TEACHER'S JOB SATISFACTION AND SELF-EFFICACY: A REVIEW

Aikaterini Gkolia
Dimitrios Belias
Athanasios Koustelios
University of Thessaly, Trikala, Greece

Abstract

The main aim of the present study is to provide a clear picture and investigate the relation between job satisfaction and self-efficacy experienced by general employees and teachers, as it rises through literature review. There seems to be no consensus about how job satisfaction should be defined, as the definition depends on the research subject and on each individual's priorities. During the past decades, many different theories and models of job satisfaction have been developed. In addition, different factors that are likely to have an influence on job satisfaction have been distinguished, as well as several consequences emerging from job satisfaction. In addition, the concept of self-efficacy has been defined in many different ways. In general, an educator is conceived as one of the most important persons responsible for shaping a nations' future. The review shows that schools must pay more attention to improving teacher's job satisfaction and self-efficacy, investigating and enhancing those factors which promote teachers' job satisfaction and personal efficacy. Moreover, the current review provides information about instruments to measure teacher's job satisfaction and self-efficacy. The review shows that different factors of teachers' job satisfaction are related and have a positive influence on different factors of teachers' efficacy. Implications and suggestions for future empirical research of findings are drawn as well.

Keywords: Education, job satisfaction, self-efficacy

Introduction

An educational system is usually considered to be the fundamental principle of a developing country. Effective teachers are essential for the accomplishment of an educational system. A high demanding educational system has made the teaching profession extremely challenging, as high performance is expected from teachers. Teachers who are satisfied with their

jobs usually have a high degree of professional capabilities and feel that they could manage, organize and perform specific tasks and behavior, even in case of failure.

The purpose of this study is to provide a critical review of the relation between job satisfaction and self-efficacy. Specifically, the current review is trying to explain the meaning of job satisfaction and self-efficacy in general, as well as in the educational context, and the relation between those two concepts. Results have been derived from bibliographical and research studies from different fields, mostly education.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

1. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been an issue of concern for many researchers in the past, mainly because of its connection with important organizational phenomena, such as turnover, absenteeism and organizational effectiveness (Currivan, 1999; Nguni, 2006; Van Scooter, 2000). Between the years, 1927 and 1932 Pr. Mayo of Harvard Business School investigated the relationship of productivity and job itself. Although numerous definitions have been given to job satisfaction, there is no consensus on how job satisfaction should actually be defined. The claim that a different meaning should be given to job satisfaction, depending on the research subject, seems reasonable (Kantas, 1998). Lawler (1973) refers to overall job satisfaction as a term encompassing all those things a person expects to get from his/her job and all those things he/she actually receives (Evans, 1998).

In fact, job satisfaction is believed to be an inside reaction against the concept of working conditions. It has also been claimed that job satisfaction is the overall evaluation somebody receives from his/her working environment. This overall evaluation has been connected with high levels of motivation and productivity (Noe *et al*, 2009; Greenberg & Baron, 1995). It is related to the norms, values and expectations of a person (Schneider & Snyder, 1975). Furthermore, Brooke, Russell and Price (1988) and Okoye (2011) defined job satisfaction as a measure to check whether a person is satisfied or not with his/her job. Bogler (2001) defines job satisfaction using teachers' perceptions of occupational prestige, self-esteem, autonomy at work and professional self-development.

The investigation of the factors affecting job satisfaction, plays a major role to the achievement of organizational goals. Levi (1967) reported that the degree of employees' involvement in decision making at workplace has an impact on workers' productivity. In other words, the more an individual is involved in a certain task, the more productive and self-sufficient and satisfied they feel with their job. The persistence of an individual for high-performance working practices (professional motivation)

to achieve the objectives of the group has resulted in the increase of satisfaction (Robbins, 1984). Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards have an influence on professional motivation associated with job position and working environment (Li, 1993). Career development opportunities and employee turnover intentions in organization are considerable variables that effect job satisfaction. According to Kanter (1977), an employee being satisfied with their present job's contents does not guarantee the same level of satisfaction at the same time for their potential career development or internal mobility in organization. For instance, an employee being satisfied with current job contents means that the worker has many opportunities in their present career, receives unofficial professional training, and expects better long job prospects. In contrast, employees with fewer opportunities for career development are more likely to leave their unsatisfying job (Kanter, 1977).

On the contrary to the above, there are various reasons that lead to job dissatisfaction. Firstly, the main meaning of role ambiguity is when workers are unclear and uncertain about their expectations for behaviour or performance within their role in the workplace. Various studies have shown that when workers lack a clear definition of the actions which are necessary to fulfill a specific role, their levels of job satisfaction are likely to be negatively affected (Lee & Schuler, 1982; Wood, et al., 1998; Edmonson, 2006). In addition, bad interpersonal relationships with coworkers are another reason of job dissatisfaction. Poor or unsupportive relationships and conflicts with colleagues and/ or supervisors lead to negative psychological intensions resulting in job dissatisfaction (Belias & Koustelios, 2014; Amarantidou, 2010).

As it was mentioned before, various studies in the field of management have indicated that job satisfaction is quite popular because of its connection with productivity, career mobility, absenteeism, job security for the future and job performance (Kantas, 1998). Specifically, consequences of job satisfaction are the low level of absenteeism and turnover of workers (Kantas, 1998). As noted by Luthans (1995), high job satisfaction levels are associated with characteristics such as less individuals' complains and convenience to learn their new duties. Here it should be noted that employees who feel better about their jobs are likely to contribute to resources practices, such as intention to stay, organizational commitment and interest (Kreither & Kinicki, 1995). In addition, overall satisfaction enhances individuals' mental and physical health, improves working conditions and reduces work stress (Kreither & Kinicki, 1995; Crohan, Antonucci, Adelmann & Coleman, 1989).

