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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative, causal-comparative study was to determine if there was a difference in perceptions of job satisfaction among full-time and part-time teachers who work in both private and public early childhood centers in South Carolina. This study adds to the literature by investigating the impact of work employment classification and type of school on job satisfaction of Early Childhood educators. It is important to investigate the job satisfaction of early childhood educators because job dissatisfaction and high turnover in centers can negatively impact young children. This study allowed 200 participants throughout multiple early childhood centers in South Carolina to complete the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire survey to determine any differences. A two-way ANOVA was conducted to conclude any differences and/or interactions among the groups. Results indicated there was no significant difference in job satisfaction among type of school and early childhood educators or between type of position and type of school environment. However, there was a difference in job satisfaction and employment work classification. Overall, early childhood educators are satisfied with their positions, despite many shortcomings in early childhood education. Recommendations for further research include exploring the job satisfaction of early childhood educators specifically in urban and rural areas, as well as including a qualitative approach to achieve a well-rounded look at the early childhood educator.
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Early Childhood Education (ECE)
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

This chapter begins with a brief background of the topic. The Problem Statement, Purpose Statement, and Significance Statement are followed by the research questions and definitions.

Background

Early childhood education is typically the education of children from birth to age eight (Krough & Slentz, 2001); however, different programs put an emphasis on different age groups, often highlighting ages three through five, before children officially attend elementary school. Early childhood education is a career that should not be taken lightly. Regardless of the age group a teacher is instructing, there are many demands on teachers in present day. Lesson plans, extra duties, and extracurricular activities, along with limited pay and resources can deplete the passion of any educator. Not only are demands high, but the children being educated are young and impressionable, requiring a certain amount of love and nurture. Krogh and Slentz (2001) point out that young children lack the ability to sort through what is important information and what is irrelevant, and because their brains lack this sophisticated ability, require teachers who are ethically and morally strong to help the children build a foundation for academics, as well as the world around them (Curtis & O’Hagan, 2003). For many decades, early childhood education was viewed as a career where children needed to be instructed how to socialize and show kindness to one another; however, studies completed in the 1990’s reveal that, while socialization is an important part of growing children, young children need strong programs in academics as well to become successful in later years (Currie, 2001; Krogh & Slentz, 2001).
Early Childhood Educator Positions and Facilities

There are many teaching positions in early childhood education, which require varying levels of education and experience. Teachers must develop an understanding of young children and what that means for their development and learning at the various age groups. The first role that is required in this field is a teacher’s aide. This career choice typically does not require any education and the pay is often very close to minimum wage (Krogh & Slentz, 2001). Aides assist teachers in various ways, including keeping the classroom clean, preparing activities, and grading projects. These positions are not to be confused with an Assistant Teacher, which typically requires an associate’s degree or child development certification (Krogh & Slentz, 2001). These teachers may be tasked with the same duties as a teacher’s aide, but may have more responsibilities in the instruction of the students. Their pay may be slightly above the aide, depending on the school they are employed. Lastly there is the role of teacher, who requires an associate’s or bachelor’s degree, and has the bulk of the responsibilities in the classroom (Krogh & Slentz, 2001). These lead or head teachers must write lesson plans, plan for activities using various curriculums, possess strong classroom management, and develop strong, friendly relationships with the students, staff, and parents. These teachers receive the highest pay, depending on education level and experience, as well the type of facility at which they are employed.

There are a variety of early learning centers that provide instruction to students in early childhood education. There are private schools, both secular and religious, that provide care to students from birth to age five. These centers may or may not include a preschool program, which follows a curriculum for academia in the early years (Nutbrown, 2011). Public facilities, such as First Steps and Head Start, provide similar preschool programs and are publicly funded.
(Gramling, 2015). These programs are often geared to parents who have a low socioeconomic status (Currie, 2001). Early intervention programs are also available, both publicly and privately, and offer services to students with disabilities (Krogh & Slentz, 2001; Nutbrown, 2011). These programs may be offered at a facility or they provide home visits for the children, depending on the disability. Finally, there is the elementary school, which provide five-year-old kindergarten, and may provide public 3K and 4K, depending on school district funding. These facilities are in an elementary school where the parents are zoned and provide instruction by a certified educator. The idea of kindergarten was well-supported by Friedrich Frobel, who believed kindergarten was a bridge year between home care and school (Morgan, 2011). This philosophy has changed greatly over the years, as kindergarten has been the topic of controversy because of the heightened academic demands placed on young children (Shepard & Smith, 1988; Goldstein, 2007; Pyle & DeLuca, 2013).

**Benefits of Early Childhood Education**

There are many benefits for enrolling children in early childhood education. Studies have shown that there is a link between children who are enrolled in early childhood learning centers and lower probability of going to prison as an adult. This study discussed by Mick Hicks in the Indianapolis Business Journal went on to state they “found early-childhood education outweighed virtually everything else government could do to boost long-run economic performance and enhance educational outcomes” (Hicks, pg. 26A, 2010) Another study researched the progress of children from economically disadvantaged homes who attended a TOP Early Learning Center in Midwestern United States. This study (Bakkin, Brown, & Downing, 2017) showed positive benefits for early childhood education, noting that students who attended a TOP Early Learning Center had higher math and reading scores than their peers
and fewer discipline referrals when in upper grades in elementary schools. What is more, those students who attended a TOP school for preschool and later qualified for special education were more likely to move to mainstream education classes faster than their peers in special education who did not. This study even showed positive results in social and emotional development of these children, suggesting students who were enrolled in a TOP facility for early childhood education were more emotionally mature and better in social situations than their peers who had not attended the facility. Further, early childhood programs have shown a positive impact on the economy, cultivating children who are more prepared for elementary school at beyond. These children have a great chance for higher education or going into the work force and becoming productive members of society (Bartik, 2010).

**Early Childhood Education and Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction has been widely researched over the years. Chamundeswari (2013) defines job satisfaction as “either a global feeling about the job or a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job.” With this definition, job satisfaction can be determined by viewing the position as a whole or various factors within the employment. This definition carries over to studying job satisfaction of early childhood educators because of the presence of a variety of factors that affect job satisfaction, such as supervision, work climate, pay and responsibilities (Rahim & Razzak, 2013). There is a direct correlation between job satisfaction and retention rates because studies show teachers who do not feel satisfied from their position will seek other employment (Bhamani, 2012). This feeling of satisfaction is key because fulfillment in the job is directly related to a teacher’s performance in the classroom, personal health and psychological health, and student development (Caprara et al., 2003). Teachers who attain satisfaction from their teaching experiences exhibit higher levels of motivation and lower
stress levels than their dissatisfied counterparts, which can lead to increased effectiveness in student performance (Goker, 2012).

There are many social benefits to maintaining quality and satisfied teachers in early childhood education, as it sets the foundation for the education of society’s next generation. Children who are enrolled in early learning programs have a greater chance for success in the later years because of the fundamentals they learn while enrolled in an early learning center (Enciso et al., 2010). Early education classrooms have been linked to not only positively impacting a child’s development, but society as a whole (Prendergast & Diamant-Cohen, 2014). One study states “Early childhood programs are an important part of intellectual development, as they allow children to build a solid learning base, accumulate human capital at a higher rate…and therefore perform better in school and in the labor market” (DeCicca & Smith, pg. 41, 2013). However, there are challenges to seeing these positive impacts due to negative factors. First, job dissatisfaction is linked to low job performance (Chamundeswari, 2013), which can be harmful academically and emotionally for children. Dissatisfaction with a job is also linked to high turnover in child care - the highest among school settings (Kusma et al., 2012). Highlighting why early childhood educators are more satisfied in their positions will help centers to determine the next steps to retaining effective teachers.

Studies show that well-designed strong early childhood programs have the ability to yield “higher achievement test scores, lower rates of grade repetition and special education, and higher educational attainment…reduced delinquency and crime in childhood and adulthood” (Barnett, 2010). On the contrary, dissatisfaction with a teaching position can negatively impact the children enrolled in the schools. Teachers who grow unsatisfied with their working conditions may begin to contribute less to their positions (Tasdan & Tiryaki, 2008). Dissatisfaction can also
cause health issues in the teachers. Teachers with negative issues on the job are linked to poor mental health, as well as a detachment to the position (Behera, 2014). This dissatisfaction can be exhibited a variety of ways, including a decline in relationship with children, potential aggression towards children, and potential neglect to job responsibilities (Bridges et al., 2011). Early childhood centers of all types depend on the teachers to help build loving and supportive relationship with the younger generations to build the curiosity and love for learning that will be needed as they move through school. As the level of dissatisfaction rises within a teacher, so does the desire to quit the position or the profession all together (Kusma et al., 2012).

There are a variety of factors that can influence job satisfaction. Fredrick Herzberg developed a theory that suggests there are two main factors that can affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction within a job - motivators and hygiene factors (Herzberg et al., 1959). Herzberg’s original study analyzed the positive and negative feelings many engineers and accountants associated with their jobs throughout the United States (Teck-Hong & Waheed, 2011). Motivators, such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement, are directly related to feeling gratified by a position, whereas hygiene factors, like salary, benefits, supervision, and work climate, are those related to negative feelings (Herzberg, 1966; Teck-Hong & Waheed, 2011). While these two factors can be found throughout multiple job positions, this research shows there are two separate entities affecting job satisfaction. Motivators are believed to directly impact positive feelings towards a position; while hygiene factors can cause dissatisfaction, but cannot lead to being content (Herzberg, 1966). Both motivators and hygiene factors can indicate job satisfaction, which can affect job performance. While this theory has received criticism, there have been many studies conducted to suggest it is valid (Sachau, 2007; Hyun & Oh, 2011).
Herzberg’s two-factor theory has been confirmed through a variety of studies on job satisfaction pertaining to education (Nias, 1981; Schroder, Ssesanga & Garrett, 2005; 2008; Costello & Welch, 2014). One study (Perrachione, Rosser, & Petersen, 2008) concluded similarly with Herzberg’s theory, citing that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors can affect job satisfaction, with the extrinsic factors only having a negative impact.

