choices for millennials. Research from Buckley et al. (2015) was utilized in the *Deloitte millennial survey: Winning over the next generation of leaders* (2016) and showed millennials to have the lowest job satisfaction when compared to other generations. Buckley et al. (2015) found that while millennials tend to be more highly educated than those from earlier generations, millennials also have a significantly greater amount of student debt than Generation X or baby boomers. In addition, millennials had higher levels of unemployment during the Great Recession of

2007-2009 than Generation X or baby boomers (Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2014) . Based on their research findings, Buckley et al. (2015) suggested organizations try to clearly understand millennial workers' needs by not treating them as a homogeneous block, but segment the millennial workforce by the stage of adverse life experiences. The priorities outlined were student loan repayment assistance, housing purchase assistance, and transportation incentive programs (e.g. public transportation discounts or carpooling options).

Generation Z

Generation Z, aged 7-24 at the time of this study, numbered 65.6 million in the 2019 Census. This is the youngest generation included in this study. The influential events and trends that shaped this generation in the United States were school shootings, global terrorism (notably Al-Qaeda and ISIS), and increased social diversity (Grubb, 2017). This generation is still in progress and is the smallest generation included in this study. The end date for Generation Z has not yet been formally established, although the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 has arisen as a key consideration for when to draw the line for an end date (Harari, 2022).

Generation Z saw an explosion of technological advances in their childhood, using apps and social media to communicate with others. Many members grew up with smart phones in their pockets and social media emerged as a major form of communication (Gerhardt et al., 2021). The majority of this generation were in school when the pandemic caused school closings and a sudden shift to online learning in many parts of the world. This caused them to communicate through technology even more than the millennials (Gerhardt et al., 2021).

The first members of Generation Z entered the workforce in 2018. Grubb's (2017) case studies showed Generation Z to be a globally-oriented group, that is extremely tech savvy. In addition, Grubb's (2017) research found this generation to be pragmatic and socially progressive, with one central work and career goal: to find lifetime work and not have to rely on social safety programs to fund retirement. The communication preferences reported were texting and social media. Grubb (2017) noted this generation is also known as the "Internet in the pocket generation" as they were born into a world with functioning internet and grew up with mobile devices. The workplace strengths found were independence, being technologically adept, and having value for long-term professional development. The weaknesses observed were short attention spans and a lack of experience (Grubb, 2017).

Paggi and Clowes (2021) reinforce the claim that smartphones are the one device that sets this generation apart from the others. No other generation had information as widely available and mobile as the members of Generation Z. Because of this, Generation Z values independence, creativity, freedom to work when and where they want, diversity, and access to technology (Paggi & Clowes, 2021). However, Paggi and Clowes (2021) also found, Genreration Z may lack skills and experiences many older people did learn earlier in life, such as the ability to use a paper map or locate information from nondigital sources. Paggi and Cowels (2021) conclude that employers should look for differences between their youngest and oldest employees and find the intrinsic strengths of each generation to enhance an organization's culture and productivity.

Microsoft Education and the Economist Intelligence Unit surveyed over 1,000 student-teachers and early-career teachers from around the world in 2020 about their

workplace preferences in the profession of education. The research indicated teachers from this generation are digital, social, global, visual, and mobile. They tend to place a high priority on social-emotional learning for students and global issues. The study also found Generation Z to be values-oriented, seeking to work with purpose and passion. The researchers concluded that without feeling a sense of purpose and passion in their careers, members of Generation Z will leave their jobs.

Generations in the Workforce

There are primarily four generations currently employed in the teaching profession: Baby boomer, Generation X, millennial, and Generation Z. Because generation cohorts are analytical constructs, precise boundaries have been used to differentiate one generation from another. In 2018, Pew assessed labor market, demographic, attitudinal, and behavior measures to establish an endpoint of each generation that was also used in this study. For the purpose of this study and literature review, generation cohorts will be divided by the following age groups: baby boomers, aged 55-73; Generation X, aged 39-54; millennial, aged 25-38; Generation Z, aged 7-24.

Multiple generational workplace behavioral preferences and/or values have been researched under a range of generational topics. These include reaction to organizational change (Bourne, 2015), work ethic behaviors and attitudes (Meriac et al., 2010), preferences for supervision and managerial interaction (Deal, 2007; Gordon, 2009; Muthu &Yee, 2011), personal and workplace values (Comperatore & Nerone, 2008; Gibson et al., 2009; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Ye & Mathu, 2011), and recruitment and retention approaches (Gursoy et al., 2010; Twenge, 2007). The findings from these

studies indicated significant generational differences in perspectives of work, attitudes toward authority, and world views.

Johnson and Johnson (2010) created basic needs in the workplace for administrators to manage friction between generations. They note that while there is not one way to manage every person in a generation, there are some considerations that can help understand this part of a person's identity. Johnson and Johnson (2010) developed a model, with five different modes of management: directing, teaching, persuading, collaborating, and coordinating. In directing mode, a manager directs employees to do a task. Johnson and Johnson (2010) found millennials and Generation Z prefer direct communication and orders, while baby boomers preferred to feel like they were a part of the decision-making process with their superiors. Teaching mode occurs when a manager instructs their staff in a new skill. While baby boomers preferred a lecture to learn a new skill, the younger generations preferred a hands-on approach (Johnson & Johnson, 2010). In persuading mode, a manager tries to convince people by helping them understand why something must be done. Members of all generations responded positively to persuasion by their managers (Johnson & Johnson, 2010). Collaboration mode occurs when the manager relates to their colleagues in a more collegial fashion than in the directing mode, teaching mode, and persuading mode. Generation X and baby boomers were found to prefer this mode more than millennials and Generation Z. The fifth and final mode is the coordinating mode, where managers "trust their employees to get things done and get out of their way" (Johnson & Johnson, 2010, p. 201). Johnson and Johnson (2010) concluded their findings by recommending the coordinating and collaborating approaches to management for Generation X and baby boomers. In addition, it was recommended that

direct communication, with less ambiguity and more efficiency, is preferred by the millennials and Generation Z.

While studies on generational differences in the workplace are plentiful, it was noted by this researcher that results have been mixed. Parry and Urwin (2011) reviewed theory and evidence on generational differences in work values. Many of the studies are unable to find differences between the age cohorts in the area of work values. Another critical finding from the empirical evidence was the lack of evidence in differentiating between age, period, and generation. Parry and Urwin (2011) concluded that understanding generational differences, based on age and impactful historical and social events, remains a useful idea for managers, even though they did not find a convincing case for generations to be a significant distinguishing factor.

Other researchers caution employers not to apply generational studies across the board without understanding that individuals are not defined by their generational cohort. King et al. (2019) warned there is little evidence to support the premise that people from different generations behave significantly different at work or desire significantly different things. By placing generational commonalities as a defining characteristic, it was possible that employers could increase the use of stereotypes. In their work, King et al. (2019) analyzed 20 different studies with approximately 20,000 participants and found only small and inconsistent differences in job attitudes when comparing generational groups. Instead, King et al. (2019) found that employers' perceptions and preconceived beliefs about age had a greater impact on the results. They found workplaces are crowded with age-related stereotypes that are not always accurate or aligned with evidence. This can impact workplace culture and efficiency. In one experiment, King et al. (2019) found

a stereotype that older people cannot learn new tasks as quickly as younger generations significantly interfered with the training they received. Trainers had lower expectations and provided worse training to the older participants than if they believed they were training a younger person. Based on their findings, King et al. (2019) suggest that employers actively avoid workplace generation and age stereotypes by openly talking about biases, develop shared goals for all, and face their own biases with an open-mind and willingness to adapt to the individual needs of each employee.

