A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY EXAMINING THE FACTORS THAT

CONTRIBUTE TO THE RETENTION OF EXPERIENCED SPECIAL

EDUCATION TEACHERS IN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Jeanne Lynn Newsom

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The University of Houston-Clear Lake

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements

For the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in Educational Leadership

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE

MAY, 2023

A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY EXAMINING THE FACTORS THAT

CONTRIBUTE TO THE RETENTION OF EXPERIENCED SPECIAL

EDUCATION TEACHERS IN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Jeanne Lynn Newsom

APPROVED BY

_____

Elizabeth A. Beavers, Ph.D., Chair

_____

Randy L. Seevers, Ph.D., Committee Member

_____

Michelle Peters, Ed.D., Committee Member

_____

Jane Cooper, Ed.D., Committee Member

RECEIVED/APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION:

_____

Terry Shepard, Ed.D., Associate Dean

_____

Joan Pedro, Ph.D., Dean

Acknowledgements

Psalm 121:1-2

"Set a goal so big that you can't achieve it until you grow into the kind of person who can." ~ Anonymous.

R. L., I could write and write about how supportive you've been in this crazy journey. Thank you! Thank you for being the most supportive husband on the planet and for getting me through this marathon. And thank you for "keeping things quiet" during all those p.m. online classes during COVID, when I was anxiously finishing those assignments that were due "today," and during this final leg of hunkering down for my dissertation research and typing.

Mom, I wish you could be here and read this. Thanks for instilling in me the drive to realize anything is possible and for giving me the wings to follow my dreams. "Look Mom. I made it!"

Barbara and Logan, Even though you are both "grown and flown," I always knew you were cheering me on. Even when I thought it was too much, your continual encouragement kept me going. I did it!

Julie, The best sister ever! Through all of the "craziness" during this journey, you were always there. Always.

A HUGE thank you to my dissertation chair (and my hero – well, she's a lot of doctoral students' hero), Dr. Elizabeth Beavers. Without you, I would never have finished. Your knowledge base and "cheerleading capacity" kept me going (and going…). You are a blessing!

And…To all of the special education teachers out there who "still remain." Your gifts of love and commitment to "our kids" is rare…the world is a better place because of you.

ABSTRACT

A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY EXAMINING THE FACTORS THAT

CONTRIBUTE TO THE RETENTION OF EXPERIENCED SPECIAL

EDUCATION TEACHERS IN TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Jeanne Lynn Newsom
University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2023

Dissertation Chair: Elizabeth A. Beavers, Ph.D.

Abstract

The special education teacher shortage in the U.S. continues to grow and the implication of this shortage is multifaceted. First and foremost, students that are eligible for special education may not be receiving the educational supports and services that they deserve and legally require. Additionally, this shortage may cause great financial burdens on school districts that are continually having to hire and train new special education teachers. There also may be negative financial obligations when districts are sued because there are inadequate or uncertified teachers supporting these students. There are many studies that have inquired why teachers leave the field of education, however, there are minimal that have explored special education teachers specifically, and according to Billingsley and Bettini (2019) current studies of special education teachers that leave or remain are largely quantitative. The purpose of this qualitative study was to investigate

the perceptions and experiences of special education teachers that have remained in the field. The research questions revolved around intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors regarding why they have remained. Using both in person and a video conference platform, five participants were interviewed with an open-ended interview protocol. The researcher then analyzed the interview transcripts which revealed two intrinsic (work itself and achievement) and three extrinsic (supervisor/leadership quality, working conditions, and coworker relations) emergent themes. Overall, the findings of this qualitative study revealed interventions for education leaders and authors/instructors of educator preparation programming to assist in reducing the special education teacher shortage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

It is well known that teaching is a highly stressful occupation, and a considerable amount of research and literature has been committed to this topic (Ogba, 2020; Agaiâ et al., 2015; Smith at al., 2000; Mearns & Cain, 2003). Frustration in teaching is common and is expected; however, when these adverse feelings begin to permanently reside, exhaustion surpasses energy and effectiveness erodes into ineffectiveness (Brunsting et al., 2014; Schaufeli, et al., 2009). In addition, research supports elevated levels of stress may lead to burnout when teachers feel that the demands of their job exceed their resources and coping capabilities (Hakanen et al., 2006).

Studies have steadily shown that teachers are a main influencer regarding students' educational outcomes (Coleman et al., 1966; Hanuskek, 2006; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017) which includes long and short-term academic outcomes (Lee, 2018) as well as noncognitive outcomes such as self-efficacy and motivation (Jackson, 2018). Teachers who are burned out but stay in the field, are at risk for adverse personal outcomes and reduced progress for their students (Williams & Dykes, 2016). Additionally, teachers who experience burnout usually become less efficient in their behavior management procedures (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009) and may provide lower quality programming and supports (Ruble & McGrew, 2013). With inadequate programming, students with disabilities are more likely to struggle emotionally, socially, behaviorally, and academically (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Ruble & McGrew, 2013).

Special education teachers (SETs) provide instruction to students with disabilities and manage services mandated in the student's individualized education program (IEP) (Legislative Analyst's Office, 2013). At the end of the 20th century, burnout in SETs was described as a "crisis" (Wisniewski & Gargiulo, 1997), and this crisis has gone

1

unresolved for the last 40 years (Mason-Williams et al., 2020). From 2005 to 2012 the number of SETs in the United States (U.S.) dropped by 17% (Dewey, et al., 2017). According to the United States Department of Education (2016), 49 out of the 50 states report that there is a shortage of SETs and that 98% of the country reports that SETs are in demand. In 2018 the demand for SETs rose by 17% (Snyder et al., 2018) and Sullivan et al. (2017) reported that special education–certified teachers leave schools at about twice the rate of other teachers. Sullivan et al. (2017) argued that SETs in Texas also leave Texas public schools at nearly twice the rate of general educators.

Literature on attrition and burnout of SETs attribute low job satisfaction as a main indicator in their leaving the field (Emery & Vandenberg, 2010; Paquette & Reig, 2016). Studies show that there are a range of factors that can affect levels of job satisfaction experienced by SETs such as school environment, workload manageability, and access to resources (Andrews & Brown, 2015; Bettini et al., 2017; Boyer & Gillespie, 2000; Brunsting et al., 2014; Thornton et al., 2007).

A survey by Rand Corporation yielded that 78% of teachers reported that significant job-related stress and teachers reported depression at a rate of 2 ½ times greater than the general public (Diliberti & Schwartz, 2021). Research shows that the job of a SET is more stressful than that of general education teachers (Bettini et al., 2017) because they face large student caseloads, lack of role clarity, lack of administrator supports, increasing and excessive paperwork, feelings of isolation, and minimal collaboration with colleagues (Albrecht et al., 2009). Additionally, SETs face vast academic and behavioral challenges of their students as well as a growing number of responsibilities, numerous meetings, and increased accountability (Ansley et al., 2016). Special education teachers have the greatest turnover rate in the teaching field (Robertson & Singleton, 2010).

While much is known regarding teacher attrition, according to Day and Gu (2009) and Chiong et al. (2017), less is known about variables that contribute to the retention of teachers and the reasons why some educators stay in the teaching field. Research focused on variables that contribute to the retention of SETs specifically, is minimal. Therefore, this study is needed to discover what the retention variables are, in hopes of increasing the SET retention rate. As school districts across the U.S. continue to struggle with SET vacancies, this study was needed to determine possible SET retention interventions which may ultimately decrease the SET attrition rate.

Research Problem

Garcia and Weiss (2019) reported that the teacher shortage is expanding which makes it challenging to build a positive reputation for teaching which perpetuates the shortage. While some attrition is normal because of being unskilled or retiring (Adnot et al., 2016), involuntary attrition and retirement only account for 14% and 18% of all attrition respectively (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). Thus, 67% of teacher attrition is voluntary and may be rectifiable by intervention (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019).

 Research suggests that, for many decades, school systems throughout the U.S. have struggled to fill special education teaching positions (Cowan et al., 2016; Mason-Williams et al., 2020). These shortages historically have been credited to an insufficient supply of SETs (Boe, 2006) and to low retention rates (Billingsley, 2004). Current research has associated SET low retention rates to unique working conditions and assignments (Bettini et al., 2017; Billingsley et al, 2020).

Special education has never completely experienced a totally qualified teaching labor force, and has therefore, never delivered on the promise of delivering a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) for all students with disabilities (Mason-Williams, 2020). Billingsley and Bettini (2019) report that there is a growing and universal

shortage of SETs which directly threatens the quality of education that students with disabilities receive. In other words, high SET attrition rates hinders schools in providing qualified SETs for students with disabilities (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). A lack of appropriate and qualified teachers threatens a student's ability to learn (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Sorenson & Ladd, 2016), and this instability adversely affects student achievement and teacher effectiveness (Kraft & Papy, 2014; Sorenson & Ladd, 2018).

High teacher turnover consumes economic resources through expenditures regarding recruiting and training new teachers (Garcia & Wiess, 2019). School districts that invest deeply in new teacher orientation activities and professional development have significant turnover costs (Watlington et al., 2010). For example, filling teacher vacancies costs approximately $21,000 per teacher (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017; Learning Policy Institute, 2017). Regarding SETs specifically, Mason-Williams et al. (2020) argue that SET shortages have serious economic impacts because the amount of funds spent annually by school districts and other agencies regarding critical staffing concerns, as well as having to financially compensate for mandated services for students with disabilities that go unmet (Mason-Williams et al., 2020). Regarding SETs specifically, Mason-Williams et al. (2020) argue that SET shortages have serious economic impacts because of the amount of funds spent annually by school districts and other agencies regarding critical staffing concerns, as well as having to financially compensate for mandated services for students with disabilities that go unmet is substantial (Mason-Williams et al., 2020).

Significance of Study

It is essential to examine the factors related to why some experienced SETs stay in the field to determine practices that contribute to SET retention because, according to DeFranzo (2018), teacher retention is a critical issue that affects an education system (DeFranzo, 2018). DeFour and Eaker (1998) maintain that retaining veteran teachers is essential for communities and schools, thus, understanding factors that are associated with SET retention is crucial in designing interventions that may assist in combating this historical problem.

Over the past three decades, schools have seen a critical shortage of SETs (Billingsley, 2021). A high turnover rate of 25% among SETs in the U.S. has remained fairly stable over the past 20 years (Billingsley, 2021), while the turnover rate of general educators is 8% annually (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019). Examining the factors that contribute to the retention of SETs could be beneficial to education leaders and authors/instructors of educator programming in combatting the SET shortage. Addressing and alleviating the shortage will result in a higher quality education for more students with disabilities and will aid in stopping the depletion of campus and district finances regarding the recruitment, hiring, training, and holding professional development sessions for newly hired SETs.

Despite the heightened attention on why SETs leave the field, knowledge related to attrition of SETs is limited when compared to general education teachers (Hagaman & Casey. 2017). Additionally, there are studies that indicate reasons why SETs leave the field but there is minimal research that examines why some SETs remain in the field., and this study filled this disparity. In other words, this study provided unique data in the issue of SET retention which will assist education leaders and authors/instructors of educator programming in understanding the reasons why some experienced SETs

remained in the field. Ultimately, this study conveyed interventions to combat the SET shortage.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the experiences of SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years.

Research Questions

1. What intrinsic (motivators) factors have SETs, who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced regarding remaining and teaching this specific special education population?

2. What extrinsic (hygiene) factors do SETs, who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced regarding remaining and teaching this specific special education population?

Definitions of Key Terms

The following key terms pertain to this study:

ARD (meeting): (Admission, Review and Dismissal) Annual review of a student's special education program that includes an update of the student's progress, a review of the current Individualized Education Program (IEP), and the development of a new IEP for the upcoming year (Texas Project First, 2022).

Alternative Certification Program: A program that gives professionals an alternative way to receive certification in teaching while completing required training and teaching students at the same time (Texas Education Agency, 2015).

Assistive Technology*:* Any item, piece of equipment, or product system used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a person with a disability (Texas Project First, 2022).

Attrition: A reduction in numbers usually as a result of resignation, retirement, or death (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

Burnout: Exhaustion of physical or emotional strength or motivation usually as a result of prolonged stress or frustration (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

Early Childhood Teacher Certificate: Signifies that a teacher has met a set of standards that shows they understand the best ways to educate young students aged 3 to 8 (Teaching-Certification, 2022).

Experienced Special Education Teacher*:* A teacher who teaches children with disabilities as defined in section 602 of IDEA Legal Institute, (n.d.) and who has remained teaching students with disabilities at the same public-school campus for five or more years.

Job Satisfaction: A positive or pleasurable state caused by the evaluation of an individual's job or job experiences (Locke, 1976).