**Problem Statement**

There is insufficient research pertaining to job satisfaction of early childhood educators. Hall-Kenyon et al. (2013) noted that many studies focus on the relationship between salary and job satisfaction of early childhood educators, which does not take many other factors into consideration. One study researched job satisfaction between home, church, and public day care centers, but did not address secular private day cares, which is a large part of the early childhood center population (Kusma et al., 2012). Another study (Rahim & Razzak, 2013) analyzed the relationship between job satisfaction and public and private schools; however, the study does not look at the differences between the groups. It also suggested further study on a similar study with different demographics. While Wells (2015) determined teachers who were educated and married were more satisfied in their early childhood positions, the study did not look at employment status or type of school. The problem is research does not take into consideration other categories of teachers, such as work employment class, and compare the results to make clearer assumptions of the job satisfaction and views of retention of Early Childhood educators.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study is to examine the differences in perceptions of job satisfaction of part-time and full-time Early Childhood Educators in private and public school settings.
causal-comparative study will use a two-way Analysis of Variance to determine if there is a difference between the dependent variable job satisfaction and the independent variables of employment work classification and school type for early childhood education teachers. While early childhood educators can include any teacher in classes from birth to second grade, for this study early childhood education teachers will be defined as teachers teaching in three year-old, four year-old classrooms, and kindergarten classrooms. Part-time workers are those who work less than thirty hours a week, whereas full-time workers work thirty hours or more in a teaching environment. Public school teachers are employed in schools that receive either federal or state funding and private schools do not receive any funding from state or federal programs.

The participants for this study will be gathered from a random sample of teachers located in public and private early childhood centers across of South Carolina during the spring semester of the 2016-2017 school year. To reach the appropriate number of teachers, the researcher will set up a vendor’s booth at the South Carolina Early Childhood Association’s annual conference, providing a gift card incentive for those who complete the survey. Other surveys will be collected from various early childhood centers and schools based on approval by the center’s administrator. While the conference will offer a wide range of teachers from various socioeconomic areas in South Carolina, the researcher will only seek out additional school participating in Kershaw, Lexington, and Richland counties because of the large number of centers available in these areas. The demographics of the population also vary depending on the location of the county.

There will be 200 teachers surveyed, which exceeds the required minimum for a medium effect size. According to Gall et al. (2007) 194 participants are required for a medium effect size with a statistical power of .7 at the .05 alpha level in a 3 X 4 ANOVA. While this study is a 2 X
2 ANOVA, the number of participants will remain at 200 to provide clearer data. The schools will vary from low income to wealthy neighborhoods in both rural and urban areas. The population of teachers will be predominately female; however, the ethnicity, age, and education levels of the participants will vary. The sample will come from different public and private schools in both rural and urban areas. Within various schools, both part-time and full-time teachers will be surveyed from the three-year-old, four-year-old, and five-year-old kindergarten classes.

**Significance of the Study**

This study will add to the research on early childhood educators’ job satisfaction. High turnover rates at child-care facilities can negatively impact the social, emotional, and cognitive skills of the children they serve (Cassidy, Lower, & Kintner-Duffy, 2011). Students who are exposed to high turnover rates in school can also develop trust issues with educators because of the inconsistency (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2012). Moreover, there are economic and social advantages to solid early childhood education programs (Pendergast & Diamant-Cohen, 2014), which inspire the need to increase job satisfaction for Early Childhood educators. This study will examine the need to discuss teacher shortage, as well as explore strategies to retain teachers.

**Research Question**

The research question for this study is:

**RQ1:** Is there a difference in job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for early childhood educators in South Carolina based on school type (public or private) and employment work classification (full-time or part-time)?
Definitions

1. *Job satisfaction* – A pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences (Locke, 1976).

2. *Early childhood educator* – “any professional working in Early Learning and Development Programs, including but not limited to center-based and family child care providers, infant and toddler specialists, early intervention specialists and early childhood special educators, home visitors, related service providers, administrators, Head Start teachers, Early Head Start teachers, preschool and other teachers, teacher assistants, family service staff, and health coordinators” (U.S Department of Education, 2011).

3. *Full – time* – Center-based child care typically refers to full-day programs under social welfare auspices or free-standing and independent programs that offer care corresponding to the traditional working hours (e.g. 9:00 am to 5:00 pm or 7:00 am to 6:00 pm), and are open five days a week for the full year (Kamerman & Gatenio-Gabel, 2007).

4. *Part – time* – Preschools (or nursery schools in US Census Bureau reports) include the range of programs offered under public and private education auspices or providing compensatory education under special legislation and are largely half-day or cover the normal school day (usually about 6 hours…) (Kamerman & Gatenio-Gabel, 2007).

5. *Public School* – “a tuition-free, publicly funded system that must provide an education to each child in a neighborhood school within a publicly governed school system” (Resnick, 2004).

6. *Private School* – schools “managed by a non-government organization, such as a church, a trade union or a private institution” (Montt, 2011).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This chapter begins with a brief introduction, followed by the theoretical framework. The theories that direct this study are presented; Maslow’s Hierarchy of Need theory, Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory, Job Characteristics Theory, and the Theory of Work Adjustment. Next, is an extensive review of related literature. The chapter is concluded with a summary of the chapter.

Introduction

Early childhood education has been on the rise over the past decade as more mothers are returning to the workforce by the time their child is of preschool age, if not sooner (UNICEF, 2014). Research shows that children who receive good preschool educations fair better than their peers who do not. Barnett (2007) discussed the research and stated that “high-quality preschool education improves later school success, employment and earnings. It has lessened crime and delinquency and unhealthy behaviors… In economic terms, high-quality preschool has returned to the individual and the public up to $17 on every $1 invested.” These findings reveal how important preschool education is to a child’s future success, leading to the assumption that quality teachers, leadership, and curriculum are needed in these facilities to see these results. Because effective teachers are needed in these early years of education, it is important for researchers to look at different factors of job satisfaction to increase retention. The purpose of this study is to look at the differences of job satisfaction in teachers based on school type and job classification to examine which category may be more satisfied in their positions.

Choosing early childhood education as a profession requires specific abilities and demands because of the sensitive ages they are teaching. Preschool children are at a very important time in all areas of their development, including physically, socially and emotionally,
and cognitively, which requires teachers to plan for a day of activities that will help students learn to grow through play and interactions with others (Krogh & Slentz, 2001; Curtis & O’Hagan, 2003, Nutbrown, 2011). Play is a very important time for preschoolers; however, they also need exposure to various curriculums and assessments in literacy, mathematics, and science and social studies to help students build a basis for what they will build upon in elementary school and beyond (Curtis & O’Hagan, 2003). Not only are early childhood educators required to build a strong foundation in the classroom, but they are also expected to build strong relationships with the parents of their students and their community (Curtis & O’Hagan, 2003). Krogh and Slentz explain that “accomplished teachers know that positive outcomes result from viewing families as allies in their work” (Krogh & Slentz, pg. 13, 2001). These demands require early childhood educators to maintain a strong physical and mental capacity to keep up with the day to day requirements of teaching young children. When the teachers begin to deplete mentally and physically, it is not only affecting their own lives, but the lives of many young children in the classroom. Exploring what makes early childhood teachers happy in their positions can provide the necessary information to eliminate the possibility for job dissatisfaction.

**Theoretical Framework**

The following theories frame this study: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Need theory, Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory, Job Characteristics Theory, and the Theory of Work Adjustment.

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Need Theory**

To understand job satisfaction in educators, it is important to look at theories that pertain to human behavior to understand what makes people happy and unhappy in their positions. Maslow first introduced his needs theory to provide explanation for the way a human behaves
Maslow’s Hierarchy of Need Theory (1943) relates to human behavior, suggesting there are five needs humans have and in a specific order. Maslow suggested needs are in order from basic, physiological to more abstract needs. Every person has specific needs somewhere on Maslow’s hierarchy when it pertains to their jobs. For example, people need food and water to survive, followed by safety, social recognition, respect and approval, and finally self-actualization. The first set of needs must be attained before the next can be met, suggesting the last set of needs cannot be fulfilled until the other needs have been fulfilled. Maslow (1970) suggests these needs are required for humans to be motivated and driven to complete a task. In the realm of education, early childhood educators may feel their basic needs are met, but that they are unfulfilled the higher the need, which leads to job dissatisfaction.

Educators may feel their basic needs are met, but as their needs begin to grow up the hierarchy, their satisfaction with their job may decrease when the needs are unable to be met. For example, if an educator feels the need for recognition in their positions or respect from colleagues or supervisors and the need is not filled, the educator could become dissatisfied in their positions, leading to low work performance or resignation (Brien, Hass, & Savoie, 2012). As teachers’ needs begin to be met and continue up the hierarchy, the need for self-actualization becomes stronger, which can be met by teachers having the opportunity to voice their opinions in the decisions of the school (Jones, 1997). This leads to higher morale in the work place and lower retention.

**Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory**

Job satisfaction can impact a teacher’s health, student growth, and school success, and a variety of motivators, or their absence, can negatively or positively impact job satisfaction of
teachers. In 1968, Herzberg first suggested there are two factors that impact motivation at work. These two factors are known as motivation factors and hygiene factors, thus leading to the Two Factor Theory. Motivation factors are those that lead an employee to enjoy or gain contentment in a position, whereas hygiene factors do not positively impact job satisfaction, but can have a negative impact. Herzberg’s theory is akin to Maslow’s theory because hygiene factors are basic needs that someone needs to survive, and once those factors are obtained, more extensive elements are desired by a worker (Thibodeaux, et al., 2015). The motivation factors effects job satisfaction in a different way, as they “relate to that unique human characteristic, the ability to achieve” (Herzberg, p.113, 1987). Growth, advancement, as well as the feeling of partnership with an organization can be included as a motivator in satisfaction. It is important to note that even though hygiene factors are not negatively impacting a person, it does not mean that the person is satisfied; it just suggests there are not motivators to increase the satisfaction with the position (Shah et al., 2012).

Herzberg’s theory (1968) originally stemmed from a study completed researching job satisfaction among engineers and accountants. Since the study, Herzberg’s theory has been applied to a multitude of occupations, including the teaching profession. In regards to education, Ololube (2006) claims that motivators should be at the forefront of school improvement, seeing that Herzberg theorized the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. This suggests that the elimination of dissatisfaction does not necessarily mean a teacher will be satisfied with their school; therefore, to improve morale and increase retention, motivators must be present. Randal Jones (1997) references Herzberg’s theory in his study linking high staff morale to teachers being involved in the decision making in schools. Not only does decision making lead to happier teachers, it is also linked to more effective work environments. Similar to Jones’ study,
Leithwood and McAdie (2007) also cite Herzberg’s theory in their study on teacher job satisfaction, finding that certain motivators that increase morale are decision making, collaborative work groups, and consistent professional development opportunities.