Summary

The review of literature in this chapter has informed the research for this dissertation. The chapter began with research on teacher job satisfaction and continued with the relationship between job satisfaction and teacher attrition. Additional research showed the cost of teacher attrition on schools and districts as well as the factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction and attrition. The literature review also examined the impact of principal leadership and support as related to the topic of teacher job satisfaction. Finally, the four main generations employed in the United States school systems at the time of this study were examined.

While it remains difficult to detangle research results between generations or age, lessons and insights remain that can be useful to employers. When using commonalities within generations as guidance, researchers such as King et al. (2019) warn that generalizing about people based on their age or generation can lead to inaccurate beliefs and lead to inefficient and harmful stereotypes. According to the literature, employers should utilize research on generational differences as an insight, yet recognize that individual preferences can change over time due to a wide variety of other factors such as

socioeconomic status, age, mental health, experience, education, and physical capacity. Researchers such as Paggi & Clowes (2019) have found many employers have found that being aware of generational differences can enhance their understanding of individuals and help them plan for reactions of various groups.

Teacher job satisfaction is a complex issue to understand because it results from teachers' assessment of their work experiences (Toropova et al., 2020). Results of these assessments can vary between teachers in different settings and even experiences occurring prior to the survey given. Literature on the topic of teacher job retention recommended schools, districts, and states study the factors related to attrition to better understand causes and insights on possible solutions to the problem.

Finally, the literature review showed a direct relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the risk of attrition. This study seeks to examine how a teachers' generations impact their overall job satisfaction and their perceptions of principal leadership. Chapter 3 provides an explanation of the methods used to address the research questions presented in chapter 1.

Chapter 3

Methods

The purposes of this quantitative study were to determine the extent to which teachers are satisfied overall with teaching and with the support and leadership of their principal. Additional purposes were to determine the extent to which teachers' generational cohort designations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73) (Pew Research Center, 2015) impacted their overall job satisfaction and perceptions of principal leadership. Chapter 3 consists of the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations.

Research Design

Creswell and Creswell (2018) defined research designs as "types of inquiry within qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches that provide specific direction for procedures in a research study" (p. 11). The design of this study was quantitative. Specifically, a quantitative quasi-experimental design was used for this study utilizing archived survey data. This approach was appropriate because survey research allows for an objective review of subject perceptions of a phenomenon (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Independent and dependent variables must be measured separately and not measured on the same concept, reinforcing the cause-and-effect logic of quantitative research (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The independent variable in this study was teacher generational cohort designation. Designation was disaggregated into four categories included the following: Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X

ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73. The dependent variables were teacher overall satisfaction in the areas of teaching and principal leadership.

Selection of Participants

Participants included public school teachers from the state of Kansas who chose to participate in Church and Simmering's 2021 KTRI survey. Over 20,000 teachers participated in the survey. After removal of random, duplicate, and/or incomplete responses, the final sample consisted of 18,247 public school teachers from kindergarten through 12th grade. At least 1% of the teachers from 229 of the state's 286 school districts participated in the survey. The survey was voluntary and administered between October and December 2021.

Measurement

Surveys or questionnaires are often used when measuring job satisfaction. Surveys help researchers to answer descriptive questions, questions about relationships between variables, and questions about predictive relationships between variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Church and Simmering (2021) developed the Kansas Teacher Retention Initiative (KTRI) survey through partnerships with Emporia State University, Kansas Association of School Boards, Kansas National Education Foundation, and the United School Administrators of Kansas. The KTRI survey was created and distributed prior to the start of the current study between October and December in 2021. Church and Simmering (2021) asked teachers to report their age on the survey. For the purpose of the current study, the age of each teacher was disaggregated into four generations: Generation Z (ages 7-24), millennial (ages 25-38), Generation X (ages 39-54), baby boomer ages (55-73).

Church and Simmering's (2021) survey included four main sections: participant demographics (grade level, years in education, years in district, worked in other district, second job, children in district, live within district, union membership), engagement index, job satisfaction factors, and retention factors. The authors of the survey provided the researcher with raw data specifically pulled to answer the four research questions posed in this study. Two research questions and one survey item were related to teachers' overall satisfaction in the area of teaching. Additionally, two research questions and five survey items were related to teachers' satisfaction with their principal's leadership.

Item 1 addressed the respondents' level of overall satisfaction in the area of teaching. Teacher respondents selected from the following options on a five-point Likert-type scale: *1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Somewhat Disagree, 3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 – Somewhat Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree*. Participants indicated their level of agreement with the following statement to measure overall satisfaction in the area of teaching: *Overall, I am satisfied with teaching*.

Item 2 addressed the respondents' level of satisfaction with their relationship with their principal. Teacher respondents selected from the following options on a five-point Likert-type scale: *1 - Very Dissatisfied, 2 - Dissatisfied, 3 - Unsure, 4 - Satisfied, 5 - Very Satisfied*. Participants indicated their level of satisfaction based on the following statement: *Your relationship with your principal.*

Item 3 addressed the respondents' level of satisfaction with their principal's instructional leadership. Teacher respondents selected from the following options on a five-point Likert-type scale: *1 - Very Dissatisfied, 2 - Dissatisfied, 3 - Unsure, 4 -*

Satisfied, 5 - Very Satisfied. Participants indicated their level of satisfaction based on the following statement: *Your principal's instructional leadership.*

Item 4 addressed the respondents' level of satisfaction with their principal's ability to communicate. Teacher respondents selected from the following options on a five-point Likert-type scale: *1 - Very Dissatisfied, 2 - Dissatisfied, 3 - Unsure, 4 - Satisfied, 5 - Very Satisfied*. Participants indicated their level of satisfaction based on the following statement: *Your principal's ability to communicate updates and changes within the school*.

Item 5 addressed the respondents' level of satisfaction with their principal's effectiveness. Teacher respondents selected from the following options on a five-point Likert-type scale: *1 - Very Dissatisfied, 2 - Dissatisfied, 3 - Unsure, 4 - Satisfied, 5 - Very Satisfied*. Participants indicated their level of satisfaction based on the following statement: *Your perception of the principal's effectiveness at your school.*

Item 6 addressed the respondents' level of satisfaction with the support they receive from their principal in the area of student discipline. Teacher respondents selected from the following options on a five-point Likert-type scale: *1 - Very Dissatisfied, 2 - Dissatisfied, 3 - Unsure, 4 - Satisfied, 5 - Very Satisfied*. Participants indicated their level of satisfaction based on the following statement: *The support you receive from your principal specific to student discipline*.

Data Collection Procedures

Before data collection, approval for research was sought through the Baker University IRB process for the use of archived data. The researcher submitted the IRB form to Baker University on August 24, 2022. The IRB was approved on August 26, 2022 (see Appendix A). The researcher submitted an email proposal to Church and Simmering, founders of the Kansas Teacher Retention Initiative (KTRI) to use a portion of the data collected from their 2021 study and permission was granted on September 27, 2022 (see Appendix B).