Public school**:** A school that is maintained at public expense for the education of children of a community or district and that constitutes a part of a system of free education commonly including primary and secondary schools (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

Retention: The act or state of being retained (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

Special Education Teacher (SET): A teacher who teaches children with disabilities as defined in section 602 of IDEA (Legal Institute, (n.d.).

Teacher Turnover: When a teacher leaves teaching. (Gilmore & Wehby, 2020).

Traditional Teacher Certification: The conventional way to begin teaching; completing a bachelor's degree in education at an accredited college or university (Bell, 2021).

Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the need for this study, significance of the problem, research purpose and questions, and the study's key terms. The study will be a contribution to education leaders and authors/instructors of educator programming regarding what factors contribute to the retention of experienced SETs which will be beneficial in combatting the SET shortage. The following chapter will be a literature review of the major topics that supported this study.

CHAPTER II:

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter provides a comprehensive analysis of literature on topics related to factors that impact the retention of SETs. This analysis will begin with investigating this study's theoretical framework, Herzberg's two-factor theory, and the applicability of this theory to the study. The following sections will provide further literature review centered on special education in the U.S., SETs' reasons for entering the field, roles and responsibilities of SETs, attrition of U.S. teachers, current attrition trends and demands for SETs, current attrition trends and demands for SETS, SET job satisfaction, and the impacts of SETs leaving the field. The conclusion of this chapter will report a summary of findings.

Theoretical Framework

Herzberg's two-factor theory, also known as Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, was used to frame this study which examined factors related to SET retention. Frederick Herzberg is known as a pioneer in motivation theory (Lee et al., 2014). Herzberg proposed the two-factor theory in 1959 (Herzberg, 1968; Herzberg et al, 1959) following an extensive review of more than 2,000 job satisfaction studies. Herzberg et al. (1957) noted that the variables that influenced job satisfaction appeared to be different from the variables that influenced job dissatisfaction. Through open ended interviews, Herzberg et al. (1959) asked a sample of more than 200 engineers and accountants to describe instances when they felt "really good" while on the job and instances when they felt "really bad" while on the job to test this theory. Herzberg (1959) found that the factors that lead to job satisfaction were not the same as those that produced job dissatisfaction. The results of his study offered evidence of two separate and distinct categories related to job satisfaction (motivators and hygiene), thus creating the

motivation-hygiene theory. Herzberg et al. (1959), then proposed the two-factor theory of work motivation. The theory suggested that humans have two types of needs and that different aspects of a work environment satisfies or dissatisfies these needs (Park & Johnson, 2019).

Herzberg described satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the workplace using the two factors he termed motivation (satisfiers) and hygiene (dissatisfiers) (Herzberg, 1996; Herzberg, 2003). Herzberg et al. (1959) established that motivating factors and hygiene factors are independent of each other and are not merely on the opposing ends of a scale but are separate constructs. The category of motivation correlates with a need for growth or self-actualization (Alshmemri et al., 2017). The category known as hygiene factors relate to the need to evade unpleasantness (Alshmemri et al., 2017). Herzberg appropriated the term hygiene from epidemiology, noting that good medical hygiene does not make people healthy, but can stop illness (Herzberg et al., 1959). Herzberg and his colleagues reported that, similar to medical hygiene, good interpersonal relations, fair pay and policies, and pleasant working conditions did not appear to provide significant long-term satisfaction, but did appear to prevent dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). According to Herzberg et al. (1959), motivation factors lead to positive job attitudes and hygiene factors encompass the 'doing' of the job. Herzberg (1966) asserted that motivation factors could be used to satisfy psychological needs like growth and achievement, while hygiene factors could be used to satisfy physiological needs such as earning income to provide food and shelter. According to Herzberg, hygiene cannot motivate an employee, and when utilized to achieve motivation, negative effects may be produced over the long run (Acquah et al., 2021). Equally, the presence of hygiene factors will not increase motivation, but a lack of hygiene factors produces dissatisfaction

(Ozsoy, 2019). Een et al., (2021) argue that school administrators and leaders should pay attention to motivation and hygiene factors to ensure job satisfaction among teachers.

Many researchers have focused on extrinsic rewards and working conditions such as benefits, pay, and working conditions in increasing motivation levels among employees (Stringer at al., 2011; Heneman & Werner, 2005; Probst et al., 2002; Brundy & Condrey 1993). Other researchers have focused on the role of employees' feelings regarding their work such as achievement, recognition, and responsibility in improving motivation levels (Herzberg, 1968; Herzberg et al., 1959). According to Herzberg et al. (1959) and Herzberg (1968), employees are better motivated and may increase their productivity when they experience these feelings at work, compared when provided with better working conditions such as high pay and job security. A majority of the stories relayed in Herzberg's study about job dissatisfaction concerned incompetent or unfair supervisors, unfair company policies, poor interpersonal relations, unfair salary, job insecurity, and threats to status (Herzberg et al., 1959). The researchers found that most of the stories of job satisfaction involved opportunities to experience recognition, achievement, increased responsibility, interesting work, advancement, and/or learning.

Motivation Factors Leading to Job Satisfaction (Intrinsic)

Motivation factors are critical for an employee's level of job satisfaction (Waltman et al., 2012). According to Herzberg (1971) and Herzberg et al. (1993), motivating factors are essential to a job and are intrinsically rewarding. Examples of motivating factors include advancement, tasks well done, job responsibility, recognition of achievement, and work itself, which are all considered to be intrinsically rewarding (Herzberg, 1971; Sharp, 2008). In other words, motivation is centered around having a sense of personal growth and achievement (Herzberg, 1971). When these factors are satisfying, they work as motivators (Herzberg et al, 1993). However, the factors do not

produce dissatisfaction if they are missing; instead, there is a deficiency of satisfaction (Herzberg, 1971; Herzberg et al., 1993).

Hygiene Factors Leading to Job Dissatisfaction (Extrinsic)

Factors (or characteristics) known as hygiene factors, can lead toward job dissatisfaction in an individual (Waltman et al., 2012). These factors are critical for basic survival needs (Herzberg 1971, Herzberg et al., 1993). Examples of hygiene factors include salary, benefits, competent supervision and administration, work relationships, a good work environment, and rewards (Herzberg, 1971; Herzberg et al., 1993; Sharp, 2008). Herzberg et al. (1993) suggests that even if these factors are not met, they do not motivate, but assist in preventing job dissatisfaction.

Studies for Motivation and Hygiene Factors Leading to Job Satisfaction

A comparative study by Bušatlić and Mujabasic (2018) aimed to test how Herzberg's two-factor theory applied to the context of high school teachers in examining whether motivator and hygiene factors had an effect on the job satisfaction of 150 public and private high school teachers. The authors' main data source was a questionnaire from an adapted version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The findings indicated that nearly 84% of the variance in job satisfaction can be substantially explained by motivation and hygiene factors. Specifically, the study confirmed that, when considered individually, all motivator and hygiene factors significantly correlated with job satisfaction (Bušatlić & Mujabasic, 2018).

Frahm and Cianca (2021) used Herzberg's two-factor theory to identify characteristics that impact teacher job satisfaction, with the main focus being leadership behaviors that increased teacher retention in rural schools. The participants in this study were eight superintendents, eight principals, and seven aspiring administrators. Data was gained through transcriptions from focus groups where open coding was used to

categorize segments of information. Findings from the study reinforced Herzberg's theory regarding interpersonal relationships (hygiene factor) in determining employee dissatisfaction. One participant acknowledged that good relationships equal retaining teachers. Participants also cited low salaries and less lucrative benefits as teacher retention barriers. These barriers may complicate the potential dissatisfaction that can come with lower salaries and the costs related with recruiting and training new teachers, leading to other hygiene factors (Frahm & Cianca, 2021).

Isaacs et al. (2020) studied Herzberg's theory as it related to the job satisfaction of medical interns. Twelve interns who were coming to the end of their internship training consented to be interviewed for this study. The focus of the interviews was what aspects of the internship made the participants happy and what aspects needed improvement. The interns were also asked about their positive and negative experiences. Results presented themes such as advantages of rural internship and good teaching, which related to achievement and advancement (motivating factors) and different themes such as poor access to administration and stressful working conditions, which related to administration and working conditions (hygiene factors). The results of this study directly aligned with Herzberg's theory demonstrating that reasons for job satisfaction are generally different from reasons for job dissatisfaction (Isaacs, et al., 2020).

Relevance to Special Education Teacher Job Satisfaction

The following analysis of the literature examines research regarding relevance of Herzberg's two-factor theory and teachers' job satisfaction. While an exhaustive review of the literature could not identify research that specifically aligned Herzberg's theory to the context of SET job satisfaction, studies that explored teacher job satisfaction were identified. Additionally, a study regarding Herzberg's two-factor theory within the

context of psychology was also examined, as it closely related to SET job satisfaction during the current pandemic COVID-19.

Herzberg's two-factor theory is one of the most frequently used theoretical frameworks in job satisfaction studies (Dion, 2006). Nias (1981), interviewed 100 primary school teachers. Evidence in this study was consistent with Herzberg's theory that job satisfiers are derived from the job itself such as the emotional satisfaction of being with children and the pleasures of helping children learn (Nias, 1981). This same study also supported Herzberg's theory as it reflected main sources of job dissatisfaction which included institutional factors (e.g., inefficient administration, poor communication, and weak leadership) which made teaching difficult and required ways that the teachers found were offensive (Nias, 1981). Bogler, (2001), studied 745 teachers' responses on a quantitative Likert-type questionnaire in 1997. The respondents were directed to refer to their current administrator and to complete the questionnaire that asked questions about the administrator's decision-making strategies and leadership styles, their perceptions about the occupation of teaching, and their satisfaction relating to issues at their work. Bogler (2001) found that the teachers' perceptions of occupational prestige, autonomy at work, self-esteem, and professional development contributed the most to job satisfaction, which directly supports Herzberg's two-factor theory.

Herzberg's theory was also used by Abraham and Prasetyo (2021) to determine factors that affected job satisfaction of teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic and to examine a teacher's work motivation in relationship to the theory. In this study, 20 teachers were both observed and engaged in focus groups. The study found the sources that functioned as satisfiers included relationships, job security, and school policies, which are all Herzberg's hygiene factors Herzberg's theory highlights that hygiene

factors cannot serve as sources of motivation or satisfaction but can prevent employee dissatisfaction (Abraham & Prasetyo, 2021).

A study by Gangwar et al. (2022) also focused on testing the efficacy of Herzberg's theory during the COVID-19 pandemic. This study aimed at analyzing the motivational and hygiene factors of people working from home during the pandemic. In this study, a questionnaire was sent through social media. Forty-four males and 44 females, all over the age of 18 and working from home, responded to a questionnaire, and were selected as the sample. The study supported that there is a significant difference in job satisfaction of employees "locked in" at home due to motivation and hygiene factors. The two top motivating factors that predicted job satisfaction were achievement and work itself. The two top hygiene factors that played a critical role were relationship with supervisors and company policy (Gangwar et al., 2022).

Special Education in the U.S.

Special education is a process by which students who have special needs, receive their education by specially trained staff, to address their specific individual needs while incorporating these needs in a typical education environment as much as possible (Benitez Ojeda & Carugno, 2021). Benitez Ojeda and Carugno (2021) report that success regarding academic achievement, self-sufficiency, and future community contributions may not be achieved if special education students do not receive this additional support. Children who have special education needs are entitled by law to receive support and accommodations that will enable them to reach their academic potential and perform to the best of their abilities (Minz & Wasserman, 2020; Protopapas & Parrila, 2018).

Federal commitment in ensuring that all students have equal access to educational opportunities, which includes teachers that are prepared to meet the needs of students who require specialized instruction, began in 1965 with the enactment of the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (Mason-Williams et al., 2020). The ESEA mandated availability of categorical aid for advancing educational programs in "meeting the special education needs of educationally deprived children" (P.L.89-10, §201). A reauthorization of this act lead to additional aid for children whom English was a second language, migrant children, and children with mental and physical handicaps (McLaughlin, 2010). Although ESEA had a distinct emphasis on ensuring equal educational opportunity, many officials believed that educating children with disabilities was not a public-school responsibility (Mason-Williams et al., 2020). Subsequently, in 1970 (A History of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2022) only one in five students with disabilities was educated in the public-school setting and nearly one million children were kept out of public schools (Abeson et al., 1976).

In 1970, U.S. schools only educated one in five students with disabilities, and many states excluded certain students such as those that were blind, deaf, intellectually disabled or had an emotional disturbance (A History of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2022). In 1975, Congress enacted the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, also known as Public Law 94-142, which emphasized the inclusion of individuals with disabilities (Mason-Williams et al, 2020). Before Public Law 94-142, many children were denied access to opportunities to learn (A History of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2022). Public Law 94-142 specified that students with disabilities were entitled access to FAPE which must be designed to meet their unique needs as specified by their Individual Education Program (IEP) and funded through federal categorical aid (Mason-Williams et al., 2020).