**Job Characteristics Theory**

Another theory that correlates with job satisfaction is the Job Characteristics Theory (1975). This theory suggests that the characteristics of a position can be directly related to the outcomes in the position. Hackman, Oldham, Janson, and Purdy (1975) compare work to play, suggesting that people who are successful in their jobs view it as satisfying as they view play. These views translate to high job satisfaction because it gives workers intrinsic satisfaction and determination to work hard. There are five characteristics within the model, including autonomy, task identity, task significance, skill variety, and feedback. These characteristics impact the three psychological conditions of experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of actual results, which then stimulate outcomes, including job satisfaction (Hackman et al., 1975). The three psychological conditions lead to someone feeling positive when he or she feels their performance has been high quality. Job Characteristics Theory is a chain reaction leading to satisfaction or dissatisfaction within a position. The theory suggests teachers need the three psychological states to be present concerning the classroom, school environment, or a combination of the two to have positive job satisfaction within a school (Hackman et al., 1975).

**Theory of Work Adjustment**

The Theory of Work Adjustment seeks to explain work adjustment outcomes (satisfactoriness, satisfaction, and tenure) by studying the interaction between work personality and the work environment (Weiss, 1967). The theory states that “vocational abilities and
vocational needs are the significant aspects of the work personality, while ability requirements and reinforce systems are the significant aspects of the work environment” (Weiss, 1967, pg. v). The theory suggests the adjustment to a job can be projected by matching work personality to work environments. This means the adjustment an individual has to a job depends on the correspondence of their abilities and the requirements of the position, as well as the reinforcers available in the work environment (Weiss, 1967). This theory was tested throughout the research yielded from the Work Adjustment Project. The findings indicate that a person’s needs at a job are measurable and can be found separately from job satisfaction (Weiss, 1967). The Work Adjustment Project led to the development of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, after the instruments the study was using became complicated to score. Originally the study used the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank and the Employee Attitude Scale, as well as 22 other experimental questions to test the theory (Weiss, 1967). The length of the survey, as well as the different weights of questions, caused researchers to develop a shorter instrument that was easier for the participants to read and researchers to score, resulting in the MSQ (Weiss, 1967).

**Related Literature**

While early childhood education encompasses all children from birth to age eight (Holochwost et al., 2009), most early childhood centers serve children from birth to age five. Early childhood care centers continue to open in all areas, from rural to urban, classified as both private and public to meet the needs of the various demographics in each area. Kindergarten refers to the year before children attend elementary school; however, many elementary schools now offer kindergarten in their elementary program though it is sometimes not required in various states. Many private preschools which accommodate children birth or pre-kindergarten often offer an optional five-year-old kindergarten for parents who prefer to keep their children in
a private setting before attending public education. Preschools and nursery schools are referred to synonymously, and refer to programs for three and four-year-olds. These programs are often “half-day or cover the normal school day (usually about 6 hours…)” (Kamerman & Gatenio-Gabel, p. 24, 2007).

Beyond kindergartens and preschools are center-based child care and family child care. Center-based child care is full day, often in operation for ten to twelve hour days. These full-day programs often offer preschool half of the day, typically in early morning, with basic childcare when the preschool curriculum has completed. These centers range in the ages they accommodate; however, six weeks is often the youngest, with four to five years being the oldest. Family child care refers to the care of infant to preschool age children in a caregiver’s home. Like both preschools and center-based child care, these facilities have rules they are required to follow, as well as limitations on the number of children they can accommodate. Almost all childcare facilities, regardless of whether they are public or private are required by state law to “be licensed in some way by the states with regard to health and safety standards, staff-child ratios, maximum number of children per group, nutrition and have at the least annual inspections” (Kamerman, p 24, 2007).

As the number of children enrolled in early childhood centers rise, so have the expectations of early childhood educators. These teachers are expected to complete daily lesson plans, follow state and federal protocols, as well as provide emotional and social well-being to the preschoolers in their classrooms (Wells, 2015). These expectations continue to become more demanding as research continues to show effective early childhood centers have a direct correlation with positive reading and math scores in later elementary years (Ladd, Muschkin, & Dodge, 2014). With the rise in expectations comes the effects on job satisfaction, potentially
leading to high turnover rates among early childhood care centers. This has led to the need for research regarding perceptions of job satisfaction among early childhood educators to stifle teacher turnover and enhance the development of effective preschool teachers.

**Early Influences of Early Childhood Education**

To understand the decisions made in early childhood education in America, it is important to look at the early influences that persuaded those choices. In the late 17th century, England began a movement known as the charity school movement (Cahan, 1989). While children of affluent families had access to education, there were a variety of social problems in England during this time and many advocates for the schools believed that providing child care for poor children could help alleviate these issues. The movement was very successful and by the mid eighteenth century, tens of thousands of poor children in England were attending these schools; however, they were not geared towards preschool children (Cahan, 1989). It was not until the nineteenth century that England realized they needed to address care for preschool children, specifically those of the working class, because of the rise of the Industrial Revolution and working mothers (Cahan, 2006). With the increased number of factory workers being mothers and children, it became apparent that appropriate care for the young children was imperative because the lack of proper care was causing the infant and child mortality rate to skyrocket (Hayes, 1916). Eventually, multiple programs sprouted what were known as infant schools, which were created to help the working class families and society as a whole (White & Buka, 1987). Once again, it was believed that providing education to the poor youth could potentially break the cycle of poverty because both affluent and poor children were receiving appropriate care, whether at home in the wealthy homes or in an infant school for the poor children (Kamerman, 2006).
Eventually it became illegal for children under a certain age to work in the factories, making the need for the infant school even more great, and preschools for children as young as eighteen months were being built throughout Great Britain (Cahan, 1989). These schools were attractive to many advocates because the education provided concentration on character building, as well as Christian teachings, and they continued to achieve popularity all over Western Europe (Kamerman, 2006). However, as popular as these facilities were becoming, there were concerned citizens who felt that the infant schools did more harm than good. Some believed that separating young children from their mothers was harmful to the natural maternal relationship, while others believed that it was not appropriate to educate poor children because then they would resent their socioeconomic status (Forest, 1927). Regardless of the concerning opinions, the infant schools in England became very popular and had the support of many in society as well as politically. They also paved the way for early childhood education in the United States, as many of the founding ideas inspired early American childcare decisions and beyond.

**History of Early Childhood Education in America**

Early childhood education in the United States rose from various factors in society, including socioeconomic status, moral teachings, and the rise of maternal employment. The development of early childhood education has taken on many forms in the United States since the nineteenth century. Early childhood education centers in the early 1800s, known originally as infant schools, were created for two reasons. First, these schools were originally created for children from families of poverty (Cahan, 1989). The idea behind early childhood education at this time was poor families were not competent enough to raise productive members of society; therefore, providing early education for poor children could potentially reverse the cycle (Kagan, 2009). In addition to reversing the cycle of poverty, it was believed that early childhood
education would ultimately make for a better society because the children could be molded at a young age (Nutbrown & Clough, 2014). Others believed that providing early childhood education to young children would help children become more advanced in preparation for elementary school and beyond (Cahan, 1989). These two origins of early childhood education paved the way to how Americans view education for children before elementary school.

Taking a deeper look into the origin of early childhood education with the purpose to rear children of poverty, many educators in America believed this time in education could be used to provide moral education to these children (Morrison, 2006). Society viewed parents from a low socioeconomic status as incapable of teaching good values and morals to their children because of their financial situation. Furthermore, educators hoped that students would take the moral teachings they learned during the school day and teach the others in the household how to lead honest lives (Cahan, 1989). These schools were mirrored after the infant schools in Europe, and “by the late 1820s, civic-minded social elites in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston had opened infant schools with moralistic intentions” (Cahan, p.10, 1989). These schools mirrored early education of the twenty-first century, with the ages of children enrolled between 18 months and 4 years old, as well as the hours of operation beginning early morning at 6 am and ending mid-evening at 7 pm (Cahan, 1989). The implementation of early childhood education centers suggests the idea that fostering learning prior to elementary school could potentially help poor children eventually break the poverty barrier. It was also believed that providing childcare facilities to the poor would rid them of the stress of raising children; therefore, the adults could concentrate on working to overcome poverty (Kuhn, 1947). The other origin of early childhood education centers was led by a group who believed providing education to children prior to elementary school would help those students get ahead in cognitive growth and learning (Cahan,
Unlike the schools created for poor children, these educators created schools for affluent children, creating a divide between the two economic groups.

This push for early education for both the poor and wealthy was short-lived, and by the 1830s, the home was believed to be the best place for young children to be taught before beginning their education in elementary school (Cahan, 1989). However, the effects of the early infant schools would resonate at the beginning of the 20th century when care for children of the working class was still a necessity for some poorer families and early education was desired for the wealthier children. Thus a great divide continued to be perpetuated well into the turn of the century between day nurseries for the poor and private nursery schools for the wealthy.

The Day Nursery

The day nursery in the history of American education stemmed from the original infant schools geared towards poor children. While many families carried traditional roles where the mother stayed at home to care for the children while the father worked outside the home, there were still families who had two working parents and needed childcare for their children. Aside from these working families, there was also a rise in the concern for children of poverty as a whole by the end of the 1800s (Morrison, 2006). Many charities began to have a heightened interest in a “child saving movement,” including the creation and implementation of a variety of educational and child care programs. The rise of these charities was based on society’s perception of children of poverty as victims of their circumstances (Bremner, 1956). This was the root of the rise of the day nursery because many activists felt there was a need for change in the poor children who were left alone by both working parents into the care of anyone who was able (Rosenau, 1894). To the activists, day nurseries were the answer to relieve children from hazardous conditions of being left alone with substandard care. The first day nursery served
children as young as six weeks old and was established in 1854 in New York for children with two working parents (Cahan, 1989). Over the next sixty years, the rise of day nurseries continued to expand in the urban areas of northern states; however, the demand for this early form of early childhood education would rise dramatically during times of crisis and war, only to drop again once the troubling times has decreased (Kamerman, 2006).