After permission to use the data had been granted, the researcher gained access to the raw data for the following survey items on the KTRI from Church and Simmering: age demographic, overall satisfaction with teaching, perception of principal effectiveness, relationship with the principal, instructional leadership of the principal, principal communication, and support received from the principal specific to student discipline. The teacher survey, administered electronically between October and December 2021, allowed the researcher to access data for 18,427 participants. The researcher worked to identify raw data sets that had not been analyzed or correlated for the reports by Church and Simmering (2021). Church and Simmering provided the researcher with the raw data on September 27, 2022. Prior to sharing the data sets with the researcher, Simmering removed all identifiers to ensure district and teacher anonymity.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Responses to each of the items in the survey were utilized to address research questions in the study. For the purposes of this study, the level of significance was set at .05. The following is a list of this study's research questions and hypotheses testing analyses:

RQ1

To what extent are teachers satisfied overall with teaching?

H1. Overall, teachers are satisfied with teaching.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H1. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

RQ2

To what extent are there differences in overall teacher satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73)?

H2. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher overall satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test H2. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, overall teacher satisfaction with teaching, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24,

millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

RQ3

To what extent are teachers satisfied with their principal's leadership?

H3. Teachers are satisfied with their relationship with their principal.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H3. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

H4. Teachers are satisfied with their principal's instructional leadership.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H4. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

H5. Teachers are satisfied with their principal's ability to communicate updates and changes within the school.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H5. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is

calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

H6. Teachers are satisfied with the principal's effectiveness at their school.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H6. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

H7. Teachers are satisfied with the support they receive from their principal specific to student discipline.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H7. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

RQ4

To what extent are there differences in teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73)?

H8. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their relationship with their principal among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H8. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal teacher relationship with the principal, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

H9. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's instructional leadership among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H9. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal instructional leadership, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

H10. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's ability to communicate effectively within the school among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H10. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal communication, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

H11. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's effectiveness among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H11. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal communication, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

H12. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's support for student discipline among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H12. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal support of student discipline, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

Limitations

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) defined limitations as "factors that may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or on the generalizability of the results" (p. 133). Limitations of this study included:

1. The sample of school districts was drawn from a single state; therefore, results may not be generalizable to all states.
2. Participants were asked to report teacher satisfaction in the areas of teaching and support from their principal. However, these perceptions cannot be verified by an independent measure. The study may be limited by the teachers' reported answers.
3. The survey was sent to all Kansas school districts and participation in the study was voluntary.
4. Single administration of this survey does not allow for comparison to past data.

Summary

Chapter 3 included further explanations of the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, and data analysis and hypothesis testing. In addition, the research questions and hypotheses were discussed in detail. The population was Kansas public school teachers at the time the optional survey was administered. The sample for this study included 18,247 public teachers from grades kindergarten through 12th-grade. The data analysis procedures for each of the hypotheses were also described. Finally, the limitations of the study were identified and described. Chapter 4 details the results obtained through the one-sample t-tests and ANOVAs conducted in the hypothesis testing.

Chapter 4

Results

This study investigated overall teacher satisfaction in the areas of teaching and principal leadership. The first purpose of this quantitative research study was to determine the extent to which teachers are satisfied overall in the area of teaching. The second purpose of this study was to determine the extent of the differences in the overall satisfaction among teachers from different generational cohort designations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The third purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which teachers are satisfied with the leadership of their principal. The final purpose of the study was to determine the extent of the differences in their satisfaction of their principal's leadership among teachers from different generational cohort designations.

While previous chapters contained the background, literature review, research questions, hypotheses, and methodology associated with this quantitative survey research, Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample. Hypotheses tests were conducted. One-sample *t* tests were utilized to identify the difference between sample means and null values. Further, the hypothesis testing section contains results from one-factor ANOVAs and Tukey's HSD post hoc analyses to determine if teachers' level of overall satisfaction in teaching and satisfaction with their principal's leadership was affected by their generation.

Descriptive Statistics

The sample for this research study was 18,247 Kansas public school educators from kindergarten through 12th grades who participated in the KTRI survey. The survey was voluntary and administered electronically between October and December 2021. The average age of respondents was 43 years old. Sixty one percent of respondents reported they had worked in more than one school district (Church & Simmering, 2021). Twenty seven percent of respondents reported having a second job outside of education. The majority of respondents were from the Generation X and millennial generation, with the smallest number of respondents from Generation Z (See Table 1).

Table 1

Number of Respondents by Generation

Generation	*N*	*%*
Generation Z	25	0.1%
Millennial	6,554	35.9%
Generation X	7,716	42.3%
Baby boomer	3,136	17.1%

It is noted by the researcher that the number of respondents in the Generation Z category was relatively minimal. This is further addressed in Chapter 5 through the recommendations for future research.

The frequencies calculated for this research study provided specific information about the sample. Hypothesis testing was conducted for this study to investigate the

research questions. The following section contains the results of the hypothesis testing that involved analysis to draw conclusions related to the research questions.

Hypothesis Testing

RQ1

To what extent are teachers satisfied with teaching overall?

H1. Overall, teachers are satisfied with teaching.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H1. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it calculated the data from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(18248) = 349.169$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 2.585$. The sample mean for overall teacher satisfaction with teaching was ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.27$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H1 was supported. Overall, teachers are satisfied with teaching. The effect size indicated a large effect.

RQ2

To what extent are there differences in overall teacher satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73)?

H2. There is a statistically significant difference in overall teacher satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H2. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, overall teacher satisfaction with teaching, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(3, 17427) = 26.223$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .004$. See Table 2 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's HSD post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's HSD post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Two of the differences were significant. The Generation X mean ($M = 3.30$) and the baby boomer mean ($M = 3.46$) were higher than the millennial mean ($M = 3.22$). H2 was supported. There is a statistically significant difference in overall teacher satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The effect size, as measured by eta squared, indicated a small effect.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H2

Generation	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Generation Z	3.56	1.23	25
Millennial	3.22	1.26	6,554
Generation X	3.30	1.28	7,716
Baby boomer	3.46	1.27	3,136

RQ3

To what extent are teachers satisfied with their principal's leadership?

H3. Teachers are satisfied with their relationship with their principal.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H3. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(18425) = 506.350$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 3.730$. The sample mean for teacher satisfaction with their relationship with their principal ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.06$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H3 was supported. Teachers are satisfied with their relationship with their principal. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H4. Teachers are satisfied with their principal's instructional leadership.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H4. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(18425) = 406.170$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 2.992$. The sample mean for teacher satisfaction with their principal's instructional leadership was ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.20$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H4 was supported. Teachers are satisfied with their principal's instructional leadership. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H5. Teachers are satisfied with their principal's ability to communicate updates and changes within the school.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H5. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(18425) = 407.273$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 3.000$. The sample mean for teacher satisfaction with their principal's ability to communicate updates and changes within the school was ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 1.21$) was

significantly higher than the test value (3). H5 was supported. Teachers are satisfied with their principal's ability to communicate updates and changes within the school. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H6. Teachers are satisfied with their principal's effectiveness at their school.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H6. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(18425) = 393.608$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 2.900$. The sample mean for teacher satisfaction with their principal's effectiveness at their school was ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.23$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H6 was supported. Teachers are satisfied with the principal's leadership at their school. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H7. Teachers are satisfied with the support they receive from their principal specific to student discipline.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H7. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing because it involves the comparison of one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size is reported.