Public Law 94-142 was later reauthorized as the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) which makes FAPE available to eligible students with disabilities and ensures special education supports and related services in a least restrictive environment (LRE) to

those children (About IDEA, 2020). The IDEA regulates how states and public agencies deliver early intervention, special education, and related services to over 7.5 million (as of the 2018-19 school year) eligible infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities (About IDEA, 2020). Infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families receive early intervention under IDEA Part C, while children and youth ages three through 21, receive special education and related services under IDEA Part B (About IDEA, 2020).

In the 2019-20 school year, there was 7.3 million students (ages 3 through 21) served under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) in the U.S., which is approximately 14% of total public-school enrollment (NCES, 2021). During this same school year, the percentage of students served under IDEA was greatest for American Indian/Alaska Native students (18%), followed by Black students (17%), and students of two or more races (15%) (NCES, 2021). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2021) reports that the percentage was the lowest for Pacific Islander students (11 %), and Asian students (7%).

Among students ages 6 - 21 who are served under IDEA, the percentage who spent most of their day in the general education setting (i.e., 80 % or more of their school day) increased from 59% in 2009, to 65% in 2019 (NCES, 2021). In contrast, during this same period of time, the percentage of students who spent between 40% to 79% of their day in the general education setting decreased from 21% to 18%, and the percentage of students who spent less than 40% of their time in the general education setting decreased from 15% to 13% (NCES, 2021). In fall 2019, the percentage of students that were served under IDEA who spent most of their school day in the general education setting was highest for students with the disability of speech or language impairment (88%) (NCES, 20121). Approximately two-thirds to three-quarters of students with specific learning disabilities (73%), visual impairments (69%), other health impairments (68%), and

developmental delays (67%) spent most of their school day in the general education setting (NCES, 2021). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2021), less than one-third of students with deaf-blindness (26%), intellectual disabilities (18%), and multiple disabilities (14%) spent most of the day in the general education setting (NCES, 2021).

Students eligible for special education are those that have been identified by a team of professionals as having a disability or disabilities that adversely affects academic performance and is deemed that he or she requires special education supports (NCES, 2021). The thirteen categories of a disability are: specific learning disability, other health impairment, autism spectrum disorder, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairment, visual impairment (including blindness), deafness, hearing impairment, deaf-blindness, orthopedic impairment, intellectual disability, traumatic brain injury, and multiple disabilities (IDEA, 2004).

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 was the first national law to require penalties for U.S schools based on a student's standardized test score (Whitney & Candelaria, 2017). According to Whitney and Candelaria (2017), the NCLB era ended in December 2015 and its replacement, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), continues to include consequences for schools regarding standardized test scores. According to DeMatthews and Night (2019), ESSA mandates that state education agencies continue to maintain standards, testing, and accountability to boost achievement and address equity issues that have plagued the education system.

Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and Special Education Teacher Shortage

Special education teacher shortages have existed at least since 1975 when PL-145 (IDEA) was first passed (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Although educational

opportunities were available for a number of students with disabilities before 1975, this law mandated that public schools educate all students, thus contributing to a remarkable increase in the demand for SETs (Dewey, et al., 2017). Since then, the demand for SETs has surpassed the supply, generating a pervasive and persistent national shortage (McLeskey & Billingsley, 2008), and projections indicate that this shortage is growing (Levin et al., 2015).

The History of Special Education Teacher Certification

Federal involvement ensuring that all students received educational opportunities that were equal, which included having access to teachers who were prepared to meet the unique needs of students that required specialized instruction, began in 1965 with the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (Mason-Williams et al, 2020). This law emphasized the critical role that fully prepared teachers played in providing equal educational opportunity for all students (Mason-Williams, 2020). Although ESEA had a direct emphasis on providing equal educational opportunities to all students, a majority of the hope that was brought on by ESEA was quickly decreased by the large challenges of instructional capacity (Mason-Williams et al., 2020). The insufficient supply of individuals prepared and willing to serve, and the sparse infrastructure for developing a large number of teachers within a sensible timeframe complicated matters (Kleinhammer-Tramill, 2014).

In 1975, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act determined that students with disabilities have a right to a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) (Zetell & Ballard, 1979). This mandate generated an immediate demand for services and for teachers and other staff members to provide these services (Meyers et al., 2020). The No Child Left Behind Act and the reauthorization of IDEA required that all teachers be highly qualified (Rosenburg et al., 2004); meaning that a minimum standard was

mandated for SET licensure (Sindelar et al., 2016) The reauthorization of NCLB is Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which eliminates this requirement (Klein, 2020).

Special education teacher certification is generally comprehensive from pre-kindergarten through grade 12, and there has been a definite trend toward noncategorical licensure since 2000 (Sindelar et al., 2019), which allows school districts flexibility in assigning SETs to teach students with varied disabilities. In Texas, an individual may become certified to teach special education by either the traditional route, which requires a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution and completing a teacher preparation program, or through an alternative certification program (Texas Special Education Certification & Requirements, 2021). In the traditional route, select Texas bachelor's degree programs offer the necessary coursework to qualify for a Texas teaching certificate, but additional classes in the field of special education are required (Texas Special Education Certification & Requirements, 2021).

The continual teacher shortage has led to states producing policies to support alternative routes into teaching to supplement the supply (Meyers et al., 2020). These routes may differ from traditional training in many ways, but they tend to tap into non-traditional participants (Meyers et al., 2020). Currently, ESSA allows for states to utilize degree-granting programs for teachers without relying on traditional higher education systems (ESSA, 2015). At present, IDEA requires that SETs be fully certified, and if they are not, be enrolled in an alternative preparation program (Meyers et al., 2020).

Special Education Teachers' Reasons for Entering the Field

For many people, the decision to teach is motivated by intrinsic motivators that are symbolic of hope and possibility (Manuel & Cater, 2016). According to Watt and Richardson (2014), teachers have definite reasons for starting in the profession. Perryman and Calvert (2020) found that having the desire to make a difference in the lives of

students, confidence in their ability to teach, and finding a profession that is rewarding were main reasons for teachers to enter the field. Stephens and Fish (2010) reported that the most influential element that impacts an individual's reason to pursue a career in special education is "the desire to serve those in need" (p. 402). Another main reason is having prior experience with individuals with disabilities (Stephens & Fish, 2010; Zhang et al, 2014). Stephens and Fish (2010) also found that family, empathy toward students, and the availability of positions were reasons given by SETs regarding why they entered the field of special education. A study by Lavian (2013), examined how SETs interpreted and saw their roles. The findings indicated that, at the beginning of their careers, SETs were driven by thoughts of 'saving the world' or by beliefs in their own capabilities and their desire to work hard for their students (Lavian, 2013).

Cormier (2021) interviewed seven Black male special education teachers about what motivated them to enter the field of special education. Data collection and analysis focused on the teachers' introductions to the field of special education and their educational paths. Cormier found that the men chose to enter the field for varying reasons which included having prior experiences working with children or suggestions from mentors. All participants in the study indicated that their career choice was in response to the desire to be a change agent, mainly driven by the awareness of the needs of Black boys what are disproportionately represented in U.S special education programs (Cormier, 2021).

Through an interview approach, Chambers (2007), explored the perceptions of eight individuals who had a sibling with a disability regarding their choosing a career in a disability field. All participants either had a degree in special education or related area or were pursuing a degree and all had worked in serving individuals with disabilities. The first theme that emerged in the Chamber's study was motivations related to their brother

or sister who had a disability. One participant mentioned that she had been preparing her entire like to work with individuals with disabilities. Another participant revealed that she hoped to make a difference in her special education students' lives because special education did not help her sister. The second theme that emerged was opportunities and general experiences moved them into the disability field. Two of the participants reported that they entered the disability field because they worked with therapeutic horseback riding sessions. One participant realized she needed to know more about disabilities and teaching, thus gained a master's degree in special education. The other stated that she felt good about herself when she was helping others, especially those individuals with disabilities (Chambers, 2007).

Special Education Teachers' Primary Reasons for Leaving the Field

Many new SETs list factors such as lack of knowledge and working conditions as primary reasons for leaving the field (Hagaman & Casey (2018). A study conducted by Hagaman and Casey (2018) involved 52 participants; 22 were preservice SETs, 18 were new SETS, and 12 were administrative personnel. Their study involved three focus groups from two states in the Midwest. In this study, all groups identified that the primary roles of SETs include teaching and planning, managing behaviors, and crisis intervention. All three groups also identified stress and lack of support as major reasons why SETs would leave the field. However, some differences emerged across the groups. First, the administrators were not as likely to list lack of training or caseload issues as reasons why SETs might leave which was in direct contrast to both preservice and new special educators who indicated these issues were top reasons to leave the field (Hagaman & Casey, 2018).

Roles and Responsibilities of Special Education Teachers

By definition, SETs work with students who have a broad range of learning, emotional, mental, and physical disabilities (U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2021). Over the past few decades, research, policy, and practice in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 settings have documented the increasingly complex and multifaceted roles for SETs (Shepherd et al., 2016). Special education teachers are prepared to teach students in one or more of the 13 disabilities identified under IDEA (2004). According to IDEA (2018), a child with a disability indicates that the child has been evaluated as having a disability and requires special education and possibly a related service. Special education teachers are prepared to teach students in one or more of the 13 disabilities identified under IDEA (2004). The 13 types of disabilities are autism, deaf-blindness, emotional disturbance, hearing impairment, intellectual disability, multiple disabilities, other health impairment, specific learning disability, speech or language impairment, traumatic brain injury, and visual impairment (IDEA, 2018).

Collaboration

Special education teachers must collaborate with general educators and other colleagues to support students with increasingly diverse backgrounds across tiered systems of supports while still delivering specialized instruction to students within various disability categories (Sheppard et al., 2016). The shift to a more tiered model of support has generated opportunities for special and general educators to share their expertise and employ preventative approaches, but it has also resulted in more complicated systems and blurred lines between roles which have raised some concerns about the degree to which specialized instruction is available to students with more intensive needs (McCray et al., 2014; Pullen & Hallahan, 2015).

According to Squillaci and Hofman (2021), the roles and functions of SETs has evolved with the development of inclusive practices, and this is often a source of stress because they may have less autonomy and more complicated collaboration than their general education peers. Jurkowski and Muller (2018) reported that the coordination of separate forms of instructional responsibilities and among two partners continues to be an unresolved issue. Furthermore, general educators and SETs do not commonly agree on their respective co-teaching responsibilities (Stefanidis & Strogilos, 2015) and several studies report that co-teaching oftentimes results in the SET being treated like an assistant within the classroom setting (Bettini et al., 2015; Brunsting et al., 2014).

Findings by Ansley et al., (2019) found that there are significant connections between satisfaction with workplace relationships and job satisfaction, and according to Stewart-Banks et al. (2015) these relationships can be promoted by providing opportunities for teachers to collaborate and create positive working relationships. During the 2016-17 school year, Hester et al. (2020) investigated 366 SETs from 43 states. The purpose of the study was to conduct an examination into the factors that cause stress as well as factors that may lead to decisions to leave the special education field. Results from the study revealed that responsibilities such as collaborating with other teachers are stressful facets of their job and collaboration descriptions alluded to feeling devalued and not being respected by other teachers (Hester et al., 2020).

Teaching Assignments

Special education teachers' teaching assignments vary based on the service delivery model adopted by their district. For example, some special education teachers work primarily in an inclusive setting such as co-teaching with general education teachers (Scruggs, 2007), others teach in a resource or push in models which provide small-group instruction in a special or general education setting (Mitchell et al., 2012), while others

24

teach in a combination of all of these models (Kaff, 2004). A smaller percentage of special education teachers work in self-contained classrooms and typically provide instruction for all content areas to a small group of students with either substantial learning and/or behavior needs (Edgar & Rosa-Lugo, 2007).

Demands of Case Management and Workload Manageability

Special education teachers must also interact with many individuals to manage services for their students such as collaborating with general education teachers, related service providers, paraprofessionals, and parents (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Beyond instruction, special education teachers have a primary responsibility in managing their students' individual education programs (IEPs) which includes developing the program, attending meetings, and assuring that all aspects of the program are consistent with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities ACT (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). All of these factors can vary greatly across teaching assignments within the same school and across schools (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019).

It has been long reported that novice SETs have workloads that are unmanageable (Billingsley et al., 2004; Griffin et al., 2009). Bettini et al. (2017) studied novice SETs' perceptions of their workloads to determine if they perceived their workloads are less manageable than novice general education teachers, and whether their perceptions of workload manageability predicted emotional exhaustion and career intentions. Their study was a secondary analysis of an existing data set named the Michigan Indiana Early Career Teacher Study. The results of the study demonstrated that workload manageability may be linked with career intentions and emotional exhaustion (Bettini et al., 2017).