Unlike the early childhood centers of modern America, the main goal of the day nurseries was to promote cleanliness and hygiene in children (Cahan, 1989). The children were not exposed to daily lessons and rarely experienced play; however, the centers were diligent in providing a clean environment (Cahan, 1989). Many nurseries were unable to provide adequate meals for the children, and many times there was only one worker to care for as many as 50 children at one time (Rosenau, 1894). It was not until the early 1900’s that the day nurseries attempted to address other needs of the children, such as educational and social (Cahan, 1989). The shift towards addressing educational and developmental needs became increasingly popular during the turn of the century, as many immigrants began to seek residency on American soil (Cahan, 1989). The day nurseries began to teach both immigrant children and their parents about a variety of American norms and customs (Addams, 1910). By World War I, day nurseries continued to gain popularity throughout America, with the rise of immigrants and their children; however, the main focus on the day nurseries working class parents (Cahan, 1989). When the study of child psychology began to rise in the 1920s and 1930s, more affluent parents believed that professionals in a day nursery setting were necessary in helping to raise young children because these workers offered an expertise in child development the average parent may not have (Cahan, 1989). Since the social welfare system was beginning to change its perception of
the appropriate help low income families should receive, the day nurseries were negatively impacted by new interest in child psychology (Cahan, 1989)

**The Nursery School versus the Day Nursery**

The emergence of the nursery school as opposed to the day nursery began in the 1920s, and its creation resonated with the previous divide in early childhood education and socioeconomic status (Cahan, 1989). As seen previously, the two origins for ECE were to help poor families raise their children and to provide a head start for affluent families. While this idea seemed to fade away in the late 1800s, it quickly arose again with the existence of the nursery school (Cahan, 1989). Many of the nursery schools were affiliated with colleges and universities because they provided an instant laboratory for the study of children (Shonkoff & Meisels, 2000). The purpose of these schools was to help children develop socially through play, as well as learning other responsibilities in self-regulation (Shonkoff & Meisels, 2000). Unlike the day nursery, which did not always concentrate on developing the child, the nursery school was considered a “…place where the individualism fostered at home might be tempered by an emphasis on the requirements of collective life and… provided an unparalleled opportunity for children…to interact with other young children in an environment that promoted normal social development” (Cahan, 22, 1989). Many advocates even argued that children who attended nursery school had improved home relationships because they were provided with purposeful teachings that developed the whole child (Woolley, 1926).

Day nurseries began to feel the pressure to raise their standards because of the growing popularity in of nursery schools among the public. Day nurseries worked to steer away from concentrating on hygiene and instead worked to focus their attention on the development of the child cognitively, emotionally, and physically. This “led to the reduction of teacher-child ratios
the acquisition of more and better equipment, the use of a coherent pedagogical component, and other innovations” (Cahan, p. 24, 1989). Day nurseries also sought educated teachers for their facilities to compete with what the nursery school had to offer; however, they still fell short of the nursery school due to lack of funds and inability to retain high quality workers (Cahan, 1989). When the Great Depression hit the United States in the 1930’s, it took a toll on both day nurseries and nursery schools. The student/teacher ratio increased considerably because of the inability to compensate teachers during the stressful economic times (Cahan, 1989). Though there were limited resources, day nurseries and nursery schools worked to continue on in an effort to provide care and education to young children, but their popularity was on the decline.

**Early Childhood Education during World War II**

A boom for the need for early childhood education was seen during World War II because of the increased number of women who became a part of the work force. Though the number of mothers working was rising, appropriate care was on the decline due to insufficient facilities, and many women did not want to put their children in any kind of child care facility because of the lack of quality in care in many of the remaining facilities (Cahan, 1989). There was also increased pressure from the government for women to stay at home with their children, stating “in this time of crisis ... mothers of young children can make no finer contribution to the strength of the nation and its vitality and effectiveness in the future than to assure their children the security of home, individual care, and affections” (Child Welfare League, 1942, p. 7). Because child care centers were considered a low-priority budget item, many centers received little or no federal funding. The government made it very difficult to obtain federal funds to operate any type of childcare center, creating “a bureaucratic maze in which no fewer than seven different agencies were involved in allocating funds (Cahan, p. 30, 1989).
Childcare Post World War II and Head Start

By the end of the war however, the government committed to provide more funds for childcare centers as more women decided to continue to work after the war (Cahan, 1989). Most child care facilities were still modeled after day nurseries and geared to the working class and poorer families (Cahan, 1989). Many advocates still felt there was a need for childcare for children of poverty because they were victims of their socioeconomic status, and they believed early childhood education could help children grow out of poverty. This led to the creation of Head Start in the 1960s as a summer program funded by the federal government; however, it was such a success the centers expanded to a full school year program for poor children (Kamerman, 2006). Many federal initiatives had been established during previous emergencies in America, such as The Great Depression and World War II; however, once these challenges were over the funding was stripped away from these institutions (Kagan, 2009). Head Start was different.

President Lyndon B. Johnson affirmed a war on poverty, and the Head Start program was one of the answers to conquering that war (Office of Head Start, 2015). The presidential administration believed early childhood education gave poor children a way to compete with more affluent peers, which, in turn, could help break the cycle of poverty in American society (Cahan, 1989). This way of thinking was very similar, if not identical to the origins of American early childhood education; however, the Head Start program had different aspects than previous childcare for the poor. Like many childcare facilities before it, the goal of Head Start was to provide these children with “a year-long program of social and cognitive enrichment, medical care, and nutrition…,” and, unlike many early day nurseries, it is still in operation today (Cahan, p. 33, 1989; Kagan, 2009). Aside from socialization and literacy, one beneficial aspect of Head Start was the involvement of parents and community, promoting the idea that reaching the whole child
would help them to thrive in the future (Cahan, 1989). Not only does Head Start provide educational services to underprivileged preschool children, it also provides “health, nutrition, social and other services” (Kamerman & Gaternio-Gabel, p. 24, 2007). Head Start continues to thrive today serving millions of children in rural and urban areas all of the United States, make it a very successful federal initiative in the history of American early childhood education (Office of Head Start, 2015).

Head Start continued to thrive throughout the years, making its’ main focus for the program was poor children. However, there was an increased need for appropriate childcare among middle class families throughout the 1970s and beyond, as more and more middle class women decided to continue to work outside of the home even after their born (Kamerman, 2006). This was different than in previous decades when women sought out employment while their husbands were away at war or because they had been left widowed or abandoned. This was a new age where women were choosing to leave the home to work because they wanted to be a part of the professional world. There was also a change in view of preschool education by middle class parents. Previously, the middle class viewed the home to be the appropriate place to raise children before elementary school; however, now they “increasingly viewed preschool as a valuable experience for their children, and essential for facilitating an easier transition to school” (Kamerman, 2006).

The Creation of NAEYC

During the rise of childcare facilities in the 1920s, a group of researchers came together and felt there needed to be an organization that would concentrate on the standards of which the facilities should be held (NAEYC, 2016). The organization was eventually titled the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). During the Great Depression,
many teachers were out of work because of the lack of funds to run childcare facilities and compensate teachers. The federal government’s response to this crisis was the Works Progress Administration (WPA), which provided funds for unemployed childcare workers (Cahan, 1989). The NAEYC had activists helping to develop and implement the programs for the WPA. During World War II, the NAEYC also helped to create and implement programs under the Lanham Act, which provided childcare for any child whose mother worked for the cause while their husband was at war (Cahan, 1989). After the Depression and into World War II, the NAEYC held various conferences, published conferences, and expanded its organization to ensure that childcare facilities had the optimal information to provide the best care for the children (NAEYC, 2016). In the 1980s, membership continued to grow as the needs for childcare grew for families where other parents wanted to work outside of the home (NAEYC, 2016). The National Association for the Education of Young Children continues to set standards for childcare facilities today, both public and private, to ensure that children receive the care and development they deserve.

**Early Childhood Education Today**

The early origins of early childhood education set the foundation for early childhood centers today. There is a difference between modern day care centers and preschools, and the children who have access to them. There is a vast difference in preschool participation based on race, socioeconomic status, and geographic location (Kagan, 2009). White children, as well as upper middle class and wealthy families, are more likely to be enrolled in a preschool program than African American children or children from lower and middle class families (Kagan, 2009). However, children from low income families were more likely to be enrolled in preschool
programs than children from middle class families because of the eligibility for government assistance (Kagan, 2009).

There is also a significant difference in the quality of care between centers with a higher population of children of lower income families than those from upper middle class and wealthy families. There is great inequality in the facilities accommodating poor children and wealthy children, especially seen in the teachers employed. When it comes to success in early childhood centers “the single more important determinant of quality and the factor most related to achieving critical outcomes for children is the quality of faculty who work directly with young children” (Kagan, p. 12, 2009). More affluent children have access to centers where the teacher retention rate is higher, as well as teacher compensation (Kagan, 2009).

**Job Satisfaction**

The studying of job satisfaction became popular in the 1930s, with the increase interest in the attitudes of factory workers on the job. Uhrbrock (1934) studied the attitudes of factory workers. The results of this study, and many others like it during this time, were intended to help factory owners and foremen understand what caused irritation in the work place in order to keep a balance of harmony and productivity. The idea as early as the study of factory workers is that if employees are content on the job, they will execute the demands of the job more efficiently. A study completed shortly after Uhrbrock’s specifically focused on job satisfaction in the work place. Hoppock (1935) suggested that there may be a variety of attributes at a job that cause both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and workers can balance the factors to develop a combined idea of satisfaction within a position.

These studies began to shed light for leaders in the work place to determine what a job atmosphere must look like for workers to be truly content in the workplace; however, the
interests were not solely on factory workers. Since the beginning studies of jobs satisfaction, many other occupations have been studied to determine what builds morale in the work place. Studies completed on registered nurses found that many pediatric nurses become frustrated with healthcare administrators and managers because of leadership quality. This research led to an increase in enrollment for Masters in Nursing programs hoping to strengthen leadership to alleviate this issue (Roberts-Turner, et al., 2014).

Teachers have been studied extensively because of the impact they have on society. Nearly every child encounters a teacher at some point in their life, with the majority of children spending their lives from three-year-old kindergarten to high school exposed to countless teachers. An increase in the need to study what gives teachers job satisfaction, along with what factors lead to their departure from schools and the field all together have risen to high importance to provide children with a quality education from the moment they step through a school house doorway.

Teacher job satisfaction is important to study because the happiness of educators is linked to their job output. A MetLife survey completed in 2013 showed that 39% of teachers are satisfied with their jobs, which shows a significant decrease from 62% in five years earlier in 2008 (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2013). When teachers possess high morale, and are satisfied at their work place, interactions with students are more positive, which leads to better education (ColakoGlu & Odabas, 2013). Unfortunately, turnover and decreased efficiency in education are continuing to increase (Akhtar & Naureen, 2012). Even if job satisfaction is not enough to force educators to leave all together, it does decrease motivation to work hard in the field, causing the students to suffer (Shen, et al., 2012). The expertise and commitment of a
teacher is critical to mold students into self-sufficient and curious learners who have the
capability to run a society when generations ahead have passed on.

Teacher job dissatisfaction can infect a learning environment, causing students and a
community to be negatively impacted in the end. The need to study job satisfaction in teachers
began in the mid-twentieth century, with early studies (Chase, 1954; Sergiovanni, 1967;
Studies have analyzed teachers across the United States, in both elementary and secondary
schools, finding a variety of factors to affect job satisfaction in teaching, including marriage,
salary, and age; however, a factor to have a major impact on job satisfaction was being part of a
democratic working environment. Teachers wanted their voices heard in issues pertaining to
policies, procedures, and curriculum. Positive opinions towards school leadership were also
correlated with high job satisfaction (Al-Mahdy, et al., 2016). Many of these factors were
highlighted again by Hunter (1955) and Carpenter (1971), who added that job dissatisfaction had
the potential to plague the quality of education for students. Bhamani (2012) claims the teaching
quality of teachers is impacted by their job satisfaction, leading to the idea that teachers who are
unsatisfied with their positions are more likely to be ineffective teachers. This assumption found
in later studies further explains why it is so important to have satisfied teachers in schools.