The results of the one sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(18425) = 373.776$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 2.754$. The sample mean for teacher satisfaction with the support they receive from their principal specific to student discipline was ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.26$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H7 was supported. Teachers are satisfied with the support they receive from their principal specific to student discipline. The effect size indicated a large effect.

RQ4

To what extent are there differences in teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73)?

H8. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their relationship with their principal among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H8. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal teacher relationship with the principal, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(3, 17427) = 1.560$, $p = .197$. See Table 3 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was not warranted. H8 was not supported. There is not a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their relationship with their principal among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H8

Generation	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Generation Z	3.92	1.08	25
Millennial	3.93	1.07	6,554
Generation X	3.95	1.05	7,716
Baby boomer	3.97	1.02	3,136

H9. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's instructional leadership among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H9. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal instructional leadership, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of

the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(3, 17427) = 1.179$, $p = .316$. See Table 4 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was not warranted. H9 was not supported. There is not a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's instructional leadership among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H9

Generation	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Generation Z	3.64	1.35	25
Millennial	3.61	1.21	6,554
Generation X	3.59	1.21	7,716
Baby boomer	3.64	1.18	3,136

H10. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's ability to communicate effectively within the school among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H10. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal communication, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated a there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(3, 17427) = 1.843$, $p = .137$. See Table 5 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was not warranted. H10 was not supported. There is not a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's ability to communicate effectively within the school among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H10

Generation	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Generation Z	3.84	1.25	25
Millennial	3.64	1.22	6,554
Generation X	3.62	1.22	7,716
Baby boomer	3.68	1.18	3,136

H11. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's effectiveness among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H11. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal communication, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(3, 17427) = 2.041$, $p = .106$. See Table 6 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was not warranted. H11 was not supported. There is not a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's effectiveness among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H11

Generation	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Generation Z	3.80	1.29	25
Millennial	3.60	1.23	6,554
Generation X	3.55	1.23	7,716
Baby boomer	3.60	1.23	3,136

H12. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's support for student discipline among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73).

A one-factor ANOVA was conducted to test H12. The categorical variable used to group the dependent variable, teacher satisfaction in the area of principal support of student discipline, was teacher generational cohort designation (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the one-factor ANOVA can be used to test for differences in the means for a numerical variable among three or more groups. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, an effect size is reported.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(3, 17427) = 3.863$, $p = .009$, $\eta^2 = .001$. See Table 7 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's HSD post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's HSD post hoc

was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Two of the differences were statistically significant. The baby boomer mean ($M = 3.54$) was higher than the millennial mean ($M = 3.44$) and the Generation X mean ($M = 3.47$). H12 was supported. There is a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's support for student discipline among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The effect size, as measured by eta squared, indicated a small effect.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H12

Generation	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Generation Z	3.56	1.23	25
Millennial	3.44	1.27	6,554
Generation X	3.47	1.25	7,716
Baby boomer	3.54	1.23	3,136

Summary

Chapter 4 included the results of the data analysis and hypothesis testing related to teacher job satisfaction and teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership. The results of the one-sample *t* tests, one-factor ANOVAs, and a follow up Tukey's HSD post hoc analyses were presented. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the research study, review of methodology, and major findings. In addition, chapter 5 relates the findings to the literature, presents conclusions, implications for action, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 5

Interpretation and Recommendations

Chapter 5 is organized into three major sections to review and summarize the interpretations of this quantitative study concerning teacher overall job satisfaction and teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership. The study summary includes an overview of the problem, purpose statement and research questions, review of the methodology, and major findings. The second section addresses the findings related to the literature. Finally, chapter 5 concludes with implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks.

Study Summary

This section includes a summary of the current study, which examined teacher overall satisfaction with teaching and teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership. This study also examined the relationship between a teacher's generation and their level of overall satisfaction with teaching and their principal's leadership. The summary provides an overview of the problem as well as the purpose statement and research questions. Then, a review of methodology used in the current study is provided. Finally, the major findings from this study are presented.

Overview of the Problem

According to the Kansas National Education Association and Kansas Association of School Boards, Kansas is facing a potential critical shortage of educators in the state (Kansas Association of School Boards, 2021). The issue of teacher attrition negatively impacts district organizational systems, state and local education budgets, and student achievement. At the time of this study, no literature could be found correlating teachers'

generation to their overall satisfaction with teaching or their satisfaction with their principal's leadership.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The first purpose of this quantitative research study was to determine the extent to which teachers are satisfied overall in the area of teaching. The second purpose of the study was to determine the extent of the differences in the overall satisfaction in teaching among teachers from different generational cohort designations. The third purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which teachers are satisfied with the support of their principal. The final purpose of the study was to determine the extent of the differences in their satisfaction with the support of their principal among teachers from different generational cohort designations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). To address the purposes of the study, four research questions were posed and 12 hypotheses were tested.

Review of the Methodology

A quantitative research design was used to study the results from the 2021 KTRI survey. The subjects of this study were 18,247 public school teachers from kindergarten through 12th grade in Kansas and employed during the 2021-2022 school year. The independent variable in this study was teacher generational cohort. This was disaggregated into four categories: Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73. The dependent variables were overall teacher satisfaction with teaching and principal leadership. One-sample t-tests and one-factor ANOVAs were used to test for differences of satisfaction levels reported among generational groups.

Major Findings

By addressing the four research questions in this current study, the researcher identified several noteworthy findings. The findings showed teachers are satisfied overall with teaching. However, when extrapolating the data by generation, a significant difference was found between the millennial generation and Generation X and baby boomers. The first major finding was the determination that teachers of the millennial generation are less satisfied overall with teaching than members of the Generation X or baby boomer generations. The Generation X mean (M = 3.30) and the baby boomer mean (M = 3.46) were significantly higher than the millennial mean (M = 3.22). The data supported the current study's second hypothesis: There is a statistically significant difference in overall teacher satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different generations.

The findings also showed teachers are satisfied with their principal's leadership. However, when extrapolating the data by generation, a significant difference was found between the baby boomer generation and the millennials and Generation X in the area of principal support for student discipline. The second major finding of the current study was the determination that teachers from the baby boomer generation are more satisfied with their principal's support for student discipline than teachers from the millennial or Generation X generations. It was also noted millennials showed the lowest level of satisfaction with their principal's support in the area of student discipline. No other differences among teachers from different generations as related to principal leadership were found.

Findings Related to the Literature

This section connects the current study's findings with previous studies related to teacher job satisfaction, teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership, and generation. There was no literature found in which research had been conducted to determine the impact of generational differences specific to teacher job satisfaction and perceptions of principal leadership. However, many studies have been conducted regarding generational differences in the workplace. In addition, studies have been conducted in reference to teacher job satisfaction and teacher perceptions of principal leadership.