Managing Families of Children that Qualify for Special Education

The relationship between SETs and families of children with special education needs is more demanding and complex than relationships between teachers and families

in the general education setting (Lavian, 2014). According to Shepherd et al. (2016), SETs must also collaborate with families from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The National Research Council (2001) suggests that matching teacher and parent interventions is an important strategy for positive child outcomes. Papay and Bombara (2014) report that family involvement in the education of students with disabilities may be particularly beneficial because of higher levels of academic achievement and school completion rates, as well as increased postschool outcomes.

Hirano et al. (2018) utilized qualitative synthesis methods to examine barriers to school-based participation in transition planning and preparation for families of youths with disabilities. This study was part of a larger study, and its primary focus was to obtain experiences and perceptions of the transition development process and the transition to adulthood from caregivers and parents of adolescents with disabilities ages 14-25 who either had received or were receiving services under IDEA (Hirano et al., 2018). Family members described their experiences regarding transition planning for 349 youth and the main themes discovered in the study regarding barriers to a families' involvement in transition planning were school, family, and adult services (Hirano et al., 2018). Hirano et al. (2018) indicated that racism, lack of information, not feeling valued, teacher directed services, and poor-quality transition plans were all school barriers that families faced. Low student expectations, long waiting lists, difficulty navigating an unresponsive and unfamiliar system, not feeling respected, and conflict of parental role, and stresses of daily living also stated as barriers that the families encountered (Hiranao et al., 2018). The family barriers noted in the study included stresses of daily living and a lack of knowledge of the system (Hiranao et al., 2018).

The Attrition of U.S. Teachers

Markedly, the SET shortage is situated within the current arena of the teacher shortage as a whole. Across the U.S., content areas such as science, math, career and technology education, and bilingual education, are all experiencing a shortage of qualified teachers (Sutcher et al., 2016). A recent survey of school superintendents showed that 80% considered that the teacher shortage is a major challenge for their districts; greater than any other challenge that they face (Hodge, 2018).

The Current Attrition Trends and Demands for Special Education Teachers

The Higher Education Consortium for Special Education (2021) reported the field of special education has the most significant shortage of teachers in the U.S., so several states have turned to using long-term substitutes; some with only a high school diploma and most with not teacher training. Also reported by the Higher Education Consortium for Special Education (2021) was that there is a shortage of special education faculty at universities, which further adds to the SET shortage. Research suggests that, for many decades, school systems throughout the entire U.S. have struggled to fill special education teaching positions (Cowan et al., 2016; Mason-Williams et al., 2020). These shortages historically have been credited to an insufficient supply of special education teachers (Boe, 2006), and to low retention rates for SETs (Billingsley, 2004), which current research has associated to the unique working conditions and demands of SET working assignments (Bettini et al., 2017; Billingsley et al, 2020). According to Theobald et al. (2021) another potential explanation for the low retention rates may be linked to the preparation that SET candidates receive prior to entering the profession. The COVID-19 pandemic has also served to intensify the already critical shortage of SETs because many experienced SETs are retiring early and others simply leave the profession completely (Monnin, et al., n.d.).

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2022), in 2021 there were 476,300 SETs. It is estimated that each year brings 37,600 SET openings because of the need to replace teachers who transfer to different occupations or exit the labor force (U.S. Bureau, 2022). Special education teachers in the U.S. are leaving the classroom at disturbing rates (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017), and this can have a devasting effect on establishing high quality programs for students with disabilities. Special education teachers are in high demand and are critically needed to meet the requirements of the growing U.S. population for students that are qualified for special education supports and services under the IDEA (IDEA, 2004). This Act guarantees students with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) in a least restrictive environment (LRE) (IDEA, 2004). Forty-nine states and the District of Columbia currently report shortages of SETs (U.S Department of Education, 2021). Additionally, SET attrition is growing at a rate that is equivalent to the U.S. population of students with disabilities, and the percentage of students that receive special education supports is also rising (National Education Association, 2019).

Special Education Teacher Job Satisfaction

There have been numerous studies that have examined variables that impact SET job satisfaction. The connection between job stress and job satisfaction has been specifically observed within the arena of SETs (Eichinger, 2000). In a Stress Survey for Special Educators, SETs reported feeling incapable of coping with stressors ensued from supporting special education students (Crane & Iwanicki, 1986). Weiskopf (1980) reported that cited stressors when working with special education students include heavy workload and pressure to complete required tasks in a timely manner. Studies have also found a range of factors that can attribute to the level of job satisfaction experiences by SETs such as overall campus environment, access to resources, and workload

28

manageability (Andrews & Brown, 2015; Bettini, et al., 2017; Boyer & Gillespie, 2000; Brunsting, et al., 2014; Thornton, et al., 2007). A study by McLeskey and Waldron (2012) revealed that job satisfaction was higher when administration had more open communication and allowed for flexible teaching strategies. Davis and Palladina (2011) found that SETs who feel they are supported by general education teachers and are provided with meaningful collaboration opportunities report a higher level of job satisfaction. Fish and Stephens (2010) surveyed 57 currently teaching SETs and discovered that the teacher's ability to serve students leads to high job satisfaction.

A study by Robinson et al. (2019) which occurred during the 2016-2017 school year, aimed to address two gaps in literature on SET burnout. The first part of the study aimed to investigate the connection between SETs having meaningful professional development, feeling supported, and having feelings of job satisfaction with possible links to burnout. In this quantitative study, 363 participants were asked to complete a survey (Robinson et al., 2019). Results indicated that there is a significant relationship between SET burnout scores and job satisfaction, implying that if improved job satisfaction (and staying in the field) for SETs is a goal, lower levels of burnout must be achieved (Robinson et al., 2017).

Factors that Impact Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

The goal for a study by Ballaro and Meade (2021) was to identify work factors that contributed to the highest levels of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for forensic scientists. One of the theoretical frameworks for this study was Herzberg's two-factor theory. This was a mixed-methods study of 255 forensic scientists which investigated their physiological experiences, psychological perceptions, and environmental circumstances to determine which factor influenced the greatest level of job satisfaction. Results indicated that the top two intrinsic factors that led to the highest level of job

satisfaction were the jobs provided steady employment and staying busy. The top two extrinsic factors that lend to job dissatisfaction were the way company policies were put into practice and chances for promotion (Ballaro & Meade, 2021) which supports Herzberg's theory.

The purpose of Garza and Taliaferro's (2021) qualitative study was to describe experiences that related to job satisfaction among home healthcare nurses. This study was also framed by Herzberg's two-factor theory. Twelve home healthcare nurses participated in in-depth interviews. The four themes that emerged from the data were (a) patients contribute to job satisfaction; (b) autonomy promotes job satisfaction; (c) occupational stressors adversely affect job satisfaction; (d) and leadership impacts job satisfaction.

The Impacts of Special Education Teachers Leaving the Field

The U.S. SET shortage has been well recognized by state and local education agencies and the special education research community as a key issue that negatively affects outcomes for special education students (Garcia & Weiss, 2020; CEEDAR Center, 2020). A growing and persistent shortage of SETs jeopardizes the quality of education that students with disabilities receive (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Special education teacher attrition intensifies this shortage, which leaves many school districts in the unfortunate position if hiring unqualified personnel (McLesky & Billingsley, 2008). A study by Ronfeldt et al. (2013) drew on extensive data from the New York City Department of Education and the New York City State Education Department. The analyses focused on approximately 850, 000 fourth and fifth grade students over eight academic years. Researchers were able to connect student test scores in English language arts (ELA) and math to student, class, school, and teacher characteristics. The study found evidence for a direct effect of teacher turnover on student achievement. The results indicated that teacher turnover has significant and negative impacts on student

achievement in both ELA and math (Ronfeldt et al., 2013). No equivalent research has examined the effects of SET turnover on student achievement (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019), but specialists have suggested that the unsettling effects of SET turnover might be especially challenging given the high number of collaboration relationships SETs must build with general education teachers, related service staff, and parents (McLesky & Billingsley, 2008).

Furthermore, teacher attrition can have a sizable impact on campus and school district finances. According to Partner (2020), teacher replacement costs incorporate recruitment, hiring, training and professional development. Researchers have estimated that these costs reach as high as 150 % of the leaving teacher's salary (Partner, 2020). Moreover, when qualified educators leave, school districts are often left to hire alternatively certified teachers, which means the teachers did not earn their teaching credentials though a traditional college program (Partner, 2020). To make matters worse, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) suggests that teachers with little or no training leave the teaching field at two to three times the rate of teachers with preparation that is comprehensive. Districts that invest heavily in new teacher induction and professional development have even higher turnover costs (Watlington, 2010). Barnes et al., (2007) estimated that annual replacement costs for large districts such as Milwaukee may be as high as $14.1 million annually.

CHAPTER III:

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the perceptions and experiences of special education teachers (SETs) who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. The results of this study suggested interventions regarding how to retain SETs and combat the SET shortage. This qualitative case study gathered individual interview data gained from a purposeful sample of five SETs who currently work in special education in a large school district in southeast Texas. The participants were allowed to choose either being interviewed via a video conference platform or in person.

The SETs were asked to answer general demographic questions followed by 22 qualitative semi-structured, open-ended interview questions about their perceptions and experiences in teaching which included roles and responsibilities, administrative support, and peer support (see Appendix A). Qualitative semi-structured interviews are a dominant and widely used data collection method within the social sciences (Bradford & Cullen, 2012). This method of data collection is valuable because it allows a researcher to explore an individual's subjective perspectives (Flick, 2009) and to collect in-depth descriptions of people's experiences (Evans & Lewis, 2018). This chapter will present an overview of the research problem as well as the research purpose and questions. It will also review the researcher's role, research design, participant selection, data collection procedures, data analysis, validity and reliability, privacy and ethical considerations, and the limitations of the study.

Overview of the Research Problem

Garcia and Weiss (2019) have reported that the teacher shortage is expanding and is worse than thought. The teacher shortage makes it challenging to build a positive reputation for teaching which perpetuates the shortage (Garcia & Wiess, 2019). While some attrition is normal because of retirement or being unskilled (Adnot et al., 2016), involuntary attrition and retirement only account for 14% and 18% of all attrition respectively (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). Thus, 67% of teacher attrition is voluntary and may be rectifiable by intervention (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019).

Research suggests that, for many decades, school systems throughout the U.S. have struggled to fill special education teaching positions (Cowin et al., 2016; Mason-Williams et al., 2020). These shortages historically have been credited to an insufficient supply of SETs (Boe, 2006) and to low retention rates (Billingsley, 2004). Current research has associated SET low retention rates to unique working conditions and assignments (Bettini et al., 2017; Billingsley et al., 2020).

Special education has never completely experienced a totally qualified teaching labor force, and has therefore, never delivered on the promise of delivering FAPE for all students with disabilities (Mason-Williams, 2020). Billingsley and Bettini (2019) report that there is a growing and universal shortage of SETs which directly threatens the quality of education that students with disabilities receive. In other words, high SET attrition rates hinder schools in providing qualified SETs for students with disabilities (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). A lack of appropriate and qualified teachers threatens a student's ability to learn (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Ladd & Sorenson, 2016), and this instability adversely affects student achievement and teacher effectiveness (Kraft & Papy, 2014; Sorenson & Ladd, 2018).

High teacher turnover expends economic resources through expenditures regarding recruiting and training new teachers (Garcia & Wiess, 2019). School districts that invest deeply in new teacher orientation activities and professional development have significant turnover costs (Watlington et al., 2010). Filling teacher vacancies costs approximately $21,000 per teacher (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017; Learning Policy Institute, 2017). Regarding SETs specifically, Mason-Williams et al., (2020) argue that SET shortages have serious economic impacts because the amount of funds spent annually by school districts and other agencies regarding critical staffing concerns, as well as having to financially compensate for mandated services for students with disabilities that go unmet, is enormous (Mason-Williams et al., 2020).

As already indicated, there has been a significant amount of research relating to why teachers leave the teaching field (Day & Gu, 2009; Chiong et al., 2017). On the contrary, there is less research regarding why some teachers remain in the field. This researcher only found minimal research specifically focused on why some experienced SETs remain in the field and found no research that was solely qualitative, thus this study was warranted and filled that void. The study indicated unique interventions that can be utilized by education leaders and authors/instructors of educator programming to assist in reducing the SET shortage.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the perceptions and experiences of SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years.

1. What intrinsic (motivators) factors have SETs, who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special

34

education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced

regarding remaining teaching in special education?

2. What extrinsic (hygiene) factors have SETs, who have remained in the same

public school district and who have continued working with special

education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced

regarding remaining and teaching in special education?