1.1. Theories and models of Job satisfaction

Dinham and Scott (1997) argued that job satisfaction is directly connected and affected by different job motivators. There has also been an effort to define job satisfaction as a dependent variable explained by different factors. Job satisfaction is based on the theory of human motivation of Maslow (1943) and Herzberg (1959) (Kantas, 2008). Specifically, Maslow's *Hierarchy of Needs* Theory remains valid today for understanding human behavior. According to the theory, people have five sets of needs, which follow a particular order. The lower level needs that must be satisfied are the physiological ones (basic needs-food, drink etc); safety needs and belongingness (social recognition status) come next, followed by esteem needs and at the top of the hierarchy the self-actualization needs lie. Herzberg (1968), in his *Two Factor Theory*, suggested two factors; motivators and hygiene, which influence people's behavior. In particular, satisfaction is a factor of motivation and dissatisfaction is a consequence of hygiene factors.

Numerous researchers have divided the various factors of job satisfaction into two categories: extrinsic and intrinsic factors (Herzberg, 1959; Warr, 1987; Hauber & Bruininks, 1986; Hirschfeld, 2000). Based on the above discrimination, the relation among the employee, the job itself, the content of the job, the responsibilities of the job, the recognition that the employee receives from his/ her job and the opportunities for growth and advancement has been described. According to Warr (1987), intrinsic factors are related to the amount of variety in job, opportunity to use abilities, amount of responsibility and recognition for work. In addition, Warr (1987) suggested five factors describing the extrinsic factors; freedom of working method, physical working condition, hours of work, income and colleagues (Goetz, et al., 2012). Herzberg's Theory has been criticized because of the fact that even if a person could be partially satisfied, this does not mean that he/she is not overall satisfied with his/her job.

Hackman and Oldham (1975, 1976) suggested the *Job Characteristics Model*. The main idea of this model is to develop those characteristics of job that contribute to the growth of high levels of motivation, satisfaction and performance. Specifically, the organization must focus on five characteristics of the job; a) Skill variety, which is connected with the variety in the job and the special skills and talents for a specific task, b) Task identity, that is related to the uniqueness of the task, c) Task significance, which refers to the impact that job has on employees' life and on the lives of other people, d) Autonomy, which is connected with independence, discretion and the freedom given to the individual in planning and specifying the procedure to be used in carrying out a task, e) Feedback, which includes information about the effectiveness of the performance and

moral rewards after the accomplishment of a goal (Markaki, 2008). The above dimensions have been connected with high levels of intrinsic motivators, high efficiency, high job satisfaction, and low level of turnover and absenteeism. This theory has been criticized because it investigated only positive motivated aspects in work, leaving out dimensions of job that present dysfunctions repeatedly (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

Vroom's expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), assumes that job satisfaction is connected with different job motivators. According to this theory, job satisfaction is strongly related with the perceptions of the employees about how an outcome of a task is leading to various work outcomes (instrumentality) and the strength of the willingness or a particular reward (valence). For instance, if an employee realises that a good performance is rewarded, always resulting in a pay increase, then the instrumentality is high.

The model of Porter and Lawler (1968) is connected with the fact that an individuals' motivation to performance is determined by the individual's ability to understand the perception of what the required task is, the means he/she receives from his/her job and the way individuals organise their task. One of the most common criticism of this model is that job satisfaction is the result of the performance and not prerequisite for the performance.

Furthermore, another theory is the *Theory of satisfaction based on the needs* (McClelland, 1985). The main aim of this theory is to describe the depth of individual's satisfaction of different needs and values. The *Social Exchange Theory* (Thibaut & Kelly, 1959) makes use of the concepts that are strongly related to social relationships leading to costs and rewards. The pleasures and satisfactions an individual enjoys from participating in a relationship are the rewards (salary, benefits, personal satisfaction, social status and enhancement of esteem) (Thibaut and Kelley 1959). Costs are related to those aspects that influence performance of task negatively (anxiety, punishment experiences and difficulties of engagement in various actions and in one behavior) (Blau 1964).

In Smith et al. (1969) several different aspects of job satisfaction are suggested, such as the work itself, pay, opportunity for promotion, supervision and coworkers. Later, Locke (1976) supplemented four others aspects of job satisfaction: recognition, working conditions, company and management.

Therefore, it could be supported that there is evidence that job satisfaction has been described and treated mostly as a multidimensional construct with different facets of latent factors than an overall measure.

1.3. Measurement of job satisfaction

Most researchers have divided the numerous aspects of job satisfaction into two categories; extrinsic and intrinsic factors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Warr, 1987; Hauber & Bruininks, 1986; Hirschfeld, 2000). Based on this distinguish, various instruments have been developed for measuring job satisfaction and have been the center of attention for several years (Bolton, 1986; Guion, 1978; Kerr, 1985; Koustelios, 1991; Koustelios & Bagiatis, 1997). The trust worthiest instruments which emerged from literature review were: Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) (Bentley & Rempel, 1980), Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) (Lester, 1987), Teacher Job Satisfaction (Evans & Johnson, 1990), Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI) (Koustelios,1991; Koustelios & Bagiatis, 1997), Teaching Satisfaction Scale (TSS) (Ho & Au, 2006). The most trustworthy instruments which emerged from literature review were JDI, which includes 72 questions and 5 dimensions with the titles of work, payment, promotion, supervision and colleagues, MSQ, a 100-item, self-reported instrument with 20 subdomain with five questions on each dimension and 2 small and big scales, measuring intrinsic, extrinsic and overall satisfaction, ESI with 24 questions which measure six dimensions of job satisfaction: working conditions, salary, promotion, job itself, supervisor, and organization as a whole. Various pieces of empirical research revealed quite satisfactory psychometric properties for JDI, MSQ and ESI, including evidence for validity and reliability and are widely accepted in satisfaction research (Bolton, 1986; Guion, 1978; Kerr, 1985; Kinicki et al., 2002; Koustelios and Bagiatis, 1997; Samavi, 2011).