Teacher retention is directly correlated with level of job satisfaction in teachers. If a
teacher is satisfied with the work environment, then the chances of remaining in the position are
great. However, the opposite is just as true. Teachers who are not satisfied with the work
environment will leave, causing turnover within schools. Turnover rates among early childhood
educators is between 25% and 50%, causing in stability among the children (Barnett et al.,
2010). However, a challenge with turnover information is that teacher retention is not as widely
studied as teacher job satisfaction, especially in regards to early childhood education. One early study (1993) suggested teacher retention was affected by wages; more specifically, teacher turnover was higher when the wages were low. Other studies (Gaikhorst et al, 2014) suggest factors such as support and recognition are key in retaining early childhood teachers, specifically environments where teachers felt comfortable with making a mistake, as well as having other teachers observe instruction to provide positive feedback (Gaikhorst et al, 2014). Retention does begin to increase among early childhood educators who stay in the field for at least five years, suggesting many instances of turnover pertains to teachers with less than five years of experience (Holochost et al., 2009). However, few studies have been conducted to determine the true effects of teacher turnover because it is hard to track if the teachers who quit one early childhood care center because of poor job satisfaction, take their dissatisfaction to another center or quit the field altogether.

Early childhood teachers help set the foundation of the students they teach. Many new demands have been placed on these teachers as their effectiveness grew to be a cause for concern in the education world. No longer were these educators seen as baby-sitters needed while parents worked from 9-5, but as important contributors to the education of each generation (Hall-Kenyon et al., 2014). Early childhood educators are expected to write lesson plans, differentiate instruction, and teach social and emotional skills in addition to academics. Early childhood educators cite many positive aspects to their positions that lead to positive job satisfaction, including interactions with children, supportive coworkers, and a positive work environment (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). However, there have been an increase in documentation and administrative requirements required for preschool teachers by state and federal leaders, including additional paperwork and specific policies and procedures regarding caring for the
children and maintaining employment (Wells, 2015). These changes have led to heightened job dissatisfaction among these teachers, leading to high turnover rates and low quality instruction (Osgood, 2006). Highlighting potential factors leading to job satisfaction provides more information for the reasons behind job dissatisfaction and high turnover.

**Salary**

One factor that can lead to dissatisfied teachers is salary. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014), the average full-time early childhood educator makes $13.52 an hour, slightly less than the South Carolina state average of $14.84 an hour. These numbers equal to an estimated annual salary between $28,000 and $30,000 for full time early childhood educators. Part-time teachers make half the salary of full-time teachers, or an estimated $15,000 annually. According to one study (Moloney, 2010), early childhood educators expressed dissatisfaction in their pay, complaining that early childhood teachers make comparable pay to positions with no job responsibilities, such as stocking merchandise or cooks in fast food industries. Adebayo and Gombakomba’s (2013) study implies the less early childhood teachers are given financially, the higher their job dissatisfaction. However, the opposite was found for Head Start teachers, both full-time and part-time. Bullough’s (2012) research on job satisfaction and Head Start teachers found both full-time and part-time teachers were highly satisfied with their positions, despite the low pay. These teachers cited their satisfaction to be derived from their interests in working with children, valuing Head Start goals, enjoying their coworkers, and the intrinsic belief they were successful in their positions (Bullough, 2012). The motivator of working with children was also found in another study, which also concluded that there was no evidence salary was linked to high job satisfaction (Rochchina & Filippova, 2014). Further Hall-Kenyon et al (2014), also found in a review of literature that pay was one of the most common topics discussed amongst
early childhood teachers in the studies reviewed, specifically citing that many studies highlighted low pay having a negative impact on the teachers and early education as a field. Bullough’s findings and Hall-Kenyon’s review of the literature further connect with Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory, who theorized salary, a hygiene factor, did not positively affect job satisfaction, but could have a negative impact (Bullough, et al., 2012; Hall-Kenyon, et al., 2014).

Stress

Stress is another factor that can impact job satisfaction of early childhood educators, which can significantly impact the well-being of teachers. Job satisfaction is more correlated to mental and psychosocial challenges among teachers than physical disorders (Behara, 2014). This implies that while teachers may not be physically injured on the outside of the body, the challenges work stressors can cause for social and emotional self are just as debilitating. Research shows that a teacher’s emotional well-being can have an influence on students academically and socially and is even linked to higher academic gains in later years (Kirkland, 2013). However, children who are exposed to teachers who experience higher levels of stress may not show these higher academic gains because of a teacher’s emotional instability. These mental and psychosocial challenges can lead to more teachers to take sick days and teacher turnover. Higher workloads and student misbehavior can cause stressful situations in the classroom or school, which can often lead to lower job satisfaction (Klassen & Chui, 2010). Early childhood educators expressed emotional exhaustion from their positions as teachers (Tsigilis et al., 2006). A study found a cause of these stressors can be linked to the demands of time, specifically the amount of time teachers are away from the children and working on other tasks not directly related to the position (Ylitapio-Mantyla et al., 2012). The study further explained teachers articulated they were much happier in their positions when they were directly
working with the children, leading to the assumption a large amount of time is taken away from the children to accomplish administrative tasks. Another study (Wagner. Et al., 2013) found that fulltime early childhood educators felt more stress than part-time teachers working with similar age groups. There was no significant relationship between stress and years of experience, leading to the conclusion that fulltime early childhood educators feel more stress regardless of years of experience than their part-time counterparts.

In addition, Collie et al. (2012) found the link between job satisfaction and stress, but also teaching efficacy. The study results showed that teachers who are not confident in their abilities in the classroom can become overcome with stress, which in turn leads to being unsatisfied on the job. When teachers do not feel confident in their position, low self-esteem can arise, causing more psychological factors. Self-esteem and job satisfaction are directly correlated, given that when the self-esteem is high or low, so is the level of job satisfaction (Sharma & Manani, 2012). Thus early childhood centers should look at the various aspects of the work environment that are causing stress for the teachers and find ways to modify them in order to build self-esteem and job satisfaction.

**Supervision**

Job satisfaction can also be affected by supervision. Bhamani (2012) found in one study that early childhood teacher perception to those in supervisory roles at a given school strongly predicts job satisfaction. Teachers want to feel appreciated and needed, as well as to be provided with reassurance they are doing well in the classroom (Gangwani, 2012). Teachers can receive these positive reinforcements in a variety of ways, whether it be in an email or at a staff meeting; however, the absence of these reinforcements can negatively impact their satisfaction with their position. Supervisors who were negatively viewed were more like to have more turnover in
school settings than those who were seen in a positive light. Another study suggested similar findings with supervision highly correlated with job satisfaction (Shah et al., 2012). Teachers who feel their supervisor fosters professional relationships with them, as well as provide a sense of security are more likely to be satisfied with their job, thus positively effecting work performance and retention. Teachers are also more likely to be satisfied with a supervisor who is able to build comradery and community among the staff (Kusma et al., 2012), leading to the assumption that early childhood educators would like the work place to feel like a family or home, rather than a place of employment. These supervisors also illustrate an increased sense of support to teacher, specifically teachers new to the early childhood field. This leads to lower turnover rates (Wells, 2015). Even more, effective educational leaders aid their teachers in setting professional goals relating to personal desires, as well as the purpose of the school as a whole (Knox, J. & Anfara, V., 2013). This presumption marries well with Papadopoulos’ (2015), suggesting that supervisors, however far up, who provide a fair and objective work environment for teachers are able to build trust among employees.

Supervisors were likely to cause poor job satisfaction if they set expectations unattainably high, specifically where teachers felt their work life and home life were out of balance (Torres, 2012). Teachers expressed feelings of dissatisfaction of feeling pulled between meeting goals in school and their home lives, which they cited being unhappy in both (Torres, 2012). However, teachers who felt they had freedom and authority in school were highly satisfied with the work environment (Usop et al., 2013). Not only do teachers want to have a certain amount of freedom in schools, but they also want their voices heard. Vail (2005) suggests teachers feel a sense of value and respect when their views and opinions are considered, especially when regarding instruction. This suggests that supervisors in early childhood care centers who take on an
authoritative role of micromanaging teachers are more likely to have unhappy employees who are led to quit. On the other hand, supervisors who give teachers the opportunity to make personal decisions regarding classroom and school policies are more likely to see more satisfied teachers, resulting in lower turnover and higher job performance.

**Work Load**

Finally, work load can directly impact the job satisfaction and retention of early childhood educators. Work load can be caused by poor teacher-student relationships, negative work relationships, and poor school climate. Research illustrates that work load impacts other factors affecting job satisfaction like perception of supervision and stress (Collie, Shapka, & Perry, 2011). Further studies on job satisfaction in early childhood educators found that job demands were the leading factor in job dissatisfaction regardless of age, years of experience, education, or gender (Kusma et al., 2012). Job demands have had a direct impact on job satisfaction, specifically in reference to availability to resources (Torres, 2012). Many early childhood educators are responsible for providing their own curriculum and supplies, which they must pay for with their own money, causing more time working on responsibilities outside of the classroom. Klassaen and Anderson (2009) found that from 1962-2007, work load has had an impact on job satisfaction; however, Rahim and Razzak (2013) noted in their study that teachers did not find work load to correlate with the satisfaction of their job. The differences of these studies shine light on the question of what other factors absent from the study, if any, could have led to such a defying conclusion.