Researcher's Role

The researcher conducting this study is currently retired from public education (retired in December 2021). The researcher was employed as a SET for over 15 years; most of which was spent working with some students with behavioral challenges. After teaching in special education, the researcher taught in general education for one year, and was a district assistive technology leader for a school district in the target geographical area for four years.

As a previous SET, and one that remained teaching in the special education field for over 15 years, this researcher understands the challenges of SETs. Special education teachers have one of the most demanding and challenging jobs in public education (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2014). As a result of possible shared characteristics with the experienced SETs in this study, this researcher recognized that there is a critical need for interventions to assist education leaders and authors/instructors of educator programming in ensuring that the SET shortage is addressed and rectified.

Research Design

Crotty (1998) contended that methodology is a research main blueprint which justifies the use of specific methods to align with the research questions, theoretical foundations, data collections, and analysis measures. This case study utilized narrative methods to frame the research. Applying this method assisted the researcher in

identifying deeper analysis of the nuances that explain why SETs remain and aimed to generate interventions, grounded in the advice of teachers, that may assist in reducing the SET shortage. Sonday et al. (2020) report that merging case study and narrative inquiry can make a critical contribution in explaining current realities within professions.

According to Yazan (2015), case study is one of the most regularly used qualitative research methodologies. A case study is an in-depth investigation of a person, group, community, or event (McLeod, 2019). Stake (1995) agrees with Smith (1978) in that a case study is specific, complex, and functioning, and is an integrated system which has working parts as well as being purposive in social sciences and human services. Stake (1995) suggests using observation, interview, and document review for qualitative case study research. The benefits of employing a case study affords opportunities to gather data from several sources (Sonday et al., 2020).

This study's design consisted of an open-ended, semi-structured interview protocol which was administered to five participants. Creswell (2013) suggests gathering extensive details about a few individuals and provide the recommendation of no more than four to five participants for a case study. In a qualitative study, the researcher's intention is not to generalize from the samples, but to describe, explain, and interpret a phenomenon (Maxwell, 2013). In other words, sampling is not a matter of opinions, but a matter of information depth and richness Guetterman (2015). This researcher believes that five participants enabled making valid findings about general trends that emerged in the data. The five participants held different SET roles, had varied teacher career longevity, and had varied campus demographics across the district. Therefore, this researcher concluded that, for in-depth and detailed understanding of the SETs' perceptions and experiences, five participants was an appropriate sample size for this study. Each administration was predicted to occur within 45 to 60 minutes timespan but

in reality occurred between 45-75 minute timespans. The interview sessions were recorded and transcribed. The results were analyzed, and each participant member checked for accuracy. Member checking is a method for exploring the credibility of results whereas the results are returned to participants to verify accuracy (Birt et al., 2016).

Participant Selection

The criteria that was required for the participant sample was SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. The participants were solicited by using a purposeful sampling in order to locate initial research participants. According to Welman and Kruger (1999), purposeful sampling is the most important kind of non-probability sampling used to identify primary participants. This sampling was based on the purpose of the research (Greig & Taylor, 1999), which located participants "who have had experiences related to the phenomenon to be researched" (Kruger, 1988, p. 150). The purposeful sample was obtained from a large school district in Southeast Texas.

Table 3.1

Participating School District's Student Demographic Data

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Total Students	21,007	100%
African American	3,067	14.6%
Hispanic	7,857	37.4%
White	6,785	32.3%
Asian	2,395	11.4%
Native American	42	0.2%
Two or More Races	819	3.9%
Eco Disadvantaged	6,911	32.9%
Limited English Proficiency	2,374	11.3%

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to collecting data, the researcher received approval from the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) at the University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL). To collect data, interview protocols were utilized. The interview protocol served as an instrument of inquiry and asked questions specific to the study (Patton, 2015). It was also utilized as a tool for conversation.

The researcher's goal was to obtain five SETs for this study. First, a participant recruitment letter outlining the purpose of the study was shared (see appendix A) with the Chair of the UHCL's College of Education Mentoring Collaborative. This individual was the first point of contact in identifying the purposive sample through the University's partnerships with various local school districts. She contacted University partners who

were experienced SETs and shared the participant recruitment letter which explained the purpose of the study and asked volunteers to provide their personal email addresses to contact the researcher via email if interested.

Upon identifying possible participants, the researcher sent an email to all with a link to Qualtrics, with the intent to explain the study, its potential benefits, the design, the study's purpose, and a consent to allow an interview (see appendix A). Consent was obtained and documented via a Qualtrics survey. Once consents were gained, five participants that fit the study's criteria of SETs, who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years, were be selected. An additional email was sent to the selected participants explaining that they met the criteria for the study and explained that a telephone contact will be made to schedule an interview. Moreover, an email was sent to those SETs that either did not meet the study's participant requirements or alerted those whose participation was not necessary based on their demographic data and to ensure that there was a range of participant experience in the study. Approximately two to three days prior to each interview, the researcher contacted the selected participants via telephone and made brief introductions and answered any questions. All participants were contacted via telephone thus no voicemails were left.

Open ended, semi-structured questions were used in the interview protocol which focused on the perceptions and experiences of the participants. The interviews occurred via a video conferencing platform or in person, based on the participant's preference. The interviews that occurred via video conferencing were audio and video recorded, with closed captioning turned on which assisted with transcription. The interviews that occurred in person were audio recorded via the application iRecord: Transcribe Voice

Memo which assisted in transcription. There was one interview per participant; each lasting between 45 and 75 minutes.

Before the interviews began, the researcher introduced herself, reiterated the study's purpose, and asked if there were any questions. Additionally, the researcher reinforced assurances of confidentiality for participants. The researcher gained permission to both video (if video conference occurred) and audio record the interview session to ensure accuracy. The participants were told that the sessions will be automatically transcribed by either closed captioning (video conference) or via the application iRecord. The researcher began recording once securing permission to begin from the participant. A copy of the interview protocol is available as Appendix C.

Each interview consisted of general demographic questions followed by 22 open-ended, semi-structured questions listed in the study's interview protocol. Adding to or adjusting the interview questions was allowed and was appropriate when the participant's responses deemed this necessary or if the participant(s) wished to elaborate. Additionally, participants were contacted after their interview for clarification when required.

After the interviews were transcribed, each participant received the results to member check for accuracy. Member checking or seeking feedback from a participant about one's data or interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) has become so consistently and extensively recommended as a validity check that it often appears to be a requirement for thorough qualitative research (Motulsky, 2021). It is a method that is most commonly used to validate, assess, or verify the trustworthiness of qualitative results (Birt et al., 2016). Upon completion of the interviews, the researcher uploaded the interviews in the researcher's password protected computer. In accordance with CPHS and federal requirements, all data will be held for three years and will be destroyed once the three-year time requirement has passed.

Data Analysis

Data from the interviews were transcribed and analyzed for emergent themes. After each interview was transcribed, the researcher coded developing themes, using a combination of priori and emergent codes. Each theme was organized into categories related to the research questions. As there were multiple single participant interviews, the researcher coded each transcript which was followed by a search for commonalities across all transcripts. Once the themes were evident, the researcher organized the data for further analysis which included any relationships of the data to the research questions. Any unessential elements, such as remarks that do not pertain to the study, were not examined.

To begin coding thematically, each interview was analyzed which created single profiles using priori coding. Upon completion of thematically coding the interview transcripts, the researcher explored possible patterns and themes within each participant's profile. Open coding is an emergent coding technique derived from grounded theory methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and requires applying codes that are obtained from text (Blair, 2016). According to Butina (2015), written findings that are presented by themes or categories are a traditional written report format for qualitative studies. This researcher reported findings, organized by themes, in this traditional design. First, a brief overview of a specific theme was described. Each theme was then supported by several narrative quotes which allowed for rich and solid descriptions of the data. Keeping the narratives together ensured that clarity and meaning was communicated (Butina, 2015).

Validity and Reliability

Each participant was asked to member check the transcriptions that were recorded by this researcher. Member checking or seeking feedback from a participant about one's data or interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), has become consistently and extensively

41

recommended as a validity check and often appears to be a requirement for thorough qualitative research (Motulsky, 2021). To increase validity of the study, the researcher required specific feedback regarding reducing bias and maintaining an impartial viewpoint when conducting the research. The interview questions were edited and reviewed by committee members to reduce bias and improve open-ended responses. Additionally, to reduce personal bias, the researcher attempted to maintain a neutral affect while interviewing participants as much as possible. As noted above, member checking with the participants occurred regarding the interview transcripts to confirm accuracy.

The researcher recognizes that, as a former SET, some bias were inevitable in the research pursuits, thus self-exploration while analyzing the data was required to assist in the reliability of the study. Furthermore, guidance from the researcher's dissertation content specialists was essential regarding analyzing data objectively. This researcher understood that bias is natural but minimized it as much as possible through the above methods.

<div align="center">**Privacy and Ethical Considerations**</div>

The researcher obtained permission to conduct this study from the UHCL's CPHS before collecting any data. A cover letter was sent to the SETs who agreed to participate and explained the purpose of the study, ensured that they were aware that their participation was voluntary, and that their responses and identities were to remain confidential. The researcher used procedures to protect confidentiality such as pseudonyms for themselves, their supervisors, and their district. The participants were asked to complete and sign an informed consent form, which explained the possible risks and rewards of the study and what the participants could expect if they chose to participate. During the interview phase, every attempt to remain objective was made.

During the coding phase, the researcher continually countered against subjective interpretations as themes emerged. The data collected is stored on a computer and on a flash drive; both are password protected on a personal computer. The computer will be kept in a locked office. The flash drive will be stored in a locked desk drawer for five years and after this time, will be destroyed.

Limitations of the Study

During data collection, the COVID-19 pandemic was occurring which may have impacted the results gained in the interviews. According to Klusmann et al. (2023), it is fair to assume that the remarkable changes that the pandemic levied on teachers impaired their occupational wellbeing. A second limitation to this study was the small sample size. There may be limits of generalizability due to the small sample size (Guetterman, 2015),

As larger sample size may have resulted in different emergent themes. A third limitation to this study is that all participants worked in the same school district which may have brought "unique to the district" participant answers and may have limited the findings. A final limitation to this study was that self-reporting interviews were obtained whereas the participants may have been too embarrassed to reveal private details, may have not told expressed truths, or they may have exaggerated. Also, various participant biases may have affected the results.

Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the perceptions and experiences of SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. This chapter explained the methodology that was used. This study used individual open-ended, semi-structured interview questions to gather perceptions and

experiences of five SETs. The researcher organized and analyzed the data gained which

will be presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV:

RESULTS

This study set out to examine the perceptions and experiences of SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. This research is important due to the chronic level of SET shortages. This study presented an opportunity to explore and analyze five SETs' perceptions, experiences, thoughts, and reasons regarding why they have remained in the field of special education at their current school district. This chapter begins with a brief summary of my career in special education (including reasons for my inquiry into why some SETs remain), a brief description of the participants, and will be followed by the findings guided from the research questions. The findings are organized by common themes. This chapter will conclude with a summation of the study's findings.

My Journey and Inquiry

I write this chapter of my dissertation as a recently retired educator, after 20 years of working in the field of education;18 which were specifically in special education. I decided to work toward an alternative certification for teaching special education approximately 29 years ago because I did not like my current career course as a state parole officer and I always liked working with children (at the time I had none of my own). Many of my friends were teachers and had mentioned that teaching is "the best" career if you want to have kids of your own. I saw an advertisement in a local newspaper explaining the process and two years later, found myself certified to teach special education (early childhood through 12th grade), and teaching resource social studies and science in a West Texas middle school. After teaching for two years, I took time off to raise my children.

Nearly ten years later, I became involved in my daughter's campus's PTA (Parent-Teacher Association) and also began substitute teaching. My official teaching career (in the same district my daughter was at) began when I gained a position as a part-time teacher in the dyslexia program. This position was followed by full-time positions as a reading resource teacher (and the special education department chair), an ARD (Admission, Review, and Dismissal) facilitator, a regular education reading teacher, and the assistive technology (AT) liaison; all in the same school district.

My inquiry into the reasons why some SET remain in the field began five years ago when I became a public-school district's assistive technology (AT) liaison. This "AT" position allowed me to assist all of the district's twenty-three campuses and the majority of the district's SETs personally. It was clearly evident that a large percentage of SETs either left the field or were looking for a different job year after year. Conversely, it was also apparent a small minority remained year after year. Knowing that there was a critical and growing shortage of SETs in the area and in the nation, my interest in understanding "why some stay" commenced.