1.4. Teacher's job satisfaction

An educator can arguably be conceived as one of the most important person responsible for shaping a nations' future. In the literature, job satisfaction has been a significant issue in empirical educational research (De Nobile and McCormick, 2008; Dinham & Scott, 2000; Singh & Billingsley, 1996; Spector, 1997). Heller et al. (1993) argue that "schools must pay more attention to improve teacher's job satisfaction" (p. 75). It is disappointing to find out that, although some educators do enjoy teaching, a high proportion of teachers who are not satisfied with their job do in fact still exist. Zigarelli (1996), in an attempt to search for the underlying characteristics that lead to effective schools, has suggested the need to investigate the following factors: Selection of qualified teachers, teacher morale, teacher satisfaction and school culture, as well as principal autonomy. According to Zembylas and Papanastasiou (2004) job satisfaction refers to the relationships between

teachers and their teaching. Moreover, further research suggested a strong relationship between different aspects of school environment and teacher's job satisfaction. In other words, teachers could affect classroom's management and solve many problems of the schools if they retained good inter-personal relations with student's parents, their colleagues and their principal (Henke, Choy, Geis, & Broughman, 1996; Whiteford, 1990). Recent studies in Greece suggested that teachers of public schools (Aspridis, 2013) were satisfied with the job itself and their supervision, whereas they were dissatisfied with pay and promotional opportunities (Koustelios, 2001; Tsigilis, Zachopoulou & Grammatikopoulos, 2006). In addition, another study in Greece showed that autonomy was correlated with job itself, supervision and the educational organization as a whole (Koustelios, Karabatzaki, & Kousteliou, 2004). Other studies indicated a negative correlation between a high level of stress in the teaching profession and emotional engagement of teachers with their students (Chang, 2009; Spilt et al., 2011). Veldman et al. (2013) used a self-reported method and indicated a positive correlation between teachers' job satisfaction and teacher-student relationships.

2. Self-efficacy

According to the Social-cognitive theory of learning, a person's self-efficacy depends on behavioral, environmental and cognitive factors (Bandura, 1986). Bandura and Wood (1989) supported the idea that a robust sense of personal efficacy to sustain the necessary attention on productivity and a constant effort to achieve goals is the key of success in many areas. Bandura (1986) was the first to define self-efficacy as a person's sense and confidence in his/her abilities to achieve his/her goals. More specifically, the term "self-efficacy" refers to a person's personal critique on his/her capabilities to organize and perform a specific behavior (Staple, Hulland & Higgins, 1999). The concept of self-efficacy does not indicate the actual skills that a person may have, but the degree of his/her faith in them. People with high self-efficacy consider a new situation as a challenge, do not give up their effort in case of failure, but very quickly regain what they have lost, while people with low self-efficacy have low aspirations and consider a new situation as a threat, trying to avoid it, reducing their effort or even abandoning every effort to achieve their goals (Bandura, 1994). According to self-efficacy theory, increasing manager's self-efficacy, organization performance could develop and improve (Staple, Hulland & Higgins, 1999).

Self-efficacy has, among others, been investigated in the frame of contemporary occupational settings. As Golia, Belias, Tsioli and Koustelios (2013) mention, teachers' self-efficacy is strongly related with principals' leadership behavior, who provide motives, vision and opportunities for

flexible and adaptive behavior in the classroom. The relation between a school's leadership and teachers' self-efficacy is strongly affected by the latter's job satisfaction, in terms of ambitions and mutual content to future goals (Golia et al., 2013). Another interesting study of Sahinidis, Giovanis and Sdrolias (2012) on entrepreneurial intention among students revealed the strong effect of social norms and valuations (SNV) on personal attitude, perceived behavioral control and emotional intelligence. As the authors explain, this finding makes the role of SNV pivotal if an intervention is attempted, so as to increase the self-efficacy of the person. Therefore, teachers are able to increase their students' self-efficacy, by instilling in them the belief that starting a business is feasible once you have the skills for it and the opportunity arises.

2.1. Teacher's self-efficacy

During the last decades, several studies have been focused on teachers' self-efficacy. According to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001), teacher's beliefs about the degree up to which they are able to influence students' involvement in the learning process has been characterized as a simple idea with significant implications. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy defined teachers' self-efficacy as "the estimation of their abilities to bring desired results in potential involvement with their students, or results that are related to the students' learning, even with students which are difficult to motivate" (Henson, 2001). Additionally, talking about self-efficacy as the faith in ourselves, Tschannen-Moran argued that teachers' self-efficacy motivates school teachers to adhere to various setbacks that arise. Bandura stated that people with low self-efficacy are insufficient as teachers, even if they are aware of what they are supposed to do (Frank, 2009). Teachers' high self-efficacy is related with their high confidence in their ability to confront different new issues that arise, as well as their ability to deal with the consequences that may be created in the classroom (Staple, Hulland & Higgins, 1999). There are at least four types of teachers' self-efficacy, which play a key role in a teacher's way of teaching and his/her willingness to persist even when things in class are not so easy (Gibbs, 2003). The types of teachers' self-efficacy are the following: behavioral self-efficacy, cognitive self-efficacy, emotional self-efficacy and, finally, the culture of his/her self-efficacy (Gibbs, 2003).