This study's first research question was designed to identify the extent to which teachers are satisfied in the area of teaching. The results of the current study indicated that overall, teachers are satisfied with teaching. These results are in contrast to the findings of Sutcher et al. (2016) where it was reported teachers had record low levels of job satisfaction, with Sutcher et al. concluding the United States will face a severe shortage of teachers in the coming years due to the levels of dissatisfaction. A review of literature showed that while teachers are generally satisfied in the area of teaching itself, they are less satisfied with other aspects of the job. Butt et al. (2005) showed that teachers are generally more satisfied with the cognitive and affective dimensions of work regarding their personal experience than with the organizational dimensions. The areas of greater dissatisfaction tend to be items such as administrative tasks, excess paperwork, and amount of time spent working outside of contract hours (Will, 2022).

The study's second research question was designed to identify differences in teacher overall satisfaction with teaching among teachers who were born into different

generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the current research study indicated teachers of the millennial generation to be significantly less satisfied with teaching overall than members of the Generation X or baby boomer generations. These results are in agreement with Deloitte (2016) where it was reported only 53% of millennials reported high levels of job satisfaction. The results of the current study also resemble the findings of the Merrimak College and EdWeek Research Center (2022) survey that found the teachers who are most satisfied overall with teaching are male and from the baby boomer generation. The same study determined the "profile of the least satisfied teacher is a female millennial middle school teacher with three to nine years of experience" (p. 5). Baby boomers typically have higher levels of job satisfaction compared to Generation X and Generation Y (Bos et al., 2009; Young et al., 2013).

The current study's third research question was designed to determine the teachers' levels of satisfaction in the area of principal leadership. The results of the current research study indicated teachers are satisfied with their principal's leadership. The following areas were examined: the teacher's relationship with their principal, the principal's instructional leadership, the principal's ability to communicate updates and changes within the school, the teacher's perception of the principal's effectiveness at their school, and the support the teacher received from the principal specific to student discipline. The results of the current study were neither in contrast or congruent to other studies, as no study was found that measured teachers' satisfaction with their principal's leadership. Studies have been conducted to analyze teacher preferences and the degree to

which teachers are impacted by varying leadership styles, characteristics, and behaviors; however, a measure of teacher satisfaction in these areas could not be found.

Literature regarding teacher job satisfaction does point to a number of factors influencing teachers' decisions to leave the profession, including inadequate principal support (Markow et al., 2012). Research indicates a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction (Hulpia et al., 2009). In fact, Ingersoll and Smith (2003) found that a principal's management or leadership style can make a significant difference in a teacher's experience in the school. Management and leadership style are reported as one of the most often-cited reasons for dissatisfaction.

The study's fourth research question was designed to determine the extent to which there are differences in teacher satisfaction with their principal's leadership among teachers who were born into different generations (Generation Z ages 7-24, millennial ages 25-38, Generation X ages 39-54, baby boomer ages 55-73). The results of the current study indicated teachers from the baby boomer generation are more satisfied with the leadership of their principal than teachers of the millennial or Generation X generations. While prior studies on the impact of generational differences on teacher perceptions of principal leadership were not found, a large number of studies on teacher perception of principal leadership have been conducted.

Conclusions

As presented in chapter 1, school districts across the country are concerned with rising rates of teacher attrition. When teachers vacate positions prematurely, school districts, schools, other teachers, and students are negatively impacted. Continued identification of factors and trends could help districts increase teacher retention and

decrease attrition. Data obtained from the current study's survey results could guide district administrators as they attempt to remedy trends in the areas of teacher job satisfaction. The following section provides implications for action and recommendations for future research.

Implications for Action

The results of the current study provide implications for action and future research. Applying a general rule for all members of a generation should not be made regarding their overall satisfaction with teaching and their perceptions of their principal's leadership. As presented in chapter 2, researchers such as King et al. (2019) have warned that generalizing about people based on their age or generation can lead to inaccurate beliefs and inefficient and harmful stereotypes. Further, a more detailed examination of teacher satisfaction in the areas of overall teaching and principal leadership is required.

School district leaders may benefit from targeted practices to improve teacher job satisfaction, given the current state of teacher attrition. While the results from the current study showed teachers are satisfied overall with teaching, there are teachers who responded to the survey who were not satisfied with teaching. Eleven point eight percent, 2,054, of participants reported they were very dissatisfied overall with teaching and 3,621 (20.8%) reported they were dissatisfied with teaching. When considering these are professionals who are currently in teaching positions across the state, it may benefit district leaders to provide additional supports or programs in an attempt to retain more teachers over time.

Findings from the current study indicated that Kansas school districts may benefit from providing special consideration to preferences of millennial and Generation X

teachers. These two generations represented the largest sample sizes in the current study and both showed significantly lower overall satisfaction with teaching when compared to baby boomers. Findings showed members of the baby boomer generation to be more satisfied with teaching overall. School district leaders should be mindful that while two generations were found to be less satisfied overall with teaching, 860 members of the baby boomer generation reported being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with teaching. District leaders may benefit from recognizing the number of current teachers reporting job dissatisfaction.

As principal leadership has been shown to be a contributing factor for teacher job satisfaction, district leaders may benefit from a deeper understanding of teacher leadership preferences. The current study showed teachers to be satisfied with their principal's leadership. The findings showed teachers to be the most satisfied with their principal's leadership in the area of their relationship with their principal. The findings showed teachers to be least satisfied with the support they receive from their principal specific to student discipline. With the literature showing support for student discipline and behavior to be an impactful area on teacher job satisfaction, it may benefit school district administrators and principals to develop systems of support for teachers in this area.

While sweeping generalizations based on generations should not be made about individual teacher satisfaction with principal leadership, district leaders may benefit from a deeper understanding of the leadership preferences of the millennial and Generation X generations. Based on the current study, this is especially true in the area of support for student discipline. The current study found these two generations to be significantly less

satisfied with their principal's support for student discipline than the baby boomer generation. With the millennial and Generation X teachers being the largest number of respondents, it may benefit districts to consider teacher leadership preferences as related to principal support for student discipline.

Recommendations for Future Research

The current study resulted in two major findings. The findings showed that while teachers are satisfied overall with teaching, when the data were extrapolated by generation, teachers of the millennial generation were found to be significantly less satisfied overall with teaching than members of the Generation X or baby boomer generations. As the millennial generation represents a significant portion of the teaching population, a future study could focus on specific measures districts could put in place to improve overall job satisfaction among that generational cohort group. In addition, results indicated a statistically significant difference in teacher satisfaction with their principal's support for student discipline among teachers who were born into different generations. Specifically, findings showed that teachers from the baby boomer generation are more satisfied with their principal's support as it relates to student discipline than teachers from the millennial or Generation X generations. As the majority of the teaching workforce are millennials and Generation X, a future study could focus on student behavior support systems that members of the millennial and Generation X generations prefer.

In the current study, only 25 members of Generation Z were represented due to the age of participants at the time the survey was administered (Church & Simmering,

2021). As Generation Z ages, it is presumed the number of teachers from that generation will increase in the teaching profession. Replication of this current study beyond the year 2021 could increase the number of participants from Generation Z. As studies have shown, a large number of teachers leave the profession in the first five years of teaching (Pas et al., 2012; Roberson & Roberson, 2009). Therefore, it would be beneficial for a future researcher to have an increased sample size of Generation Z teachers to gain more insight into their perceptions of the profession.