The Participants

The participants for this study consisted of SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. All participants taught in the same large school district in Southeast Texas. There were eight SETs who agreed to participate via the online survey which resulted in a 100% response rate. The teachers were solicited to complete an online survey and interview, based on their years of special education teaching service within the same school district and working with students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. Based on demographic data and to ensure that there was a range of participant experience, five of the eight SETs that agreed to

46

participate were selected to be interviewed. The participating SETs consisted of two males and three females. Four participants identified their racial identity as White or Caucasian and one reported being Black or African American. Four of the five earned their teaching certificates through alternative certification.

Participant One: Sally

Table 4.1

Student Demographic Data for Sally's Campus

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Total Students	3,250	100%
African American	418	12.86%
Hispanic	1,284	39.51%
White	1,225	37.69%
Asian	201	6.18%
Native American	10	0.31%
Two or More Races	105	3.23%
Eco Disadvantaged	1,073	33.02%
Limited English Proficiency	172	5.29%

Sally (pseudonym), an African American, 50 to 59 year old female is a special education English III and IV (11th and 12th grades) resource teacher. An English resource teacher in this specific school district is a specialized educator that focuses on helping children with physical or educational learning difficulties to develop their reading and writing skills. Sally gained her special education certification through alternative certification. She holds teaching certifications in Special Education (early childhood

through 12th grade), English/Language Arts (4th through 8th grade), and ESL (English as a Second Language). Sally also has a master's in special education. Sally's entire 18-year career in education has been in special education where she has remained at her current campus. Her campus has an administrator that is specifically in charge of special education and who has been in place for approximately eight years.

Participant's Journey to Becoming a SET

Sally explained that having an autistic son and attending ARD meetings were main catalysts in her leaving the corporate world and beginning her journey as a SET. Sally stated that when she initially interviewed for a job in special education, she was offered a position as a behavior intervention teacher. She declined that job and about two weeks later was offered a job in the same school district as a high school English resource teacher which she accepted. Sally expressed that in the beginning of her career "a lot of people kind of helped me along the way" and that the principal at that time wanted the resource students to be exposed to the same curriculum as the general education students. She gave the example that if the general education teachers were teaching *Romeo and Juliet,* she was asked to teach that to her resource students, but at a lower reading level. Sally said that this was a new concept at her campus and that she has modeled that concept "all of these years." Sally has remained at the same high school her entire special education career and has taught all four high school English resource levels (English I, II, III, and IV).

A Typical Day

Sally stated that her day typically begins with making a personal list of things to accomplish. I tell the students to take notes when class begins, but many of them are not able to do so because of their low literacy levels. She further explained,

There are like two classes in my room; like two grade levels. Some of the students are low, like they read at the first or second grade level. I get a lot of life skills students put into resource (class) so my lesson may not go right and I have to change things. They may not have the book that I want at the low level that is needed, so I may have to change my lesson. I have to go down many, many levels sometimes, and some students still cannot get it. I mean, just basic and simple things like using commas. They simply cannot get the foundation.

Required Duties

When asked if there were any other duties (other than teaching) required for her job she said "yes." She elaborated on this question by saying,

I'm a case manager so I have to get ready for ARDs by preparing the

students and their paperwork. I also have to do the grading like any other regular teacher and tend to all of those duties, as well as keep up with my case management tasks. Case management entails a lot. I mean, you have to keep up with the pace because my students have goals and objectives to monitor and keep data on, as well as send out documents to teachers. It is a lot to try to maintain and keep up. I finally have less students than a straight inclusion teacher has, but it is still a lot of work to do.

Participant Two: Mitch

Table 4.2

Student Demographic Data for Mitch's Campus

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Total Students	753	100%
African American	80	10.62%
Hispanic	275	36.92%
White	334	44.36%
Asian	33	4.38%
Native American	1	0.13%
Two or More Races	27	3.59%
Eco Disadvantaged	225	29.88%
Limited English Proficiency	41	5.44%

Mitch (pseudonym), a Caucasian, 40- to 49-year-old male is a behavior support intervention (BSI) and inclusion teacher in a middle school (grades 5th and 6th). Mitch explained that his job focuses on providing students with behavioral and emotional disorders suitable instruction and intervention within the general education setting. He received his special education certification through alternative certification. He holds teaching certifications in Special Education (early childhood through 12th grade), Physical Education (early childhood through 12th grade), and Generalist (4th through 8th grades). Mitch's highest level of education is a bachelor's degree. Mitch's entire 11-year career as a certified educator has been in special education where he has remained at his current campus. His current administrator has been in place for approximately three years.

Participant's Journey to Becoming a SET

Mitch explained that, after college, he thought he would "never see the inside of a school building again." He stated that he worked at different jobs for nine years before becoming a teacher. Mitch said that he was "kind of in limbo" and started substituting for PE (physical education) which began his journey into special education. Mitch explained that he formed bonds with many of the students while substitute teaching for PE and that teachers in other subjects began asking if he would substitute for them too. He stated that "My schedule filled up fairly quickly." Mitch further explained that he "found a niche with the special ed students on of the campuses. It was fun and enjoyable to work with a group of kids and to see their growth and their processes in working through things." Mitch has remained at the same campus for his entire teaching career and has taught language arts as a resource teacher as well as being an inclusion and BSI teacher.

A Typical Day

Mitch summed up his typical day by explaining that it depends on the students; when they come in and what might come from home.

> You just never know if they're tired or they may have had an argument in the morning so I kind of just feel the students out in the morning when they get to us. They check in with us in the morning where we sit and talk a little bit – see how their mornings have been going. If everything looks good and the kids are doing good we start on daily goals which are on the board. They read some of the goals to get their minds right, which helps them be successful through their day. Then, we let them go to class, and monitor them every twenty minutes which involves peeking in on them to be sure they are on task and doing their assignments. If everything is ok, we jot down that information and pass by. If the teacher needs us, and the

student needs a break, we may stay in the classroom, take to them for a walk, or go somewhere else…it just depends on each individual kid. If there's a student that is having a major struggle or having some issue in class, we may need to pull the kid out due to specific behaviors or whatever may be going on.

Required Duties

When Mitch was asked what the required duties of his job were, he replied, "It is a lot! I just need to be available for the kids and just have patience with them."

Participant Three: Mary

Table 4.3

Student Demographic Data for Mary's District (same as participating district)

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Total Students	21,007	100%
African American	3,067	14.6%
Hispanic	7,857	37.4%
White	6,785	32.3%
Asian	2,395	11.4%
Native American	42	0.2%
Two or More Races	819	3.9%
Eco Disadvantaged	6,911	32.9%
Limited English Proficiency	2,374	11.3%

Note: Mary is assigned to the entire district. Statistics are the same as Table 3.1.

Mary (pseudonym), a Caucasian, 40- to 49-year-old female, is a special education homebound teacher for early childhood through 12th grade students. She provides teaching in a home for those students with severe disabilities, appropriate activities that meet their IEP. As the main homebound teacher in her district, she teaches up to seven students per week and supports students who are enrolled throughout the district's 23 campuses. She gained her special education teaching certification traditionally and is also certified in General Education (early childhood through 6th grade). Mary's entire 20-year career as a certified educator has been in special education as a homebound teacher in her current district. Her current supervisor is a district specialist over homebound services and has been in place for approximately three years.

Participant's Journey to Becoming a SET

Mary stated that her working in a school cafeteria and interacting with the students initiated her interest in helping students eligible for special education. She decided to "take the next step" and become a paraprofessional for SETs. When employed as a paraprofessional, she realized that she wanted to work with students that were eligible for special education more directly, so she pursued a degree in special education and became a SET.

A Typical Day

When Mary was asked to describe a typical day she stated that there is no such thing as a typical day.

> One day can go from having three students and all three need some sort of
> counseling, going back to the ESC (Education Support Center) to work on
> lesson plans, and preparing for ARDs. A day can go might involve having
> all of my students being healthy and present, and well enough to
> participate in school and all activities, or only one student who is able to

participate. So, there is no typical day for me. I don't know what a typical

day would look like.

Required Duties

Mary reported that she is required to prepare for and attend all ARDs for all of her

students. She elaborated by saying,

I also must write lesson plans, adapt goals and objectives, implement goals

and objectives, and be creative. Being flexible is really important. I work a

lot by myself but sometimes work with related services like speech, OT

(occupational therapy), PT (physical therapy), and VI (vision impaired). I

don't really collaborate with other teachers.

Participant Four: Mike

Table 4.4

Student Demographic Data for Mike's Campus

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Total Students	3,250	100%
African American	418	12.86%
Hispanic	1,284	39.51%
White	1,225	37.69%
Asian	201	6.18%
Native American	10	0.31%
Two or More Races	105	3.23%
Eco Disadvantaged	1,073	33.02%
Limited English Proficiency	172	5.29%

Mike (pseudonym), a Caucasian, 40–49-year-old male, is an inclusion teacher for grades 9th through 12th. An inclusion teacher in his specific school district assists students who are eligible for special education while in a general or special education setting as written in each students' IEP. Mike obtained his special education teaching certificate through alternative certification and his highest level of education is a bachelor's degree. He holds Special Education Certification (early childhood through 12th grade) and Social Studies Composite Certification. Mike's entire 26-year career as a certified teacher has been in special education where he has remained at his current campus. His campus has an administrator that is specifically in charge of special education and who has been in place for approximately eight years.

Participant's Journey to Becoming a SET

Mike explained that his working in a small private alternative school directly after graduating from college began his journey into becoming a SET. This job included teaching as well as speaking with the parents and students about their challenges. He then pursued an alternative certification in special education. Mike stated, "I never really intended to be a special education teacher…I kind of got roped into it, and then twenty-six years later I am still on." Mike has remained at the same high school as a SET for his whole 26-year career.

A Typical Day

Mike stated that his typical day includes working with three different teachers and in three different subjects. He further elaborated by stating,

> I also do resource English inclusion; like the lowest of the kids that are on modified curriculum. They are not life skills, but these students need most assignments modified. They more like need one to one help. I also help kids that are not on modified curriculum for content areas including government, economics, and U.S. history.

Required Duties

When Mike was asked to explain the required duties of his job he explained that he gathers paperwork for ARDs from the teachers, parents, and students. He also said, I have to modify different tests and assignments and go along with the kids when they are given. I mean, theoretically, each kid can have a different version of a modified test based on where he is and what their level of functioning is because they (tests and assignments) need to meet their levels. Also, I try to look at every assignment ahead of time and try to see what the kids might struggle with. I sort of try to foresee what problems might happen or what situation might cause issues.

56

Participant Five: Jane

Table 4.5

Student Demographic Data for Jane's Campus

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Total Students	806	100%
African American	146	18.11%
Hispanic	364	45.16%
White	226	28.04%
Asian	30	3.72%
Native American	1	0.12%
Two or More Races	37	4.59%
Eco Disadvantaged	353	43.80%
Limited English Proficiency	160	19.85%

Jane (pseudonym), a Caucasian, 30-39, is a life skills teacher for a middle school (grades 5th and 6th). A life skills teacher teaches students functional communications skills and functional academic skills such as reading, counting, and sharing (Texas Education Agency, 2019). In a life skills setting, the students' needs can be widely varied; with a main focus being on communication (Texas Education Agency, 2019). Jane obtained her special education teaching certificate through alternative certification and is also certified in the area of Generalist (early childhood). Her highest level of education is a bachelor's degree. Her entire seven-year career as a certified educator has been in special education where she has remained at her current campus. The current administrator of her campus has been in place for about two years.

Participant's Journey to Becoming a SET

Jane shared that she finished an alternative certification program and earned her special education teaching certificate at the end of a school year and "felt ready to teach." She did not get a teaching job the following summer, so she took a job at her son's elementary school as a substitute paraprofessional (for a life skills class) the first day of that school year. Jane stated that the longer she stayed the more she "just fell in love with the kids." She said that the following school year there was an opening at the middle school where many of her current students would attend. Mary interviewed for and was given that job, and she has remained at the same campus, in the same position her whole teaching career.

A Typical Day

When asked what a typical day entailed Jane said that "there's a lot going on during the day." She explained that sometimes she is a counselor, a "momma," a doctor, and a lawyer. She further elaborated by saying that she must catch up a lot during the day, especially when there are "behaviors." Jane explained,

> I try to do what works for each of the kids. We start with the weather and calendar time, then we do a short news article; PE follows. We come back and do some reading and some kids go out to general education. I have a wheelchair student this year so we move him out of his chair during this time and catheter him. I then put him back in his chair and the students go to lunch. This is when I eat lunch too. After lunch we do restroom breaks which is when my wheelchair student needs to be catheterized again. We do restroom breaks throughout the day but again, whatever works. After this break the kids go to specials which is art or music. Then they have

snack time and a restroom break, which takes about 40 minutes to an hour,

so by then it is time to go home.