Behavioral self-efficacy explains the degree of a teacher's belief in his/her efficacy to execute specific actions in order to handle specific teaching situations.

Cognitive self-efficacy describes a teacher's personal estimation of his/her capability to regulate over his/her thinking during the teaching action.

Emotional self-efficacy refers to a teachers' belief in his/her ability to manage their own emotions in a particular teaching context.

Last, but not least, *Cultural self-efficacy* is about a teacher's personal expectations of being effective in specific situations in culturally appropriate teaching ways (Gibbs, 2003).

2.2. Measurement of self-efficacy

Many researchers have attempted to define self-efficacy as a dependent variable, affected by different factors. In one of his surveys, Bandura (1977) supported that different factors are likely to affect people's perception of self-efficacy. He defined two dimensions of self-efficacy: the effects of expectations and the efficacy of expectations. During the last decade of Bandura's research (1997), the perception that the concept of self-efficacy can be measured by a significant number of sources, like *mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion and physiological and emotional states*, has become prominent. Specifically, the term *mastery experiences* refers to the most powerful source of self-efficacy. It is based on direct and personal experiences, and it is connected with how much skill and effort put forth and how persistent teachers are in facing failure. Next, *vicarious experiences* are based on the observation of the experiences of others. Teachers approach situations imitating skills and coping strategies that they see others like themselves doing successfully. *Verbal persuasion* as a resource of self-efficacy stems from what others say to us. Teachers are led to believe they can accomplish a task or behavior when they achieve realistic encouragement or discouragement and become more likely to exert greater effort to become successful. The teacher's acceptance of colleagues and principals is a very important issue that has been found to increase teachers' self-efficacy. Finally, *physiological and emotional states* exists when teachers personal efficacy is influenced by their physical and emotional arousal and allows people to practice dealing with stress, relaxation techniques, and symbolic desensitization (Bandura, 1977a; Bandura, 1977; Muretta, 2004)

In the last decades, many questionnaires have been developed for the measurement of self-efficacy, based on Bandura's definition of self-efficacy. Some of them are the following: Teacher Locus Control (Rose & Medway, 1981), Bandura's Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (Bandura, 1997), Ashton Vignettes (Ashton, Buhr & Crocker, 1984), Webb efficacy scale (Ashton, Olejnik, Crocker & McAuliffe, 1982), Teacher efficacy scale (Gibson, & Dembo, 1984). In addition, Dimmock and Hattie (1996) have developed some tools-questionnaires in order to measure self-efficacy among principals of primary and secondary education. However, several studies that followed revealed the low validity and reliability of those tools. Many of them either

do not actually measure self-efficacy as a multidimensional model or do not measure what exactly is a teacher's self-efficacy or, finally, do not follow Bandura's recommendations (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Therefore, the development of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale and Principal Sense of Efficacy Scale (PSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004, respectively) intended to cover the various shortcomings of the above questionnaires and measure the levels of self-efficacy among teachers and principals of primary and secondary education effectively. TSES includes two versions: Long version with 24 items and three dimensions, each dimension having eight items, and Short version with 12 items and three subdomains, each subdomain having four items. Three subdomains are Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Strategies and Efficacy in Classroom Management. The response format for the TSES is a 5-point Likert-type scale with the following (1) = Nothing, (2) = Very little, (3) = Some influence, (6) = Quite a bit and (9) = A great deal (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

3. The relation between teacher's job satisfaction and self-efficacy

Several investigations have supported that a school's efficacy depends not only on its principal, but also on the members of its teaching group. Researches have shown that teachers with high self-efficacy create new powerful incentives for learning to the students, consequently improving their marks. In addition, they devote themselves to their work and desire to remain in their position for as long as possible (Coladarci, 1992; Reyes & Shin, 1995). The relation between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction is very important. Several studies have proven that teachers with high self-efficacy are more enthusiastic and satisfied with their job (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, & Steca, 2003; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006). A leader-principal reinforces the power of self-efficacy. Teachers who feel comfortable with their working environment and are personally supported by the administration tend to have higher self-efficacy (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Lewandowski, 2005).

Several studies have shown that teachers' self-efficacy contributes to their job satisfaction (Coladarci, 1992; Reyes & Shin, 1995). For instance, high level of teachers' self-efficacy is positively related with teachers' job satisfaction and negatively with teachers' burn out (Gibbs, 2002). As noted by Martino (2003) transformational leadership behavior and teacher's self-efficacy influence teacher's job satisfaction.

Hipp and Bredeson (1995) studied 280 high and low efficacy teachers in 10 middle schools and found that the relation between the principal's leadership style and personal teaching efficacy (PTE) is mediated by the positive experiences that teachers undergo on the job, mainly, their

satisfaction. A couple of years later, Hipp (1997) confirmed that a school leader who provides teachers with informative feedback about their performance is very likely to enhance the latter's capacity beliefs, self-efficacy, effort, which all lead to job commitment and job satisfaction.