**School Climate**

School climate can both positively and negatively affect job satisfaction in early childhood educators. One contributing factor to school climate is teacher empowerment, or the
influence a teacher feels he has over the classroom and school as a whole. Empowerment leads to enhanced job performance and work efficiency and is linked to higher retention rates in teachers (Shen, et al., 2012). School climate can also encompass other factors, including relationships with students, relationships with colleagues and supervisor, as well as communication level between leaders and teachers. Early childhood educators who feel the school climate promotes professional and personal growth are more likely to be satisfied with their positions than those teachers who feel their school climate is suppressive (Wagner & French, 2010). Professional development opportunities are imperative to the growth and development of the early childhood educator. Teachers must feel supported, as well as provided with opportunities to grow in instruction and student relationships in order to be successful in the classroom. A school climate that provides these opportunities is more likely to see less turnover and higher job satisfaction (Chakraborty & Ferguson, 2010). School climate directly affects turnover when new teachers feel isolated from veteran teachers. Teachers who are new to the early childhood level of education or new to the profession altogether, need solid support from other teachers and supervisors to gain a positive view on the position (Vail, 2005). Job satisfaction can be positively impacted if educational leadership includes teachers in decision making, as well as providing support for all teachers, especially newer teachers. These changes have the potential to motivate early childhood teachers to work harder in the classroom, thus benefiting the students and slowing turnover rates; however, their absence will continue to negatively impact student growth and development.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to the amount of faith a person has in his or her ability to do a specific task. Regarding education, the level of self-efficacy in a teacher refers to their personal belief in
the ability to effectively teach students (Gkolia, Delias, & Koustelios, 2014). Many factors can negatively and positively affect self-efficacy in teachers, including years of experience, types of school, and classroom stress (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). One study illustrates there is a direct link between job satisfaction and self-efficacy. Teachers who felt they had a solid grasp on classroom management and effective instruction conveyed a higher sense of job satisfaction than those who felt weak in the areas (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Further, teachers who have high levels of self-efficacy could pass this characteristic onto the students, suggesting these teachers had positive teacher-student interactions, which are linked to high job satisfaction (Epstein & Willhite, 2015). It is important for teachers to have a high sense of self-efficacy in order to feel comfortable teaching value lessons to preschool students. When teachers do not feel they can effectively teach this young population, the risk of negative effects on the self-efficacy of the students comes into play. Moreover, teachers who felt they possessed high levels of self-efficacy were more likely to seek out professional development opportunities, thus working to perfect their instructional effectiveness (Wagner & French, 2010). This high level of self-efficacy impacts job satisfaction directly because as teachers become more comfortable and confident in the classroom - the happier they are and more likely to stay. Teachers who feel they are not successful in the classroom may not develop the intrinsic motivation to seek out professional development opportunities or take require professional development seriously, causing the satisfaction with the work place to continue to elevate, leading to higher turnover.

**Private vs. Public School**

While public and private schools share the goal of educating children, the organization of the two sectors are very different. Overall public schools have fixed salary scales and benefits for teachers, which are substantially more than what is offered to private school teachers.
There is also research to show that childcare facilities that are publicly funded have lower turnover rates, as well as higher pay for their teachers than private facilities (Kagan, 2009). While private school teachers may receive acceptable salaries, there are other negative factors that can impact job satisfaction including lower job security and higher expectations within the community (Rahaman, H, 2012).

Research findings are mixed on the job satisfaction levels between public and private schools. One study shows private and public school teachers show no difference in job satisfaction because of the type of school (Akhtar, Hashmi, & Naqvi, 2010). The findings suggested the type of school was irrelevant, as long as specific intrinsic and extrinsic factors regarding supervision, work environment, and diplomacy were addressed. However, in a study by Bridges (2011), private school early childhood educators were more likely to leave their position than state-funded preschool teachers. These findings do not correlate with Kusma et al. (2012) or Tasdan & Tiryaki (2008), who found that public day care teachers were more dissatisfied than those working in private centers; however, the differences could be connected to the region of the study. There was a difference in factors of job satisfaction between public and private schools; however, because the factors were different, the overall job satisfaction of the teachers was the same, thus concluding that neither group of early childhood educators is any more satisfied than the other, just with different aspects of the job (Papanastasiou, Zembylas, 2006).

Effects of Job Satisfaction and Retention on Students

Early childhood educators are vital to the social, emotional, and academic future of the children they encounter daily. Research (Zinsser & Curby, 2014) Thomason & La Paro, 2012; Abu Taleb, 2013) shows students are affected by teacher interactions on three levels: emotional
care, classroom organization, and effective instruction. Students who are exposed to teachers who are more receptive to their needs and dedicate to providing well-rounded and instruction perform higher on multiple measures. This exposure can also lead to more effective teacher-child interaction, specifically, more positive and nurturing contact with preschoolers. Thmason and LaPara (2012) found that teachers who are not satisfied with their positions in their schools can negatively impact verbal stimulation and emotional growth in young children, causing more issues in future years of education.

Because perceptions of work climate can impact job satisfaction, it can be further concluded that these perceptions also negatively impact students. Often, poor relationships between teachers and students are because of student behaviors. When early childhood educators perceive their students as poorly behaved, they may not actively seek to build relationships with them. Studies show the students are not affecting the work climate - the teachers are. Collie et al. (2012) states, “…student behavioral issues often occur when tasks are too hard, too easy, or not interesting, and this relates to the teacher’s abilities in managing the classroom, engaging the students, and applying effective instructional strategies” (p. 1199). Students are negatively impacted by these situations because they are losing a relationship with their teachers, losing instructional time, and being exposed too early to chaotic situations, which can carry over to the upper grades. In this situation, the teacher is unable to realize the perception of job satisfaction is directly linked to his or her contribution to the work climate, not the students.

Lack of job satisfaction can lead to turnover in schools, which can have a negative effect on the children attending early childhood care centers. Lacina (2012) found the children would demonstrate frustration and sadness with the loss of a teacher, leading to a sense of insecurity.
Lacina further states that children in early childhood programs with high turnover rates are more likely to have lower language levels, as well as lower cognitive and social development. These developmental delays presumably follow the children throughout their education, leading to the possibility of being behind in later years. Ronfeldt, Loeb, and Wyckoff (2013), report that teacher turnover is directly related to student achievement, and these deficits can also follow students throughout their educational career. With these negative impacts turnover has on the children enrolled in schools, a need for higher job satisfaction is justified.

**Summary**

The findings of these studies of job satisfaction and retention, specifically in early childhood educators, have directed this study to discover more about the perceptions of job satisfaction and retention in early childhood educators. Abu Taleb (2013) articulates there are not many studies focused on early childhood educators compared to their elementary and secondary counterparts, yet the need for the studies is just as great, if not greater. She calls for a look into the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that affect job satisfaction of early childhood educators in order to shed light on potential ways to increase retention. Further research is needed to analyze job satisfaction from different perspectives. Kusma et al. (2012) suggests further research be completed on job satisfaction in early childhood educators using research designs beyond the one-way ANOVA and Pearson correlation. Using another research design, such as two two-way analysis of variance, will allow researchers to evaluate job satisfaction and retention among early childhood educators differently to discover other possible differences and interactions. Furthermore, Hall-Kenyon et al. (2013) explains the majority of research on job satisfaction of early childhood educators specifically pertaining to salary and education, suggesting other factors or groups need to be analyzed to determine trends and fill gaps.
Wells (2015) calls for a closer look at the differences in type of position, as in full-time and part-time teachers, to determine differences among the two groups because of the large part-time teacher population in early childhood education as opposed to elementary and secondary schools. Rahim & Razzik (2013) also call for conducting further research exploring the differences among private and public primary teachers in a different setting. The population of this study was from the country Pakistan; therefore, future research will determine if a different population and demographic details will yield the same results, providing further details on perceptions of job satisfaction and retention in early childhood educators. Increasing job satisfaction among teachers is vital to the learning potential, as well as the emotional and social needs of preschool children. By increasing teacher job satisfaction, teachers will be encouraged to push forward with their instruction and in their personal relationships with students, leading to a more stable foundation of learning for students enrolled in early childhood care centers.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

Throughout the methods chapter is a rational for the design of this study to determine differences between the job satisfaction of full-time and part-time early childhood educators who work in both public and private schools. The research question and null hypotheses are provided, as well as a description of the participants and settings, instrumentation, procedures, and plan for data analysis. The researcher will focus on teachers in South Carolina to survey where the differences in job satisfaction may be. The study will provide data to begin a conversation on the job satisfaction of early childhood educator, possibly leading to further discussion and research on strategies to alleviate these issues.

Design

A quantitative causal-comparative design was used to compare the perceptions of job satisfaction among full-time and part-time early childhood educators in both private and public schools. The independent variables in the study are type of school (either public or private) and employment work classification, defined as part-time or full-time. Public schools are defined as any school open to the public that received either state or federal funding, whereas private school is any school open to the public that does not receive funding and depends on tuition payments to continue operations. Full-time employment in an educational setting is defined as employment that requires thirty or more hours a week, while employment is considered part-time when an employee works twenty-nine hours or less a week. The dependent variable is job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined by Locke as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (1976).
A causal-comparative research design was appropriate because “causal-comparative research is a type of nonexperimental investigation in which researchers seek to identify cause and effect relationship by forming groups of individuals in whom the independent variable is present or absent” (Gall, Gall, and Borg, p. 306, 2007). This research design is also suitable for this study because the researcher sought to compare the presence of job satisfaction in teachers who are classified in different groups (part-time/full-time and public/private schools) and to determine if there is a difference among these groups.

**Research Question**

The research questions for this study is:

**RQ1:** Is there a difference in perceptions of job satisfaction, measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, between full-time and part-time Early Childhood educators working in public and private schools?

**Hypotheses**

The null hypotheses for this study are:

**H₀₁:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for early childhood educators based on school type (public or private) and employment work classification (full-time or part-time) in South Carolina.

**H₀₂:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction for early childhood educators based on their employment work classification (full or part-time) in South Carolina.

**H₀₃:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction for early childhood educators based on school type (public or private school) in South Carolina.

**Participants and Setting**

The participants for this study were drawn from random sample of teachers located in
public and private early childhood centers across the state of South Carolina during the spring semester of the 2016-2017 school year. The researcher surveyed teachers anonymously at the South Carolina Early Childhood Association’s annual conference. Participants were employed in various regions all over the state, with a range of poor to affluent areas. Other surveys were completed by teachers upon administrator approval from various school in Richland, Lexington, and Kershaw counties. The demographics of the population also varied greatly depending on the area of concentration.

For this study, the number of participants was 200, which exceeded the required minimum for a medium effect size. According to Gall et al. (2007) 194 participants is required for a medium effect size with a statistical power of .7 at the .05 alpha level in a 3 X 4 ANOVA. While this study is a 2 X 2 ANOVA, the number of participants will remain at 200 to provide clearer data. The schools varied from low income to affluent neighborhoods in both rural and urban areas. The population of teachers were predominately female; however, the ethnicity, age, and education levels of the participants varied. The sample came from teachers employed in different public and private schools in both rural and urban areas. Within various schools, both part-time and full-time teachers were selected from the 3K-5K classes to participate in the study.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used for this study was the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire originated in the 1960s and is based on Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory and Theory of Work Adjustment. The development of the survey began with the Work Adjustment Project using the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank and the Employee Attitude Scale to measure job satisfaction and consisted of four and 54 questions respectively (Weiss, 1967). The project also used 22 experimental items in addition to the other questionnaires to
“develop multi-scale satisfaction…for different occupational groups” (Weiss, 1967, pg. 12). Some questions weighed heavier than others, making the 80-question survey difficult to score; therefore, researchers looked at the various measures the previous surveys evaluated and created a new 20-scale Likert format questionnaire (Weiss, 1967). This new instrument was named the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and “was constructed to sample both intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcement dimensions” (Weiss, 1967, pg. 13). The MSQ was simplified, shortened, and the scales were limited; however, the wording of the questions was purposefully considered to keep it easy to read (Weiss, 1967).