Required Duties

Jane laughed while explaining that she is continually told "other duties as assigned" by her campus's secretary regarding the required duties of her job. She added,

I am it all. I am a plumber, a counselor, a nurse, and a referee. I do ARDs,

paperwork, communicate with parents, "cath" (catheterize) a student twice

a day, and have to support a behavior student. I do not have enough help

because my class has only has one real para (paraprofessional). The other

para is a sub and she is not required to do a lot of the things that are needed

throughout the day.

<div align="center">

Research Question One

</div>

To answer Research Question 1, *What intrinsic (motivators) factors have SETs, who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced regarding remaining teaching in special education?,* the participants' transcripts were analyzed and developing themes were coded, using a combination of priori and emergent codes. According to Herzberg, there are six motivation factors that relate to job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). These six factors were used as priori codes for this specific research question: (a) advancement, (b) work itself, (c) responsibility, (d) recognition, (e) possibility of growth, and (f) achievement (Herzberg, 1966). Two of the six codes (work itself and achievement) presented as themes in the results. These themes speak to the variables that contributed to the motivating factors grounded in the lived experiences that the participants shared. Interview questions that aligned with the data to support the exploration of the first research question included prompts eliciting details about student

behavioral challenges, what a typical day entailed, proud past moments (if there were any), job satisfaction (or dissatisfaction), reasons they remain as a SET in the same district, and thoughts on SET teacher retention.

Work Itself

According to Herzberg (1966), work itself is defined as the actual content of job assignments and tasks which can have either a positive or negative influence. Whether a job is too difficult or too easy, boring or interesting, can influence job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). Work itself, as noted, includes attributes specific to the actual work of teaching and is related to motivational factors. Four subthemes emerged from the theme of *work itself* as related to the job of being a SET. The subthemes were, (a) passion for the kids, (b) content and prepared for job duties, (c) the schedule, (f) and campus and district culture.

Passion for the Kids

While only two of the five participants recognized working specifically with students that have behavioral challenges as a motivator for remaining, four of the five participants remarked that having passion for the students has been critical in their remaining in the field. Jane, Sally, and Mary stated that they "loved the kids" and that this "love" was a motivational factor for them staying in the field. Jane and Mary both remarked that working with students that have special needs has to be "in your heart." Mary specifically stated, "I love working with my kids. I have been with some of them for 7-8 years." Mike also indicated that he finds teaching students with special needs more rewarding than teaching in an advanced class "where all of the students are alike."

Content and Prepared for Job Duties

Five of the five participants agreed that they felt content and prepared for the duties of their jobs. Mitch mentioned that "most days," he feels prepared and content. He

clarified by saying. Something may come up that you did not expect or anticipate, and that makes the job interesting." Mike acknowledged that he is satisfied with his work assignment and that he "really enjoys what he is doing." He added, "This job gives me great flexibility and allows me to move about." Mike further explained that he really enjoys working in social studies classes and "This is an area that I like so it's not something that I force myself to do" and that the schedule of his job is a "pretty nice deal." He continued by saying," We start early and get out early every day. There are not many jobs that have that type of schedule." He also said that being off during the summer, two weeks for Christmas, and a week for Thanksgiving and Spring Break is also a motivation in his remaining in the field. Mary said that her schedule is flexible and remarked, "I have been doing this for a long time so I can manage pretty much everything."

District and Campus Culture

Four of the five participants reported that their district and/or campus culture was positive. Jane stated that she liked Sunny School District (a pseudonym) and its diversity. She said that she did not live in the district but did not want to work elsewhere. Similarly, Sally reported that Sunny district "has been a great district to work for!" Like Jane, Sally explained that she did not live in the district but did not want to work anywhere else. She said that she has been approached by people who ask why she does not work "just down the street" from her home. Sally elaborated, "I drive 10 miles to work and that does not bother me." Likewise, Mary commented "my district is a good district." Mike said he has been at the same campus for seventeen years and "I've never wanted to leave."

Achievement

Achievement can be positive or negative and can include achieving a particular success or failing to make progress (Herzberg, 1966). All five participants mentioned that

being a part of and experiencing their students' achievements and/or successes was important. Specifically, two subthemes emerged in the analysis of the data which were all linked to the children's' success and the teachers' personal growth as educators. These subthemes were, (a) student academic and behavioral successes, and (b) positive student outcomes.

Student Academic and Behavioral Successes

Mitch smiled when he described a specific success of a 5th grade student who was autistic and struggled to read and write. Mitch stated that when the student was asked to read aloud he would always pass.

> I asked him to just read three or four words to me. We started small, then went into one sentence, and then a small paragraph. He struggled with the words, but we got through it. By the middle of the year, he raised his hand to read…he really wanted to read. He then started making little books. It was interesting to see how far he had come in short time. Before this, his mother told me that he would never be able to write, but I did not settle for that. Too see that kind of progress…that is why I am still in it.

Mitch also explained that he enjoys seeing the students' progression and helping the students be successful with their behaviors. Mary mentioned, "At the end of the year a student has grown so much…so it's very rewarding and awesome." Mike mentioned that it made him proud when a student grew behaviorally and responsibility. "Some of my students have had such disruptive behavior that they had to leave class. This behavior gets less and less, and by the time they are seniors, it almost never happens." Mike elaborated by explaining that he also likes to see students' basic responsibility levels grow. "For example, I had to loan a kid a pen every single day, and almost every single day he would lose it." He further explained that this student would not complete work

during the day because he would say that he could not work because he did not have a pen. Mike said that by the student's junior year he always had a pen in his backpack.

Positive Student Outcomes

Sally expressed that seeing positive outcomes of the students was a motivator regarding her staying in the field. She said it was wonderful to see the positive outcomes of her students and that she loved to know the careers they went into and how successful they had become. She mentioned that she would sometimes hear negative things like them getting into trouble or going to prison, but her "main thing is to see the positive outcomes of my students." Mary smiled as she explained how happy it made her when she transitioned a student to another teacher and "truly know that they made significant progress while under my teaching." She also stated, "To hear a parent talk about where her child was and where her child is now, due to my teaching, absolutely makes me happy." Jane reported that a parent of one of her previous students sent a picture of him bowling and playing, which he was not able to do successfully when he first came to her class. Jane said, "that makes me happy." Mike expressed that he liked to see his students grow and work their way up into adulthood, college, or out in the workforce.

<div align="center">

Research Question Two

</div>

To answer Research Question 2, *What extrinsic (hygiene) factors have SETs, who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced regarding remaining and teaching in special education?* The participants' transcripts were analyzed and developing themes were coded, using a combination of priori and emergent codes. The results were organized by themes that speak to the variables that contribute to the extrinsic (hygiene) factors grounded in the lived experiences that the participants shared. According to Herzberg, there are five hygiene factors that relate to

job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). These five factors were used as priori codes for this specific research question: (a) working conditions, (b) coworker relations, (c) policies and rules, (d) supervisor quality, (e) wage/salary. Three of the five codes presented as themes in the results; supervisor/leadership quality, working conditions, and coworker relations. Interview questions that aligned with the data to support the exploration of the second research question included prompts eliciting details about SET teacher retention and attrition, supervisor support, campus and district peers, and required duties.

Supervisor/Leadership Quality

Supervisor quality correlates to the competence (or incompetence) or fairness (or unfairness) of a supervisor (Alshmemri et al., 2017). According to Alshmemri (2017), a good supervisor, or good access to good supervision, enhances an employee's job satisfaction level. Two subthemes emerged from this theme which were directly related to the participants' willingness to remain in the field; campus level supervisor quality and district level supervisor quality. Three of the five participants remarked that they receive quality campus level supervision while five of the five participants commented on their receiving quality supervision at the district level.

Campus Level Supervisor/Leadership Quality

Mitch explained, "When everything is running smoothly, we do have the support of some of the (campus) administrators. When everything is going well, I feel like I am being supported and everything is going in the right way." Jane mentioned that she could go directly to her principal and she would understand what I need. This could be because she has a niece with downs (down syndrome)." Mike said,

> Mr. Jones (pseudonym) has been the principal over special education for
> quite a few years. He does a very good job and I don't have any

64

complaints. He is very willing to help and always has an open door if you

have any questions or concerns. He is very supportive of teachers.

When the participants were asked to state reasons why they thought SETs remain in the

field, Mike said, "being supported by administration" and both Jane and Mary said

"support."

District Level Supervisor/Leadership Quality

Mitch stated, "I think our district leadership is good. I feel like they have our best

interest at heart. I feel like we are lacking in some areas though. We do have people

pushing for the right things." Sally said that she felt her district supervisors are "running

in the right path." Mary remarked that she feels very fortunate in being able to go to her

specialist with questions, concerns, and ideas. She elaborated by saying,

I have a really good leader in ESC (Education Support Building). We

have some really good specialists. They will help me come up with a

lesson plan or some good activities. Some things that come up are too

complicated, so you have to go to them, and they are a very supportive

team.

Jane reported "there are some people in our district who are very helpful - very

supportive. They will stop by to see you just to say hi, and that is important." Similarly,

Mike said that district leadership is very supportive. He continued,

Miss Smith (pseudonym) is the person over high school. She comes to our

trainings, talks to faculty members, and is very giving of her time. If you

want you can call or email her directly, even though there are probably

several supervisors on campus that could be contacted. She is very open

about helping anybody that needs help with anything special ed related.

Working Conditions

According to Alshmemri (2017), working conditions encompass the physical surroundings of the job. The factors leading to physical surroundings may involve the amount of work, tools, and safety (Alshmemri et al., 2017). Three of the five participants mentioned that their teaching duties are aligned with positive working conditions. Sally stated "They (administration) don't bother me. I do what I do, and they let me do what I need to do." Mitch said that he feels fully prepared for the required duties of his job. He also mentioned that the looks of the school are positive, the campus is clean, and "I think the kids enjoy coming here." Mike also mentioned that he feels fully prepared for the required duties of his job. He stated that he is given "a month or so in advance of critical deadlines. I am given time for the things that need to get done."

Coworker Relations

Coworker relations regards relationships with others in the workplace (Thant & Chang, 2021). Three of the five participants mentioned having a positive relationship with coworkers as being important in their job. Mary said that she worked with an amazing group of women about two years ago. "We collaborated very well, and we had each other's backs through good times and bad times. We were always there for each other to answer questions and that is important." Mitch explained that there has been a lot of change recently (in administration). He said, "I think, overall, with the teachers, staff, and administration, everybody works together, and it has been good. The teachers do what they can to support us and the kids." Mike expressed that he was proud that the teachers on his campus have become noticeably more understanding of "special ed kids" while he has been working at the campus. "They are more accepting and understanding of accommodations and modifications, and also tend to treat every kid the same across the board." He also stated that getting teachers to be more understanding regarding

students that are eligible for special education was a significant challenge for him about 10 years ago.

Summary of Findings

The findings in this qualitative study provided an analysis of data which was collected to address two research questions. The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the experiences of SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. The majority of the data was collected in the fall of 2022 from a purposeful sample of five SETs who met the study's requirements.

The data analysis of the teachers' interviews regarding research question one illustrated that two of the six priori codes (work itself and achievement) that were gained from Herzberg's theory presented as themes. Three subthemes emerged from the theme work itself; passion for the kids, content with job duties, the schedule, and district and campus culture. Two subthemes emerged from the theme achievement: student academic and behavioral success, and positive student outcomes.

The data analysis of the interviews regarding research question two indicated that three of the five priori codes gained from Herzberg's theory (supervisor/leadership quality, working conditions, and coworker relations) presented as themes. Two subthemes emerged from supervisor/leadership quality. These subthemes were campus level supervisor/leadership quality and district level supervisor/leadership quality.

Conclusion

This chapter presented a qualitative analysis of five SETs' perceptions and experiences regarding their remaining in the field of special education. Although many rationales for remaining in the field emerged, the participants' interviews highlighted strong supervision, liking their campuses and district, and having the ability to assist their

students in various achievements as main contributors. Chapter V will incorporate a discussion of the findings in this chapter and in Chapter II, implications from this study, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER V:

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study's focus was to answer the two research questions qualitatively, in hopes to explore and explain the perceptions and experiences of SETs who remain in the field of special education. The data provided may assist education leaders and authors/instructors of educator preparation programming in defining possible interventions regarding the SET shortage. The previous chapters offered an introduction to the study, a literature review, the study's methodology, and the findings from analyzing the participants' interviews. Data for this study was collected via semi-structured interviews involving five teachers with a mean of 16 years of experience. Five of five participants stated that they have solely taught in the field of special education. Four of the five participants reported that they gained their special education teaching certificate through alternative certification and stated that their highest degree is a bachelor's. All participants have remained in the same school district and the same campus for their entire teaching career. Two participants were male, three were female; the median age selected was 45-54.