When the data were analyzed for the current research study, the ages of the teachers were grouped by generation. Some teachers are new to the profession, but were categorized in an older generation, based on age. A future researcher could investigate the significance of years of teaching experience rather than generation/age. This would allow a future researcher to determine which presented a greater impact on the results: the age of the participants or the number of years in the teaching profession.

The KTRI survey results, which provided the data for the current study, contained a total of 60 questions, with Likert scales utilized to measure three areas: satisfaction with specific aspects of being an educator, general engagement as an educator in the state of Kansas, and future intentions (Church & Simmering, 2021). A future study could examine other relationships within the data. Increasing the data set to include the results from the respondents' future intentions specific to leaving the profession would provide a researcher with more data pertaining to teacher attrition. Additionally, a future study could examine the relationship among all three areas (satisfaction with specific aspects of being an educator, general engagement as an educator in the state of Kansas, and future intentions) as related to the generation of the respondents. This type of future study

would add to the limited research on perceptions of educators by generation in the teaching profession.

Four items on the 2021 KTRI survey were related to participants' future intentions. The items (retiring within three years, planning to teach in another district, pursuing educational administration, leaving public education) were administered using a five-point Likert scale: *1 – Not Likely at All, 2 – Potentially but Not Likely, 3 – Somewhat Likely, 4 – More Likely than Not, 5 – Very Likely*. This data could be used in several future studies related to the current study. The responses from these items could be used to determine the extent to which teacher generation impacts a teacher's future intentions. In addition, a school district could use the results from the 2021 KTRI survey and compare it to district human resource data to determine if the 2021 future intentions of teachers matched real world decisions. Finally, the data from these items could be used to pinpoint groups of teachers at the highest risk for attrition. The data from the KTRI survey portion on the future intentions of teachers could be further separated by years of experience, grade level, or subject taught.

In addition to quantitative future studies, researchers could conduct a mixed-method study, where both quantitative and qualitative research techniques and methods are utilized in a single study. According to Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), mixed methods research "offers great promise for practicing researchers who would like to see methodologists describe and develop techniques that are closer to what researchers actually use in practice" (p. 14). A future mixed methods study would allow respondents

to provide open-ended responses to questions about job satisfaction and possibly provide greater insights into the issue of teacher retention and attrition.

Finally, on the topics of teacher job satisfaction, retention, and attrition, the researcher of the current study noted the possibility that literature written prior to the COVID-19 pandemic could reflect different results when compared to studies compiled after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. The current study was conducted in the fall of 2021, a year and a half after the pandemic had begun, but before school districts were fully aware of the long-term effects the virus had on the teaching profession. A future study could focus on teachers' perceptions of overall satisfaction in the areas of teaching and principal support as related to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Concluding Remarks

Although participants for this study represent teachers from only one state, the sample size of 18,247 teachers is significant and the results could be applied across the United States. Teacher job satisfaction will continue to be an issue as school districts struggle with teacher attrition and shortages. School districts can develop and implement targeted measures to improve teacher job satisfaction. Research has shown principal leadership and support impacts teacher job satisfaction. Therefore, teacher leadership preferences should be examined by district administrators and principals. As the demands on teachers intensify, systems of support will certainly be necessary. Addressing these issues openly could reflect an acknowledgement and understanding that concerns exist and that district administrators are willing to work with teachers to resolve them.

References

Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page Publishing.

Arnsparger, A. & Murphy, S. (2010). *Succeeding with colleagues, cohorts, & customers*. Claire Raines Associates.

Arroyo, M. A. (2021). *Leading schools with social, emotional, and academic development (SEAD)*. IGI Global.

Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: A literature review. *Management Research and Practice, 3*(4), 77-78. http://www.mrp.ase.ro/no34/f7.pdf

Barth, P., Dillon, N., Hull, J., & Higgins, H. (2016). *Fixing the holes in the teacher pipeline: An overview of the teacher shortages* (ED608871). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED608871.pdf

Bascia, N., & Rottman, C. (2011). What's so important about teachers' working conditions? The fatal flaw in North American educational reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, *26*(6), 787-802). https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.543156

Bureau of Labor and Statistics. (2014, September). Millennials after the Great Recession. https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2014/beyond-bls/millennials-after-the-great-recession.htm

Blazar, D., & Kraft, M. (2017). Teacher and teaching effects on students' attitudes and behaviors. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *39*(1), 146-170. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373716670260

Bobbitt, S. A., Faupel, E. F., & Burns, S. (1991). *Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results from the teacher follow-up survey, 1988-89*. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs91/91128.pdf

Bogler, R., & Berkovich, I. (2022). A systematic review of empirical evidence on teacher's organizational commitment 1994-2018. Leadership and Policy in Schools, *21*(3), 440-457. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2020.1774783

Borman, G. D., & Dowling N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 367-409. https://doi:10.3102/0034654308321455

Bos, J., Donders, N., Bouwman-Brouwer, K., & Van der Gulden, J. (2009). Work characteristics and detriments of job satisfaction in four age groups: University employees' point of view. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 82*(10), 1249-1259. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-009-0451-4

Bourne, B. (2015). Phenomenological study of generational response to organizational change. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 27*(4), 141-159. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44113688

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*(2), 303-333. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210380788

Brown, K. M., & Wynn, S. R. (2009). Finding, supporting, and keeping: The role of the principal in teacher retention issues. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *8*(1), 27-63. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760701817371

Buckley, P., Vienchnicki, P., & Baruahttp, A. (2015). A new understanding of millennials: Generational differences reexamined [Infographic]. Deloitte University Press. https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/insights/us/articles/understanding-millennials-generational-differences/DUP1276_Millennials_report_MASTER_101615.pdf

Burkhauser, S. (2017). How much do school principals matter when it comes to teacher working conditions? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *39*(1), 126-145. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373716668028

Business Health Group. (2020, January 9). *Job satisfaction: Trends and theories*. https://www.businessgrouphealth.org/resources/job-satisfaction-trends-and-theories

Butt, G., Lance, A., Fielding, A., Gunter, H., Rayner, S., & Thomas, H. (2005) Teacher job satisfaction: Lessons from the TSW Pathfinder Project. *School Leadership Management*, *25*(5), 455–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/13634230500340807

Carroll, T. G. (2012). *The high cost of teacher turnover* [Policy brief]. National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. https://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/NCTAFCostofTeacherTurnoverpolicybrief.pdf

Coates, J. (2007). *Generational learning styles*. LERN Books.

Church, B., & Simmering, L. (2021). *Kansas educator engagement and retention study*. Kansas Teacher Retention Initiative. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EgVOoy4lEJI0vI9Hxl2oltzCNoefj153/view

Colorado Department of Education. (2022, September 20). *Definitions of selected terms*. https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/rvdefine

Comperatore, E., & Nerone, F. (2008). Coping with different generations in the workplace. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, *6*(6), 15-29. https://doi.org/10.19030/jber.vi6i6.2428

Dahlkamp, S., Peters, M., & Schumacher, G. (2017). Principal self-efficacy, school climate, and teacher retention: A multi-level analysis. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *63*(4), 357-376. https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ajer/article/view/56351

Deal, J. J. (2007). *Retiring the generation gap: How employees young and old can find common ground*. Center for Creative Leadership.