There are two versions of the MSQ, referred to as a long form and a short form. The short form was used to complete this study to accommodate the time of early childhood educators. This instrument has been used in many studies since it originated (Unzicker, 2012; Martins, 2012; Newby, 1999) and is noted for identifying reinforcers in a particular job or position (Vocational Psychology Research, 2010). The Vocational Psychology Research no longer sells the questionnaires. They have made the questionnaire free to the public, providing researchers acknowledge both VPR and the University of Minnesota as the source of the questionnaire (VPR.psych.umn.edu, 2016). The purpose of the instrument is to “measure an employee’s satisfaction with his or her job” and is designed to “provide more specific information on the aspects of a job that an individual finds rewarding” than other measurements of job satisfaction (VPR.psych.umn.edu, 2016).

There are 20 questions that pertain to both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The questions pertain to various factors of a job that will cause satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the position. Each question contains a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The answers will range as follows: Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Neutral = 3, Disagree = 2, and
Strongly Disagree = 1. The scoring range is 20 to 100. A score of 20 signifies a strong dissatisfaction, whereas scoring a 100 represents strong satisfaction in a position. The instrument is valid and appropriate for adults.

The construct validity of the survey supports its ability to measure job satisfaction based on the data determined in an early study. The results indicated “the highest correlation between a satisfaction scale and satisfactoriness scale was .13…the correlation between General Satisfaction and General Satisfactoriness was .11” (Weiss et al., 1966). This research yielded a variance of less than two percent, along with a canonical correlation yielding a variance of 1.5% (Weiss et al., 1966).

The MSQ is also reliable, with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .84. The instrument color coded pink and yellow will represent private school part-time (pink) and full-time (yellow) early childhood educators in private schools, whereas instruments color coded green and blue will represent part-time (green) and full-time (blue) early childhood educators in public schools. The instrument will be personally delivered by the researcher and given to and collected from each participant. The instrument will take approximately ten minutes to complete.

**Procedures**

After IRB approval was received (see Appendix A), the researcher contacted the director of the South Carolina Early Childhood Education Associations, asking permission to become a vendor at the annual conference. The researcher made the required amount of copies of the surveys, along with information regarding the study and the survey, and created packets for each participant. Each packet provided to teachers and individual schools included a white, legal envelope, and a sticker to increase security. Survey packets to be completed at the conference did not include the extra items. At the conference, the researcher set up a booth that included
copies of the surveys, as well as a separate information card to be completed by the participant once a survey was completed. To attract participants, a sign was placed at the booth advertising for a free twenty-dollar Target gift card for participating in the study. The participant was responsible for putting their own information card in the jar to keep the survey completely anonymous. The information cards were collected and placed in a vase. Once enough surveys were collected, the researcher held a drawing and provided the winner with a gift card before leaving the conference. Other surveys were collected after the researcher personally contacted various early childhood care centers and schools to gain permission from administrators to administer the surveys to teachers. Once the schools gave permission to administer the surveys to the teachers, the researcher and director determined the appropriate method of distribution. There was only one option for administration of the survey – paper/pencil. With this option, the appropriate number of surveys were taken to each facility and the director and researcher determined the best time to pick up completed surveys. This was to ensure the surveys were completed in a timely manner and eliminated potential challenges with lost surveys. Once the surveys were completed and received by the researcher, they were coded. The surveys will be coded using a 1 through 4 in the upper right hand corner, 1 for part-time public school teachers, 2 for full-time public school teachers, 3 for part-time private school teachers, and 4 for full-time private school teachers. Survey results were entered into an Excel sheet, scored, then uploaded into SPSS. Surveys were stored in two folders and locked in a filing cabinet until the researcher’s successful defense, at which point the documents will be shredded by the researcher after the appropriate amount of time set forth by the IRB.
Data Analysis

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to determine the differences between the different groups (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2007) A two-way ANOVA allows the researcher to determine the differences among each group, as well as between the groups. The researcher ran the appropriate assumptions tests for each hypothesis. The data for this study satisfies the assumptions for a two-way ANOVA in that the dependent variable is measured on an interval scale and the independent variables are both categorical. All observations within each variable were independent. The sample of teachers was random, selected by the directors in charge of each school or facility, along with the teachers who agreed to take the survey at the conference. The assumption that the populations are normally distributed were assessed using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The assumption that the population distributions have the same variance were examined using Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance. A significance level larger than .05 indicates that equal variance can be assumed.

For each hypothesis, descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation (M and SD) were reported. The number \(N\) and Number per cell \(n\) was reported, along with the degrees of freedom (df within/df between) and observed \(F\) value. The \(n^2\) was viewed in the Test of Between-Subject Effects in order to determine the effect size with an alpha of .05. The significance level \(\rho\) was also reported.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

The findings of this study highlighted the differences in job satisfaction between full-time and part-time early childhood educators in both public and private schools. Two hundred teachers were anonymously surveyed using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, with the majority of the surveys coming from full-time teachers in public schools. Descriptive statistics and results of assumptions tests are outlined, with histograms included to look closer at homogeneity. The study found a difference in job satisfaction among teachers and school type, but not job work classification.

Research Question

RQ: Is there a difference in job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for early childhood educators in South Carolina based on school type (public or private) and employment work classification (full-time or part-time)?

Null Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for this study are:

**H₀₁:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for early childhood educators based on school type (public or private) and employment work classification (full-time or part-time) in South Carolina.

**H₀₂:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction for early childhood educators based on their employment work classification (full or part-time) in South Carolina.

**H₀₃:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction for early childhood educators based on school type (public or private school) in South Carolina.
Descriptive Statistics

Data obtained for the dependent variable *job satisfaction* for type of school (private school, public school) and employment work classification (full time, part time) can be found in Table 1. Results indicate the means for each group, both school type and work job classification, are very similar, with the mean of full-time public and private school teachers as close as to the nearest thousandth. Standard deviation was close as well, with the largest differences among part-time employees; however, the population size is not as large for this group as full-time employee or type of school.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics of Differences Between Type of School and Employment Work Classification on Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>emplworkclas</th>
<th>schooltype</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>part-time employee</td>
<td>public school</td>
<td>4.3767</td>
<td>.36492</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private school</td>
<td>4.3933</td>
<td>.42673</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.3850</td>
<td>.39021</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time employee</td>
<td>public school</td>
<td>4.0037</td>
<td>.63672</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private school</td>
<td>4.0075</td>
<td>.61464</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.0051</td>
<td>.62719</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>public school</td>
<td>4.0485</td>
<td>.62146</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private school</td>
<td>4.0847</td>
<td>.59983</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.0621</td>
<td>.61217</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Data screening

Data screening was conducted on each group’s dependent variable (job satisfaction) regarding data inconsistencies, outliers, and normality. The researcher sorted the data on each
variable and scanned for inconsistencies. No data errors or inconsistencies were identified. Box and whiskers plots were used to detect outliers on each dependent variable. No outliers were identified. See Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2 for box and whisker plot.

Figure 1.1 Box and Whisker Plot for Type of School

![Box and Whisker Plot for Type of School](image1)

Figure 1.2 Box and Whisker Plot for Employment Work Classification

![Box and Whisker Plot for Employment Work Classification](image2)
Assumptions

A Two-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the second null hypothesis that looked at the differences among employment work classification and job satisfaction. The ANOVA required that the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance are met. Normality for a two-way Analysis of Various with a sample size over 50 typically use Kolmogorov-Smirnov. However, because of the large gap in number of participants among groups, the researcher used histograms to determine normality. As indicated in Figure 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, the histograms determine a normal bell curve in each group, indicating the $p$ value is going to be valid despite a violation of an assumptions test. See Figures 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

Figure 2.1 Job Satisfaction Based on Work Employment Classification and School Type
Figure 2.2 Job Satisfaction Based on Work Employment Classification

Figure 2.3 Job Satisfaction Based on School Type
The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using the Levene’s test. A violation was found \( p = .02 \); however, the Two-Way ANOVA is robust enough to provide reasonable \( p \) values, even when a violation is found (Green and Salkind, 2011). See Table 2 for Levene’s Test.

Table 2

Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: jobsatisfaction</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

A Two-Way ANOVA was used to test the first null hypothesis; the differences in job satisfaction between type of school and employment work classification of Early Childhood educators. The first null hypothesis was not rejected, indicating there was no significant interaction between type of position and type of school environment, \( F(1, 196) = .003, p = .957, \eta^2 = .000 \). See Table 4 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.

A Two-Way ANOVA was used to test the second null hypothesis; the differences in job satisfaction among employment work classification of Early Childhood educators. The second null hypothesis was rejected showing differences among full time and part time Early Childhood Educators, \( F(1, 196) = 10.00, p = .002, \eta^2 = .49 \). See Table 3 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.

A Two-Way ANOVA was used to test the third null hypothesis; the differences in job satisfaction among type of school of Early Childhood educators. The third null hypothesis was
not rejected showing no differences among private and public schools, \( F(1, 196) = .007, p = .93, \eta^2 = .000. \) See Table 4 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.

Table 3

*Tests of Between-Subject Effects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>3.684*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>3.395</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1770.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1770.117</td>
<td>4893.941</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emplworkclas</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>10.005</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schooltype</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emplworkclas * schooltype</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>70.892</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3374.626</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>74.576</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Overview

This chapter begins with a discussion of the findings of the study, as well as each null hypothesis. Implications for this study are provided, followed by limitations and recommendations for future research. The findings correlate to previous studies, as well as provide additional data to the existing body of knowledge and theory of job satisfaction in early childhood educators.

Discussion

The purpose of the study was to determine if there was a difference in job satisfaction between full-time and part-time early educators in both private and public schools in the state of South Carolina. Using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form) as provided by the VPR and University of Minnesota, the researcher could determine any differences, as well as determine what may cause any differences based on the results of the survey. Examining and understanding job satisfaction in early childhood educators can help administrators create a work environment that will help cultivate happy, satisfied teachers in the workplace. This could ultimately lend itself to stronger instruction and little turnover in early childhood facilities.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences between teachers in private and public schools, as well as by employment work classification.