In 2006, Nil and Kranot reassessed the findings of Hipp and Bredeson (1995), by using a larger sample of schools and a research design that controlled for role variables correlated with PTE and leadership styles. The aim of the study was to explore whether PTE varies across leadership styles and what is the added value of the principal's leadership style for PTE when job related variables are statistically controlled. According to the results, positive job experiences that promote teacher satisfaction may contribute to the enhancement of PTE. Transformational leaders are more likely to shape the kind of job circumstances that enable individual satisfaction and, therefore, allow PTE to develop.

The study of Bogler (2001) showed that teachers' perceptions of occupational prestige, self-esteem, autonomy at work, and professional self development contribute the most to job satisfaction. In particular, teachers reported feeling highly or very satisfied when their work gave them "a sense of self-esteem," provided them with "opportunities for self-development," gave them "a feeling of success," and allowed them "to participate in determining school practices."

The study of Rosenblatt (2001) revealed that holding multiple roles in school has the potential of elevating school commitment and a sense of control over teachers' life, leading to the enhancement of teachers' self-efficacy, job satisfaction, work interest, and self actualization and, therefore, eliminating some of the negative symptoms of burnout.

A survey in 75 schools in Italy revealed the role of self-efficacy and collective efficacy. Those variables were found to affect teachers' job satisfactions both directly and indirectly (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006). The results were confirmed by similar previous studies (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, & Steca, 2003; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, Petitta, & Rubinacci, 2003; McNatt & Judge, 2008). A considerable research was carried out in five countries (Canada, Cyprus, Korea, Singapore and USA), which evaluated both the validity and reliability of the Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES) and the relation between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The results showed a positive correlation among the above variables across all five countries (Klassen et al., 2009). Similar results were found in subsequent surveys, in which teachers with high self-efficacy in terms of classroom management and instructional strategies reported high job satisfaction as well (Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Canrinus, Helms-Lorenz, Beijaard, Buitink, & Hofman, 2012). All surveys were carried out using a structural equation modeling (SEM)

analysis. Those results lead to the conclusion that educating team members' effort to gain high self-efficacy can result to satisfied employees and consequently achievement of high participation in work (Borgogni, Russo, Miraglia, & Vecchione, 2013. According to Gibson and Dembo (1984), when teachers apply new teaching methods, but insist in every difficult and failed situation, then they seem to have high self-efficacy. In addition, teachers with high self-efficacy can motivate students, lead them to better performance, be more daring and tackle new changes in the curriculum (Brookover, 1979; Midgley et al., 1989). All the above researches provide strong evidence that self-efficacy plays a key role in a group's working environment.

As noted by Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) in their research among primary and middle school teachers in Norway, teacher' job satisfaction and self-efficacy have a strong positive relationship. They supported that teacher's autonomy, good interpersonal relations between teachers and parents and high time pressure were the most important factors that influence teachers' job satisfaction (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010).

The recent study of Akomolafe and Ogunmakin (2014) revelaed a significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. As the authors explain, self-efficacy ultimately determines how an individual behaves, thinks and becomes motivated to be involved in a particular task. For this reason, individuals with high self-efficacy tend to behave more positively, think more creatively which also interacts with motivation. Consequently, such teachers are relatively more satisfied with their jobs. Another possible reason for this finding is that individuals with high level of self-efficacy have the ability to effectively handle various tasks, obligations and challenges related to their professional role. Therefore, it is not surprising that a significant positive relationship was found between self-efficacy and job satisfaction among teachers.

All the above studies provide strong evidences that self-efficacy influence individuals' job satisfaction.

Conclusion:

Job satisfaction has been a concern for researchers for numerous years and can enhance the motivation of educators to achieve and realize school goals (Obineli, 2013; Alzaidi, 2008; Chang, 2009; Fraser et al., 1998; Michaelowa, 2002; Ololube, 2006; Organ and Bateman, 1991; Menon and Saitis, 2006). Job satisfaction has been treated as a dependent variable. The factors of job satisfaction have been categorised into two main factors, intrinsic and extrinsic. Based on these two factors, different instruments developed. The most trustworthy instruments are JDI, MSQ, ESI, and TSI. The results of the above studies showed the importance of job satisfaction as

a construct worthy of attention in the educational sciences. Self-efficacy has proven to be a critical concern for many researchers. Difficult tasks and behaviors challenge teachers with high level of self-efficacy to not give up, but to put more effort forth in order to succeed. People who present a low level of personal efficacy in a specific task, quit from difficult tasks, and have weak commitment and low willingness to succeed. As noted by various authors, teachers with a strong sense of personal efficacy are more open to new ideas and innovations, show commitment to certain teaching and improve student achievement (Ross, 2006; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001; Tsigilis, Koustelios, & Grammatikopoulos, 2010). As noted by Bandura (1997), sources such as *mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion and physiological and emotional states define* describe the concept of self-efficacy. Based on the above sources, several instruments have been developed, with the most popular being the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), that intended to cover the various shortcomings of the above questionnaires and measure the levels of self-efficacy among teachers of primary and secondary education effectively. A Literature review has shown that teachers' self-efficacy has an influence on teachers' job satisfaction.