Deloitte. (2016). *The 2016 Deloitte millennial survey: Winning over the next generation of leaders*. https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/About-Deloitte/gx-millenial-survey-2016-exec-summary.pdf

Dion, M. J. (2006). *The impact of workplace incivility and occupational stress on the job satisfaction and turnover intention of acute care nurses* (Publication No. 3221535) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Dunham, J., & Varma, V. P. (1998). *Stress in teachers: Past, present, future* (1st ed.). Whurr Publishers.

Economist Intelligence Unit. (2020). Future ready teaching: Nurturing tomorrow's educators [Infographic]. https://edudownloads.azureedge.net/msdownloads/Microsoft-Staff-2030-Infographic.pdf

Fenlason, K. J., & Beerh, T. A. (1994). Social support and occupational stress: Effects of talking to others. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(2), 157-175.

Fry, R. (2020, April 28). *Millennials overtake Baby Boomers as America's largest generation*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/04/28/millennials-overtake-baby-boomers-as-americas-largest-generation/

Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change: What the best leaders do to help their organizations survive and thrive*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gerhardt, M., Nachemson-Ekwall, J., & Fogel, B. (2021). *Gentelligence: The revolutionary approach to leading an intergenerational workforce*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Gordon, E. E. (2009). *Winning the global talent showdown*. Barrett-Koehler Publishers.

Gray, W., Carter, R., Koos, L., & Hoyt, G. (1921). Recruiting capable men for the teaching profession. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *4*(1), 9-11. https://www.jstor.org/stable/i20189359

Green, S. E. (2004). A rhetorical theory of diffusion. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(4), 653-669. https://doi.org/10.2307/20159076

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *42*(3), 333-356. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230410534667

Grissom, J. A. (2011). Can good principals keep teachers in disadvantaged schools? Linking principal effectiveness to teacher satisfaction and turnover in hard-to-staff environments. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(11), 2552-2585. https://my.vanderbilt.edu/jasongrissom/files/2012/05/principal-effectiveness-TCR-version.pdf

Grubb, V. M. (2017). *Clash of the generations: Managing the new workplace reality*. John Wiley & Sons. https://lccn.loc.gov/2016030971

Harari, T. T., Sela, Y., & Baraket-Bojmel, L. (2022). Gen Z during the COVID-19 crisis: A comparative analysis of differences between Gen Z and Gen X in resilience, values, and attitudes. *Current Psychology*, *41*(7), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03501-4

Haynes, M. (2014). *On the path to equity: Improving effectiveness of beginning teachers*. All4Ed. https://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/PathToEquity.pdf

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley.

Hora, G. R., Ribas R. J., & de Souza, M. A. (2018). State of the art job satisfaction measures: A systematic review. *Trends in Psychology, 26*(2), 971-986.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). The relationship between the perception of distributed leadership in secondary schools and teachers' and teacher leaders' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 20*(3), 291–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450902909840

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(3), 499-534. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499

Ingersoll, R. M. (2012). Beginning teacher induction: What the data tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(8), 47-51. https://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1239&context=gse_pubs

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(8), 30-33.

Iverson, R. D., & Currivan, D. (2003). Union participation, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: An event history analysis of the exit-voice hypothesis. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society, 42*(1), 101-105. https://doi.org/10.1111.1468-232X.00279

Johnson, M., & Johnson, L. (2010). *Generations, Inc: From boomers to linksters, managing the friction between generations at work.* American Management Association.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-16.

Johnson, S., Cooper, C., Cartwright, S., Donald, I., Taylor, P., & Millet, C. (2005). The experience of work-related stress across occupations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *20*(2), 178-187. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510579803

Kansas Association of School Boards. (2021, October 15). *Coalition of education groups, including KASB, working to address school workforce shortages* [Press release]. https://www.kasb.org/45132?articleID=88455

Kaur, A. (2013). Maslow's need hierarchy theory: Applications and criticisms. *Global Journal of Management and Business Studies*, *3*(10), 1061-1064. https://www.ripublication.com/gjmbs_spl/gjmbsv3n10_03.pdf

King, E., Finkelstein, L., Thomas, C., & Corrington, A. (2019, August 1). Generational differences at work are small. Thinking they are big effects our behavior. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2019/08/generational-differences-at-work-are-small-thinking-theyre-big-affects-our-behavior

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2011). The occupational commitment and intention to quit of practicing and pre-service teachers: Influence of self-efficacy, job stress, and teaching context. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *36*, 114–129. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.01.002

Kushman, J. W. (1992). The organizational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *28*(1), 5–42.

Lancaster, L. C., & Stillman, D. (2009). *When generations collide: Who they are. Why they clash. How to solve the generational puzzle at work*. Harper Collins. https://www.proquest.com/openview/ee94a3087929a389f1ee1c3def9c7a04/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=31933

Leithwood, K., Leonard, L., & Sharratt, L. (1998). Conditions fostering organizational learning in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *34*(1), 243-276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X98034002005

Liang, G., & Abika, M. (2017) Teachers' working conditions: A cross-national analysis using the OECD TALIS and PISA data. *International Handbook of Teacher Quality and Policy*, (pp. 388-402). Routledge Handbooks Online. https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315710068

Lovely, S., & Buffman, A. (2007). *Generations at school: Building an age-friendly learning community*. Corwin Press.

Luecke, R. (2003). *Managing change and transition: 7 practical strategies to help you lead during turbulent times*. Harvard Business School Press.

Markow, D., Macia, L., & Lee, H. (2013). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher: Challenges for school leadership*. New York Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. https://www.metlife.com/assets/cao/foundation/MetLife-Teacher-Survey-2012.pdf

Marx, G. (2006). *Future focused leadership: Preparing schools, students, and communities for tomorrow's realities* (ED509044). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509044

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 430-437. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

Maslow, A. H. (1987). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.). Harper & Row Publishers.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Van Nostrand Reinhold.

McGregor, D. M. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. McGraw-Hill.

Meek, A. (1998). America's teachers: Much to celebrate. *Educational Leadership, 55*(5), 12–17.

Meriac, J. P., Woehr, D. J., & Banister, C. (2010). Generational differences in work ethic: An examination of measurement equivalence across three cohorts. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(2), 315–324. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9164-7

Merrimack College & EdWeek Research Center. (2022). *First annual Merrimack College teacher survey: 2022 results*. EdWeek Research Center. https://fs24.formsite.com/edweek/images/WP-Merrimack_College-Todays_Teachers_Are_Deeply_Disillusioned_Survey_Data_Confirms.pdf

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *62*(2), 237-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237

Moir, E. (2009). Accelerating teacher effectiveness. Lessons learned from two decades of new teacher induction. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(2), 14-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170909100204

Muthu, K., & Yee, T. Y. (2011, June 16-18). *An analysis on workplace expectations among the white-collar employees across Baby Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y in Malaysia* [Conference presentation]. Conference on Interdisciplinary Business and Economics Research, Bangkok, Thailand. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1869381

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997, October). *The impact of the baby boom echo on U.S. public school enrollments*. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/web/98039.asp

National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments. (2022, July 3). *Environment: Discipline*. https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/topic-research/environment/discipline

Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishing: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory into Practice*, *42*(4), 341-350. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4204_12Parry, E. (2014). *Generational diversity at work: New research perspectives*. Routledge.

Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 13*(1), 79-96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00285.x

Petzko, V. N. (2004). Findings and implications of the NASSP national study of leadership in middle level schools, vol I and II: Teachers in middle level schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, *88*(638), 69-88. https://doi.org/10.1177/019263650408863806

Player, D., Youngs, P., Perrone, F., & Grogan, E. (2017). How principal leadership and person-job fit are associated with teacher mobility and transition. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 330-339. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.017

Pas, E. T., Bradshaw, C. P., & Hershfeldt, P.A. (2012). Teacher-and-school-level predictors of teacher efficacy and burnout: Identifying potential areas for support. *Journal of School Psychology*, *50*(1), 129-145.

Perrachione, B. A., Rosser, V. J., & Petersen, G. J. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *Professional Educator*, *32*(2), 30-47.

Pew Research Center. (2015, September 3). *The whys and hows of generations research*. The Pew Charitable Trusts. https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2015/09/03/the-whys-and-hows-of-generations-research/

Podolsky, A., Kini, T., Bishop, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *Solving the teacher shortage: How to attract and retain excellent educators*. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/262.960

Public Agenda. (2004). *Teaching interrupted: Do discipline policies in today's public schools foster the common good?* (ED485312). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED485312.pdf

Renzulli, L. A., Parrott, H. M., & Beattie I. R. (2011). Racial mismatch and school type: Teacher satisfaction and retention in charter and traditional public schools. *Sociology of Education*, *84*, 23-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040710392720

Richards, J. (2005). *Principal behaviors that encourage teachers: Perceptions of teachers at three career stages* (ED490357). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED490357.pdf

Roberson, S., & Roberson, R. (2009). The role and practice of the principal in developing novice first-year teachers. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *82*(3), 113- 118. https://doi.org/10.3200/TCHS.82.3.113-118

Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Education Research Journal*, 50(1), 4-36. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212463813

Russell, D. W., Altmaier, E., & Van Velzen, D. (1987). Job-related stress, social support, and burnout among classroom teachers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *72*(2), 269-274. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.72.2.269

Sass, D. A., Seal, A. K., & Martin, N. K. (2011). Predicting teacher retention using stress and support variables. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(2), 200-215. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116734

Schabracq, M. J., Winnubst, J. A., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). Burnout: An overview of 25 years of research and theorizing. In M. J. Schabracq, J. A. Winnubst, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The Handbook of Work and Health Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 383-425). http://www.al-edu.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Handbook-of-Work-and-Health-Psychology-2Ed-2003.pdf

Shin, H. S., & Reyes, P. (1991). *Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: Which comes first?* (ED 338596). ERIC. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED338596.pdf

Sims, S. (2017). *TALIS 2013: Working conditions, teacher job satisfaction, and retention* (ED 604491). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED604491

Sims, S. (2018). *Essays on the recruitment and retention of teachers* [Doctoral dissertation, London's Global University]. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/195304798.pdf

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(6), 129-138. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.001

Sorensen, L. C., & Ladd, H. F. (2020). The hidden costs of teacher turnover. *American Educational Research Association Open*, *6*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858420905812

Southard, G., & Lewis, J. (2004). Building a workplace that recognizes generational diversity. *Public Management Review*, *86*(3), 17-46.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Sage Publications.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future 1584 to 2069*. William Morrow & Company.

Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 46(*1*), 31-56. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670509353043

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A_Coming_Crisis_in_Teaching_REPORT.pdf

Tatar, M. (2009). Teachers turning for help to school counselors and colleagues: Toward a mapping of relevant predictors. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, *37*(2), 107-127.

Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, *73*(4), 71-97. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247

Travers, C. J. (2017). *Educator stress: An occupational health perspective*. Springer International Publishing.

Tyler, D. E. (2016). Communication behaviors of principals at high performing Title I elementary schools in Virginia: School leaders, communication, and transformative efforts. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, *2*(2), 2-16.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2022, June 23). *Methodology: Glossary*. http://uis.unesco.org/en/glossary

United States Census Bureau. (2019, December 19). *U.S. Census Bureau releases 2014-2018 ACS 5-year estimates* [Press release]. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/news/updates/2019.html

Wiedmer, Terry. (2015). Generations do differ: Best practices in leading traditionalists, boomers, and generations X, Y, and Z. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *82*(1), 51-58.

Will, M. (2021). Teachers are not ok, even though we need them to be. *EducationWeek*, *41*(7), 14-17. https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/teachers-are-not-ok-even-though-we-need-them-to-be/2021/09

Will, M. (2022). Teacher job satisfaction hits an all-time low. *EducationWeek*, *41*(31), 15-18. https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/teacher-job-satisfaction-hits-an-all-time-low/2022/04#:~:text=In%20interviews%2C%20teachers%20say%20they,all%20the%20work%20they%20do

Wilson, M., & Gerber, L. E. (2008). How generational theory can improve teaching: Strategies for working with the “millennials”. *Currents in Teaching and Learning*, *1*(1), 1-16.

Young, S. J., Sturts, J. R., Ross, C. M., & Kyoung, T. K. (2013). Generational differences and job satisfaction in leisure services. *Managing Leisure*, *18*(2), 152-170. https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2013.752213

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Flipczak, B. (2013) *Generations at work: Managing the clash of boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the workplace* (2nd ed.) American Management Association.

Appendices

Appendix A: Baker University IRB Approval to Conduct Research

Baker University Institutional Review Board

August 26th, 2022

Dear Emily Gill and Harold Frye,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your project application and approved this project under Exempt Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.
6. If this project is not completed within a year, you must renew IRB approval.

If you have any questions, please contact me at npoell@bakeru.edu or 785.594.4582.

Sincerely,

Nathan Poell, MLS
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Tim Buzzell, PhD
Nick Harris, MS
Scott Kimball, PhD
Susan Rogers, PhD

Appendix B: Request to Utilize Kansas Teacher Retention Initiative Survey Data

Gmail Emily Gill [redacted]

Permission to use data?
1 message

Emily Gill [redacted] Tue, Sep 27, 2022 at 9:47 AM
To: [redacted]

Dr. Simmering,

Thank you for meeting with me over the past few months. Based on our discussions with Dr. Church, I would like to officially request permission to use the following data for my dissertation from your Kansas Teacher Retention Initiative Survey (Fall, 2021).

College: Baker University
District: [redacted]

Dissertation Topic:
- Teacher job satisfaction as it relates to a teacher's generation designation and principal support

Request:
- State data from the KTRI survey with all district/location identifiers removed

Data from six survey items:
- Overall, I am satisfied with teaching.
- Your perception of the principal's effectiveness at your school.
- Your relationship with your principal.
- Your principal's instructional leadership.
- Your principal's ability to communicate and make changes within the school.
- The support you receive from your principal specific to student discipline.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Gmail Emily Gill <emilyagill@gmail.com>

Sent!

Luke Simmering [redacted] Tue, Sep 27, 2022 at 2:04 PM
To: Emily Gill [redacted]

Hi Emily,

Sorry for delay! Yes, using the de-identified data focused on the variables we discussed is fine.

I look forward to reviewing your research and please reach out with any questions.

Best,

Luke