The research question for this study was:

**RQ1:** Is there a difference in job satisfaction, measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, between full-time and part-time early childhood educators working in public and private schools?

The corresponding null hypotheses for this study were:
**H01:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for early childhood educators based on school type (public or private) and employment work classification (full-time or part-time) in South Carolina.

**H02:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction for early childhood educators based on their employment work classification (full or part-time) in South Carolina.

**H03:** There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction for early childhood educators based on school type (public or private school) in South Carolina.

The findings of this study indicated there was no difference between full-time and part-time early childhood educators in public and private schools or based on work employment classification. The overall job satisfaction mean of these groups was greater than four, indicating an elevated sense of job satisfaction for these teachers. A deeper dive into the research shows the question on pay was the lowest scored; however, the distaste for salary was not enough to bring down the high average of job satisfaction. This correlates with previous research, as other studies found that early childhood educators are typically satisfied in their work place despite the undesirable salary. Klassen and Chiu (2010) found that early childhood educators believe their job satisfaction is affected by a positive work environment and healthy relationships with their coworkers, not their salary. This research related to a study completed by Bullough. Like Klassen and Chiu, Bullough’s (2012) study indicated that preschool teachers, both full-time and part-time, were very happy in their positions even with low pay. This study further indicated that it was not the pay that affected the satisfaction of the teachers, but their intrinsic belief of success, relationships with coworkers, and interest in working with coworkers. This was also reflected in the study, as the questions concerning relationships with coworkers and the feeling of accomplishment were scored high.

This study also indicated that the participants surveyed were more than satisfied with their supervisor, as well as. Questions five and six of the survey ask participants to rate their supervisor’s
ability to do the job, as well as handle other employees. The average response of these questions was approximately a 4 out of 5, indicating that participants were satisfied with their employer’s performance in the workplace. Various previous studies (Bhamani, 2012; Shah et al., 2012, Kusma et al., 2012) indicate that there is a direct correlation between teacher’s job satisfaction and positive perceptions of their supervisor, as well as school climate as a whole (Shen, et al., 2012). Finally, another component that lends itself to job satisfaction is self-efficacy. Participants of the study indicated high scores to questions relating to their perception on the ability to do the job, which is linked to high job satisfaction (Gkolia, Delias, & Koustelios, 2014; Epstein & Willhite, 2015).

The study did not indicate a difference in job satisfaction among teachers based on school type, suggesting both public and private school teachers are evenly satisfied. Research states there are mixed reviews on which group is more satisfied. There are studies (Tasdan & Tiryaki, 2008; Kusma et al., 2012) that suggest public school teachers were more dissatisfied than their private school peers. However, other studies (Kagan, 2009; Bridges, 2011) suggest the exact opposite. When looking at this study, the difference in job satisfaction among school type could have been elevated because of the regions surveyed. More than half of the surveys completed were from participants at the South Carolina Early Childhood Association conference, indicating that this region of South Carolina was heavily represented in study. While the researcher made a concerted effort to gain permission from a demographic mix of centers, the majority of those willing to participate were private schools located in higher income, suburban locations. These teachers may be happier with their positions for a variety of reasons; however, this study was not designed to investigate those reasons.

The study did indicate there was a difference among teachers based on employment work classification, suggesting part-time teachers were more satisfied in their positions than full time workers. This study aligns with research from a study by Swain & Cara (2010), which stated part-time teachers tended to be happier in their positions than full-time employees based on work load.
One study looking at job satisfaction of part-time teachers suggested that part-time teachers appeared relatively satisfied with their positions despite the lack of respect compared to full time teachers (Hoyt, 2012). The elevation in job satisfaction among part-time teachers with this study could have been influenced by the discrepancy in population between part-time and full-time teachers, as well as the region the part-time teachers were employed. A study conducted by Burrough, Hall-Kenyon, and McKay (2012) suggests that part-time teachers are more satisfied in their positions based on their marital status and age. When analyzed, the data shows that 22 of the 30 part-time teachers surveyed were married females age 35 or older, which aligns with Burrough, Hall-Kenyon, and McKay’s research.

Overall, early childhood educators participating in this study are very satisfied with their positions, regardless of employment work classification and school type. Findings from the study mirror previous research conclusions as well. Question thirteen of the survey asks participants to rate their satisfaction with pay. The average response was a 2.945, the lowest of any question, suggesting participants are less than satisfied with their pay. This was determined in previous studies concerning teacher pay (Moloney, 2010; Adebayo & Gombakomba, 2013; Guis, 2015); however, just as Bullough’s (2013) study suggests, this study concluded that early childhood educators are highly satisfied despite their dissatisfaction with their pay.

Implications

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a difference in job satisfaction between full-time and part-time early childhood educators working in public and private schools in South Carolina. The surveys were provided to 200 Early Childhood Educators living in various regions of South Carolina. Participants received the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form), which consists of 20 questions pertaining to the level of satisfaction they feel towards various aspects of their teaching position. The study was specifically geared
towards 3K through 5K educators to highlight the job satisfaction of the preschool teacher. The first and third null hypotheses were not rejected, meaning there was no difference in job satisfaction between private and public school teachers, as well as interactions between the work employment classification and type of schools; however - the second null hypotheses - there is no difference in job satisfaction for early childhood educators based on employment work classification, was rejected.

The findings from this study add to the existing body of knowledge because they correlate with many past studies, further indicating the importance of specific factors in schools. This study marries well with previous research that indicate early childhood teachers want to be respected in their work environment, with the ability to form positive relationships with those they work with and their supervisor. Early childhood educators are aware of the low pay educators receive because it is a highly-discussed topic in the media and amongst colleagues. These teachers have an intrinsic desire to work with young children; therefore, it is important for supervisors and legislators to provide these teachers with the factors that will boost their satisfaction. Coincidentally, the factors that positively affect job satisfaction do not cost any money. While these findings do correlate with many recent studies, many were conducted in foreign countries. These countries do not necessarily have the same ideals and rights for their population as the United States, so this study does provide a closer look at early childhood educators in an American state. This study benefits current research because it strengthens the data; however, going forward administrators and legislators need to start using the data to make changes to the work environment and education.

Limitations

The limitations of the study include the possibility of teachers not answering the surveys in a completely honest manner. Many of the surveys were completed in the teacher’s place of
work and then given to their supervisor, who collected them for the researcher. Because the study pertained to job satisfaction, there is the possibility that teachers did not feel comfortable answering the survey with complete honesty because of possible repercussions if the surveys were seen by the supervisor. The researcher tried to take this fear into account, providing every survey with an envelope and a sticker to provide extra protection; however, there is still the possibility these precautions did not yield completely honest results.

Another limitation to the study is the unequal sizes of the groups. While the researcher attempted to gain equal amounts of each group, full-time employees make up the vast majority of early childhood education population. What is more, the population present at the conference were most full-time teachers. Also, many of the private school teachers surveyed were employed in a suburban area of South Carolina, which could lend itself to limiting the findings.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The researcher recommends future research to be completed in other states to determine if the results can be replicated in other locations. While the study encompassed the state of South Carolina, the greater part of the surveys was collected from the Midlands region of the state. This region is predominately populated with suburban daycare facilities, which often yield higher pay and autonomy in the classroom. Future studies should be conducted in highly rural and/or urban areas, where pay and autonomy may not be as high. Also, because this study limited itself to 3K through 5K educators, it is suggested for future research to involve birth through second grade, which is the complete developmental range that Early Childhood Education encompasses in the state of South Carolina. It is also suggested that future studies include qualitative questions that allow Early Childhood Educators to explain their views of job satisfaction and what makes the teachers stay in the career.
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APPENDIX B

Dear Recipient:

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree. The purpose of my research is to examine the difference in job satisfaction of part-time and full-time Early Childhood Educators in public and private school settings in South Carolina, and I am writing to invite you to participate in my study.

If you are 18 years or older and currently employed as a teacher or teacher’s aide in a 3K, 4K, or 5K classroom in the state of South Carolina and are willing to participate, you will be asked to complete a demographics survey, as well as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a total of 29 questions, pertaining to your experience in your current position. It should take approximately ten minutes for you to complete the procedures listed. Your participation will be completely anonymous, and no personal, identifying information will be required.

To participate, please complete the attached survey and return it to the researcher. If you are completing the survey in your place of work, please place the survey in the attached sealed envelope and return to the director of the facility.

A consent document is provided as the first page of the survey. The consent document contains additional information about my research, but you do not need to sign and return it.

If you choose to participate, you can complete an information card to enter a raffle for a free $20 Target gift card.

Sincerely,

Doctoral Candidate
Liberty University
Dear Recipient:

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree. The purpose of my research is to examine the difference in job satisfaction of part-time and full-time Early Childhood Educators in public and private school settings in South Carolina, and I am writing to invite you to participate in my study.

If you are 18 years or older and currently employed as a teacher or teacher’s aide in a 3K, 4K, or 5K classroom in the state of South Carolina and are willing to participate, you will be asked to complete a demographics survey, as well as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a total of 29 questions, pertaining to your experience in your current position. It should take approximately ten minutes for you to complete the procedures listed. Your participation will be completely anonymous, and no personal, identifying information will be required.

To participate, please complete the attached survey and return it to the researcher. If you are completing the survey in your place of work, please place the survey in the attached sealed envelope and return to the director of the facility.

A consent document is provided as the first page of the survey. The consent document contains additional information about my research, but you do not need to sign and return it.

Sincerely,

Doctoral Candidate
Liberty University
APPENDIX D

Directions: Please answer the following demographics questions about yourself.

1) What is your employment work classification?
   a. Part-time employee
   b. Full-time employee

2) What is your school type?
   a. Public school
   b. Private school

3) What gender do you identify with?
   a. male
   b. female

4) What race do you identify with?
   a. White
   b. African American
   c. Hispanic
   d. Asian
   e. Other

5) What is your age?
   a. 18-24 years old
   b. 25-34 years old
   c. 35-44 years old
   d. 45-54 years old
   e. 55-64 years old
   f. 65-74 years old
   g. 75 years or older

6) What is your highest level of education?
   a. Some high school
   b. High School Diploma
   c. Some college
   d. Associates Degree
   e. Bachelors Degree
   f. Other
7) What is your marital status?
   a. Single
   b. In a relationship
   c. Married
   d. Separated
   e. Divorced

8) How long have you had a position in Early Childhood Education?
   a. Less than one year
   b. 1-3 years
   c. 4-6 years
   d. 7-9 years
   e. 10 or more years

9) What year of early childhood do you teach?
   a. Birth-2
   b. 3K
   c. 4K
   d. 5K
   e. other