A promising direction for future research is to test through empirical research whether teachers who are satisfied with their job and have high self-efficacy have a better impact on students' performance. It is important to refer to the need of longitudinal approaches in the investigation of the most significant factors that affect teachers' job satisfaction. Specifically, it could be very helpful to explore factors that motivate teachers to get strong sense of self-efficacy and enhance job satisfaction using longitudinal studies. Using carefully designed longitudinal studies in different academic years and attempting to investigate consistency in different outcomes in the same outcomes overtime, across different academic years and across the same individuals (Kyriakides & Creemers, 2008). These results provide a closer look in the concept of teachers' job satisfaction and self-efficacy; it might be worthwhile for the policy to pay attention and try to strengthen the position of teachers. Implementing appropriate assistance for teachers in the frame of the school classroom, enhancing their skills and knowledge and improving their abilities may increase teachers' confidence level of effectively managing a classroom, implementing instructional strategies and engaging students to the learning process, and improve teachers' job satisfaction. Also, the fact that the way teachers relate to individual students is a fundamental aspect of teaching and should be taken into consideration by the Ministry's decision-makers, in order to design and apply appropriate policies to create different professional development programs in order to provide teachers with suitable programs to increase their confidence in the teaching process.

References:

Akomolafe, M.J., & Ogunmakin. A.O. (2014). Job Satisfaction among Secondary School Teachers: Emotional Intelligence, Occupational Stress and Self-Efficacy as Predictors. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 4*(3), 487-498.

Alzaidi, A. M. (2008). Secondary school head teachers' Job Satisfaction in Saudi Arabia: the results of a mixed methods approach. *ARECLS, 5*, 161-185.

Amarantidou, S. (2010). *Job burnout and job satisfaction among teachers: A longitudinal study* [Επαγγελματική εξουθένωση και επαγγελματική ικανοποίηση εκπαιδευτικών: Μια διαχρονική μελέτη] (in Greek). Trikala: University of Thessaly. PhD Thesis.

Aspridis, G., (2013). *Introduction to the political and administrative organization of the Greek state,* Athens : Propobos (*in Greek*).

Ashton, P. T., Buhr, D., & Crocker, L. (1984). Teachers' sense of efficacy: A self- or norm-referenced construct? *Florida Journal of Educational Research, 26*(1), 29–41.

Ashton, P. T., Olejnik, S., Crocker, L., & McAuliffe, M. (1982). *Measurement problems in the study of teachers' sense of efficacy.* New York: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory.* New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. (V. S. Ramachaudran, Ed.) *Encyclopedia of human behavior, 4*, pp. 71-81. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Bandura, Albert; Wood, Robert. (1989). Impact of Conceptions of Ability on Self-Regulatory Mechanisms and Complex Decision Making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 407-415.

Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Leaderrship and Job Satisfaction - A review. *European Scientific Journal, 10*(8), 24-46.

Bentley, R. R., & Rempel, A. M. (1980). *Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.* Lafayette, IN: Purdue Research Foundation.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(5), 662-683.
Bolton, B. (1986). Review of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. In D. J. Keyser, R. C. Sweetland, D. J. Keyser, & R. C. Sweetland (Eds.), *Test critiques* (Vol. 5, pp. 255-265). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.
Borgogni, L., Dello Russo, S., Miraglia, M., & Vecchione , M. (2013). The role of self-efficacy and job satisfaction on absences from work. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 63*(3), 129–136.
Brooke, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant Validation of Measures of Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 139-145.
Brookover, W. B. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference.* New York: Praeger.
Canrinus, E. T., Helms-Lorenz, M., Beijaard, D., Buitink, J., & Hofman, A. (2012). Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment:exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 27*(1), 115-132.
Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003). Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 821−832.
Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., Petitta, L., & Rubinacci, A. (2003). Teachers', school staff's and parents' efficacy beliefs as determinants of attitude toward school. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 18*, 15−31.
Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*, 473–490.
Chang, M.-L. (2009). An Appraisal Perspective of Teacher Burnout:Examining the Emotional Work of Teachers. *Educational Psychologyl Review, 21*, 193–218.
Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Commitment to Teaching. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 60*(4), 323-337.
Crohan, S. E., Antonucci, T. C., Adelmann, P. K., & Coleman, L. M. (1989). Job Characteristics and well-being at midlife: Ethnic and gender comparisons. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13*, 223-235.
Currivan, D. B. (1999). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Review, 9*(4), 495-524.

De Nobile, J., & McCormick, J. (2008). Organizational Communication Schools and Job Satisfaction in Australian Catholic Primary. *Journal of Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 36*(1), 101-122.
Dimmock, C., & Hattie, J. (1996). School Principals' Self-Efficacy and its Measurement in a Context of Restructuring. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*(7), 62 — 75. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0924345960070103
Dinham, S. S. (1997). *Modelling teacher satisfaction: findings from 892 teaching staff at 71 schools.* Chicago, IL.
Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (2000). Moving into the third, outer domain of teacher satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*(4), 379 - 396.
Edmonson, S. (2006). Role ambiguity. In F. W. English, *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (Vols. 1-2). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412939584
Evans, L. (1998). *Teacher Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation.* London: SAGE.
Evans, V., & Johnson, D. J. (1990). The relationship of principals' leadership behavior and teachers' job satisfaction and job-related stress. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 17*(1), 11.
Frank, V. V. (2009). Efficacy can overcome classroom barriers. *The learning principal, 4*(8), 1-8.
Fraser, H., Draper, J., & Taylor, W. (1998). The Quality of Teachers' Professional Lives: Teachers and Job Satisfaction. *Evaluation & Research in Education, 12*(2), 61-71.
Gibbs, C. (2002). Effective teaching exercising self-efficacy and thought control of action. *Annual Conference of the british Educational Research Association.* New Zealand: Auckland University of Technology.
Gibbs, C. (2003). Explaining effective teaching: self-efficacy and thought control of action. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 4*(2), 1-14.
Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 569-582.
Goetz, K., Campbell, S., Broge, B., Dorfer, C., Brodowski, M., & Szecsenyi, J. (2012). The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on the job satisfaction of dentists. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol 2012*, 1-7.
Golia, A.K., Belias, D.A., Tsioli, S., & Koustelios, A. (2013). Organizational Culture and Leadership in Education [Οργανωσιακή Κουλτούρα και Ηγεσία στην Εκπαίδευση] (in Greek). University of Crete: *Journal of Education Sciences, 1-2*, 15-31.
Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (1995). *Behavior in organizations* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. (A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.).

Guion, R. M. (1978). Review of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. In O. K. Buros, & O. K. Buros (Ed.), *The eighth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 1679-1680). Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon Press.

Hackman , J. R., & Oldman, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 159-170.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldman, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279.

Hauber, F. A., & Bruininks, R. H. (1986). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction among Direct-Care Staff in Residential Facilities for Mentally Retarded People. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46*(1), 95-105.

Heller, H. W., Clay, R., & Perkins, C. (1993). The relationship between teacher job satisfaction and principal leadership style. *Heller, H. W., Clay, R., & Perkins, C. (1993). The relationship between teacher job, 3*(1), 74-86.

Henke, R. R., Choy, S. P., Geis, S., & Broughman, S. (1996). *Schools and staffing in the United States: A statistical profile, 1993-94.* Washington, DC: U.S.

Henson, R. K. (2001). *Teacher self efficacy: Substantive implications and measurement dilemmas.* Presented at the annual meeting of the Educational, Texas A & M University.

Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Herzberg, F. (1968). *Work and the Nature of Man.* London: Staples Press.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work.* New York: Wiley.

Hipp, K. A. (1997, April). *Documenting the effects of transformational leadership behavior on teacher efficacy.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Hipp, K. A., & Bredeson, P. V. (1995). Exploring connections between teacher efficacy and principal's behavior. *Journal of School Leadership, 5*(2), 136-150.

Hirschfeld, R. R. (2000). Does Revising the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form Make a Difference? *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*(2), 255-270.

Ho, C.-L., & Au, W.-T. (2006). Teaching Satisfaction Scale : Measuring Job Satisfaction of Teachers. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(1), 172-185.

Kantas, A. (1998). *Organizational Industrial Psychology* [Οργανωτική Βιομηχανική Ψυχολογία] (in Greek). Athens: Ellinika Grammata [Ελληνικά γράμματα].

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.
Kerr, B. A. (1985). Review of the Job Descriptive Index. In J. V. Mitchell (Ed.), *The ninth mental measurements yearbook,* (pp. 754-756). Buros: Institute Lincoln, NE.
Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the Construct Validity of the Job Descriptive Index:A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 14–32.
Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction:Teacher Gender, Years of Experience, and Job Stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(3), 741–756.
Klassen, R. M., Bong, M., Usher, E. L., Chong, W. H., Huan, V. S., Wong, I. Y., & Georgiou, T. (2009). Exploring the validity of a teachers' self-efficacy scale in five countries. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34*, 67–76.
Koustelios, A. (1991). *The Relationships of Organizational Cultures and Job Satisfaction in Three Selected Industries in Greece.* University of Manchester. UK.: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
Koustelios, A. D. (2001). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction of Greek teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management, 15*(7), 354 - 358.
Koustelios, A. D., Karabatzaki, D., & Kousteliou, I. (2004). Autonomy and Job Satisfaction for a Sample of Greek Teachers. *Psychological Reports, 95*, 883-886.
Koustelios, A., & Bagiatis, K. (1997). The Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI): Development of a Scale to Measure Satisfaction of Greek Employees. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*(3), 469-476.
Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (1995). *Organizational Behavior.* Irwin.
Kyriakides , L., & Creemers, B. P. (2008). A longitudinal study on the stability over time of school and teacher effects on student outcomes. *Oxford Review of Education, 34*(5), 521-545.
Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in Work Organizations.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
Lee, C., & Schuler, R. (1982). A constructive replication amd extension of a role and expectancy perception model of participation in decision making. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 55*, 109-118.
Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, B. J. (2005). Transformational leadership. In B. Davies, *Essentials of School Leadership* (pp. 31-43). CA: Paul Chapman & Corwin, Thousand Oaks.
Lester, P. E. (1987). Development and Factor Analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47*(1), 223-233.

Levi, L. (1967). *Stress: sources, management and Prevention.* New York: Liveright Publishing Corp.
Lewandowski , K. L. (2005). *A study of the relationship of teachers' self-efficacy and the impact of leadership and professional development.* A Dissertation, Indiana: University of Pennsylvania.
Li, M. (1993). Job satisfaction and performance of coaches of the spare time sports schools in China. *Journal of Sport Management, 7*, 132-140.
Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunette, *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1343). Chicago: Rand McNally.
Luthans, F. (1995). *Organizational behavior.* Mc-Graw-Hill, Inc.
Markaki, A. (2008). *Job satisfaction among employees of psychosocial rehabilitation units* [Η επαγγελματική ικανοποίηση των εργαζομένων σε δομές ψυχοκοινωνικής αποκατάστασης]. Piraeus: University of Piraeus. Master's Degree Thesis.
Martino, A. M. (2003). *Leadership style, teacher empowerment and job satisfaction in public elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. John's University, Jamaica: NY.
Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*, 370-396.
McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation.* Glenview, I: Scott, Foresman.
McNatt, D., & Judge, T. (2008). Self-efficacy intervention, job attitudes, and turnover: A field experiment with employees in role transition. *Human Relations, 61*(6), 783–810.
Menon , M. E., & Saitis, C. (2006). Satisfaction of Pre-service and In-service Teachers with Primary School Organization : Evidence From Greece. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 34*(3), 345–363.
Michaelowa, K. (2002). *Teacher Job Satisfaction, Student Achievement, and the Cost of Primary Education in in Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa.* Hamburg: HWWA Discussion Paper No. 188, Hamburg Institute of International Economics (HWWA).
Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. S. (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(2), 247-258.
Muretta, R. J. (2004). *Exploring the four sources of self-efficacy.* Touro: Touro University International, Dissertation.
Nguni, S., Sleegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and Transactional Leadership Effects on Teacher' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Primary Schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 145-177.

Nil, A. E., & Kranot, N. (2006). School principal's leadership style and teachers' self efficacy. *Planning and Changing, 37*(3-4), 205–218.
Noe, R., Hollenbeck, J., Gerhart, B., and Wright P., (2009). *Human Resources Management : Gaining a competitive advantage,* St. Patsikas and G. Aspridis (editing), Athens : Papazisis (*in Greek*).
Obineli, A. S. (2013). Teachers' Perception of the Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction in Ekwusigo Local Government of Anambra State, Nigeria. *An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia, 7*(4), 225-237.
Okoye, A. (2011). Attitudes of Primary School Teachers Toward Introduction of Career Guidance in Primary Schools. *A journal that cuts across all behavioural issues, 3*(2).
Ololube, N. P. (2006). Teachers Job Satisfaction and Motivation for School Effectiveness: An Assessment. *Essays In Education (EIE), 18*(9).
Organ, D. W., & Bateman, T. S. (1991). *Organizational Behavior.* Homewood, IL: IRWIN.
Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance.* Homewood, Illinois: Irwin-Dorsey.
Reyes, P., & Shin, H. S. (1995). Teachercommitment and job satisfaction: A causal analysis. *Journal of School Leadership, 5*(1), 22-39.
Robbins, S. P. (1984). *Management: concepts and practices.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice - Hall.
Rose, J. S., & Medway, F. J. (1981). Measurement of teachers' beliefs in their control over student outcome. *Journal of Educational Research, 74,* 1-28.
Rosenblatt, Z. (2001). Teachers' Multiple Roles and Skill Flexibility: Effects on Work Attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(5), 684-708.
Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effect of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education, 17*(1), 51-65.
Sahinidis, A.G., Giovanis, A.N., & Sdrolias, L. (2012). The Role of Gender on Entrepreneurial Intention Among Students. *International Journal On Integrated Information Management, 1*(1), 61-79.
Samavi, A. S. (2011). Study of Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among High-School Managers. *Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine, 1*(1), 1-3.
Schneider, B., & Snyder, R. A. (1975). Some Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60,* 318-328.
Singh, K., & Billingsley, B. (1996). Intent to stay in teaching: Teachers of students with emotional disorders versus other special educators. *Remedial and Special Education, 17*(1), 37-47.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 611-625.

Skaalvik, E., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 1059-69.

Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences.* SAGE Publications, Inc.

Spilt, J. L., Koomen, H. M., & Thijs, J. (2011). Teacher Wellbeing: The Importance of Teacher–Student Relationships. *Education Psychology Review, 23*, 457–477.

Staples Sandy D, Hulland S. John , Higgins A. Christopher. (1999, Νοέμβριος - Δεκέμβριος). *A Self-Efficacy Theory Explanation for the Management of Remote Workers in Virtual Organizations.* Retrieved Μάρτιος 15, 2011, from JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640240

Staples, S. D., Hulland, J. S., & Higgins, C. A. (1999). A Self-Efficacy Theory Explanation for the Management of Remote Workers in Virtual Organizations. *Organization Science, 10*(6), 758-776.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelly, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups. In M. R. Weis, C. Stevens, & 1993, *Motivation and attrition of female coaches* (Vol. 7, pp. 244-261). The Sport Psychologist.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 573-585.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *17*, 783–805.

Tsigilis, N., Grammatikopoulos, V., & Koustelios, A. (2007). Applicability of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale to educators teaching innovative programs. *International Journal of Educational Management, 21*(7), 634-642.

Tsigilis, N., Koustelios, A., & Grammatikopoulos, V. (2010). Psychometric Properties of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale Within the Greek Educational Context. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 28*(2), 153–162.

Tsigilis, N., Zachopoulou, E., & Grammatikopoulos, V. (2006). Job satisfaction and burnout among Greek early educators: A comparison between public and private sector employees. *Educational Research and Review, 1*(8), 256-261.

Van Scooter, J. R. (2000). Relationships of task performance and contextual performanc with turnover, job satisfaction and effective commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(1), 79-95.
Veldman, I., Tartwijk, J. v., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2013). Job satisfaction and teachere student relationships across the teaching career: Four case studies. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 32*, 55-65.
Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation.* New York: John Wiley.
Warr, P. B. (1987). Job characteristics and mental health. In P. Warr (Ed.), *Psychology at work.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. I. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.* Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Work Adjustment Project.
Whiteford, P. (1990). *Differences between teachers who have and have not taught continuously during the first five years after graduation.* Chicago, IL.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association,.
Wood, J., Wallace, J., Zeffane, R., Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (1998). *Organisational behaviour: An Asia-Pacific perspective.* Jacaranda: Wiley Ltd.
Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2004). Job satisfaction among school teachers in Cyprus. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 357-374.
Zigarrelli, M. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research. *The Journal of Educational Research, 90*(2), 103-109.