Thematic coding of the data yielded themes that align with Herzberg's two-factor theory. Two intrinsic themes emerged in regard to intrinsic factors; work itself and achievement. Three extrinsic themes emerged regarding extrinsic factors; supervisor/leadership quality, working conditions, and coworker relations. This chapter will present discussion of findings, implications, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Findings

Two research questions guided this study. Research question one addressed intrinsic factors (also called motivators) that SETs, who have remained in the same public school system and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced regarding remaining teaching in special education. Research question two addressed extrinsic factors (also called hygiene factors) that SETs, who have remained in the same public school system add who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges, perceived and experienced regarding remaining teaching in special education. Despite different participant roles, the same themes emerged. The following section examines the study's findings as they relate to existing literature and will be discussed based on the themes and subthemes that emerged from the data.

Work Itself (Intrinsic Factor)

According to McLean et al. (2019), intrinsic career motivations relate positively to career optimism. Teachers who have higher levels of intrinsic motivation generally show lower intentions to leave when compared to those with lower levels of intrinsic motivation (Grant et al., 2019; Imran et al., 2017). Markedly, higher intrinsic motivation also relates to higher commitment, which is associated with lower turnover intent (Imran et al., 2017). Furthermore, according to Karimi & Fallah (2021), intrinsically motivated individuals are more likely to feel less fatigue and emotional exhaustion and are more likely to work harder at their job.

According to Herzberg (1966), work itself is defined as the actual content of job assignments and tasks which can have either a positive or negative influence. Five out of the five participants commented that the *work itself* was a positive influence regarding their remaining in the field. These findings are consistent with Nias (1981), who found

70

that job satisfiers are obtained from the job itself which may include a teacher's positive emotional feelings of being with the children and helping children learn. In this study, the subthemes that emerged from the theme *work itself* were, (a) passion for the kids, (b) content and prepared for job duties, (c) and campus and district culture.

Passion for the Kids

Main reasons teachers enter the field is having the desire to make a difference in the lives of students, having confidence in their ability to teach, and finding a profession that is rewarding (Perryman & Calvert, 2020). Lesh et al. (2017) conveyed five SETs that were part of their study reported that their jobs were a "calling" in describing their dedication to students with disabilities. Stephens and Fish (2010) found that empathy toward students was a reason SETs enter the field of special education, and a study by Lavin (2013) indicated that SETs were driven by thoughts of 'saving the world' or by beliefs in their own capabilities and their desire to work hard for their students. Hansen (2001) defines a passionate teacher as one who truly thinks that teaching motivates them. A passionate teacher is one who loves the field of knowledge, is profoundly excited about ideas that might change the world and is highly interested in the dilemmas and potential of the young people who come into their class every day (Fried, 2001).

Fish and Stephens (2010) discovered that a teacher's ability to serve students leads to high job satisfaction. Likely, the reasons teachers (and specifically SETs) enter the field is not enough for them to remain, but pairing the reasons they entered and having the ability to sustain their passion for the "kids" as the days and years progress, remains a primary reason for them to stay. Student caseloads and their characteristics may be challenging at times, but SETs often indicate that the students are a main reason they have remained in the field (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Although only two of the five participants in this study mentioned working specifically with students with behavior

challenges as a motivator to remain, this sustainability was evident as four of five participants referenced the intrinsic factor of having passion for the "kids" as a motivation toward their remaining in the field. This is supported in the Bahia et al. (2013) study of teachers which indicated that the participants' students were the greatest source of self-esteem, satisfaction, and self-fulfillment.

Content and Prepared for Job Duties

According to Shepherd et al. (2016) over the past few decades, policy, practice, and research in special education pre-kindergarten through grade 12 setting indicate that there are increasingly complex and multifaceted roles for SETs. Workload manageability may be linked to emotional exhaustion and career intentions (Bettini er al., 2017). A study by Lavian (2014) revealed that SETs who start out as optimists are often awakened abruptly early in their careers because of the complexity of their day-to-day work.

People are attracted to jobs that match their personal abilities and interests (Schneider, 1987). For example, a person who enjoys multi-tasking (as being a SET requires much of the time), may be more attracted to or remain at a job that requires or allows for regular multi-tasking. Lavian (2014) also indicated that SETs who seemed to remain in the field may remain because special education presents a satisfying career.

In this study, although it was evident that the participants' roles varied, four of the five agreed that they felt content and prepared for the duties of their jobs, which has had an impact on their willingness to remain in the field. One participant mentioned that he felt prepared "most days," and another stated that she had been doing "this" for a long time and felt that she could manage almost everything. The participants' intrinsic feelings of contentment and preparedness may be cross sectioned by the extrinsic factor of successful administration which they indicated was in place. A study by Johnson (2019) argued that the most successful schools (in the study) employed administrators who

respected the teachers' time, eliminated needless requirements, and trusted the teachers to use their time well.

School and District Culture

The culture of a school is an important factor that establishes the perception of the school and the behavior patterns of all partners (Kalkan et al., 2020). Barnes and Spangenburg (2018) argued that a shift toward a negative culture may be damaging to the complete organization and can take substantial time to restore. A negative culture is something that can be observed as organizational commitment decreases, turnover rates increase, and productions falls (Emery & Barker, 2007). A supervisor who cannot seem to lead a team in a positive direction upsets the general culture in an organization (Barnes & Spangenburg, 2018).

In contrast, schools that have a strong culture have honest and sincere relationships among school members (Kalkan et al., 2020). School culture and teacher's work stress levels significantly impacts a teacher's job satisfaction (Febriantina et al., 2020) and Johnson (2006) asserts that the workplace matters, concerning teacher quality, effectiveness, and retention. Research has recognized that a culture of collective responsibility predicts student achievement (Lee & Loeb, 2000), the frequency of instructional collaborations with peers, the opinions of workload manageability (Bettini et al., 2018), and the intent to remain teaching (Jones et al, 2013). Jones et al. (2013) contends that a collectively responsible (school) culture predicts an intent to remain teaching and were more committed to their school, which correlates with the participants in this study. Four of the five teachers reported that their campus and/or district culture was positive; an intrinsic factor. One participant summed this up by stating, "I've never wanted to leave" which supports the other participants as they have remained in the same school district and the same campuses for all or the majority of their teaching careers.

Achievement (Intrinsic Factor)

Achievements lead to positive impacts on an employee's productivity which increases their job satisfaction (Usmani, 2022). Achievement can be positive or negative and can include achieving a particular success or failing to make progress (Herzberg, 1966). Both Usmani (2022) and Herzberg (1966) agree with this study's participant data as all were in consensus that being a part of and experiencing their students' achievements and/or successes was critically important. In this study, two subthemes emerged from the theme *achievement*; student academic and behavioral successes, and positive student outcomes. A study by Reitman and Karge (2019), associated a teacher's ability to reflect on student achievement and outcomes as being critical in teacher retention. The importance of reflecting positively was evident in this study as all participants remarked about the importance of assisting in their students' academic, behavioral, and/or outcome successes and their remaining in the field.

Student Academic, Behavioral, and Outcome Success

The greatest satisfaction in teaching comes from both witnessing students achieve success academically and seeing students developing their personal identities and characters (Brewer & Burgess, 2005). A study by Perryman and Calbert (2019) found that one of the most cited rewards of teaching was 'helping students achieve.' Student achievement is directly related to (a teacher's) job satisfaction (Ansley, 2019). Collie et al. (2012) argued that a student's engagement and motivation to learn can function as a boost for a teachers' sense of job satisfaction. This precisely correlates to the participants in this study as being grounded in their passion for their students, and the importance of seeing the students grow academically and behaviorally. One participant remarked that he enjoyed helping his students be successful with their behavior and their education and

added, "seeing a student with joy on their faces when they do something they thought they were not able to do…it is just fun and enjoyable to work with this group of kids."

A teacher's inability to properly respond to students' challenging or disruptive behaviors is a main reason why teachers report leaving the field (Ingersoll et al., 2018). The SET's daily buildup of negative emotions in reaction to challenging behaviors may lead to burnout (Chung & Harding, 2009; Hensel et al., 2012; Mills & Rose, 2011). Ingersol at al. (2018) reported that the teachers who lack behavior management skills report high levels of stress and are more likely to leave the profession (Ingersoll et al., 2018). Student disruptive behaviors are linked to increased teacher stress and burnout (Bottiani et al., 2019). Student behavior has been found to be both an extremely predictive factor in a teacher's level of satisfaction within their position and in their thoughts of leaving the profession (Harris et al., 2019).

On the other hand, teachers who can effectively manage their classrooms have reported higher job satisfaction levels (Carninis et al., 2012) which correlates to two of the participants in this study; one having revealed he felt that continuing working with students who have behavior challenges and seeing successes is an intrinsic motivator for him. Although mentioning that they enjoyed witnessing and feeling a part of their students' successes, three of the five participants did not recognize working with a student's challenging behavior as a motivator in remaining in the field, with two stating that it is "just part of the job."

Like positive student academic and behavioral successes, teacher job satisfaction directly affects a teacher's job performance and student outcomes (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009: Thapa et al., 2013). In correlation with these studies, the majority of the participants in this study expressed that seeing positive outcomes for their students was a motivator for staying in the field. For example, a participant expressed that he liked to see

his students grow and work their way up into adulthood, college, or out in the workforce. Another participant mentioned that she felt "rewarded and awesome" when she sees a child at the end of a year and knows that he or she has "grown so much."

Extrinsic Factors related to Remaining

Three of the emergent themes in this study (supervisor/leadership quality, working conditions, and coworker relations) related directly to extrinsic factors and SETs remaining in the field which are consistent with several studies. A study by McLesky and Walderon (2012), revealed that job satisfaction was higher when administration (supervisor/leadership quality) allowed for open communication and allowed flexible teaching strategies. Bettini et al. (2017) found that workload manageability (working conditions) may be linked with career intentions and emotional exhaustion. Abraham and Prasetyo's (2021) study showed that relationships in the workplace (coworker relations) can serve as a satisfier regarding job satisfaction.

Supervisor/Leadership Quality

Leaders play a critical role in keeping a teacher's motivation engine going (Aria et al., 2019). Administrative support places special significance in a teacher's decision to remain at their teaching post (Harris et al., 2019) and SETs are more likely to intend to stay if they rate administrative support more highly (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Consistent with this, in studies where teachers were asked why they left or stayed, administrative support was reported as playing a role (Billingsley, 2007; Carver-Thomas & Darling Hammond, 2017; López-Estrada & Koyama, 2010). A major theme that arose from a study by Garza and Taliaferro (2021), indicated that leadership directly impacts job satisfaction.

Sutcher et al. (2016) found that teachers who find administration unsupportive are more than twice as likely to leave the filed versus those that feel supported, which

76

correlated directly with this study because all participants indicated that they receive quality supervision at work. Two of the participants in this present research remarked that "being supported by administration" is a reason why they thought some SETs remain in the field, and all participants stated that they personally felt supported by administration either at the campus level, the district level, or both. For example, Jane mentioned that she could go directly to her principal, and she (her principal) would understand what is needed and would act on it.

According to Billingsley & Bettini (2019), there are only a minimal amount of studies that have examined district level supports, but they largely found that it related to attrition. Berry (2012) found a significant relationship between rural SETs' perceptions of district administrators' helpfulness and intent to stay. Billingsley (2007) contended that 25% of those who left an urban school district described "inadequate support from central administration" as a cause of dissatisfaction; 8% reported that it the greatest source of dissatisfaction – greater than the amount who reported having left due to dissatisfaction with principals. In this study, a participant remarked that she feels fortunate at being able to go to her specialist at the ESC with any questions, concerns, or ideas, which she reported as a contributor to why she remains.

Working Conditions

The strongest findings associated with SET attrition relate to working conditions (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Working conditions may encompass physical surroundings, amount of work, tools, and safety (Alshmemeri, 2017). Working conditions may support (a) facilitation in a teacher's efforts to enact their knowledge via effective instructional conditions (Billingsley & Bettini, 2017), (b) provide teachers opportunities to learn effective practices (Grossman & Thompson, 2008), and (c) support a teacher's metal health (McLean et al, 2017). Toropova et al. (2019), found there is a considerable

association between school working conditions and teacher job satisfaction. Studies have also found a range a range of factors that can contribute to job satisfaction experiences by SETs such as overall campus environment, access to resources, and workload manageability (Andrews and Brown, 2015; Bettini, et al., 2017; Boyer and Gillespie, 2000; Brunsting, et al., 2014; Thornton, et al,, 2007).

Workload, also known as time pressure, is regularly reported by teachers as being associated with turnover and their feeling burned out (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). Demik (2008) emphasized how restricted preparation time, combined with excessive demands, contributed to a SET's intent to leave because of their less structured schedules. When SETs encounter more job demands they are less likely to intend to remain teaching (Bettini et al., 2019). A study by Billingsley (2007) found that 33% SETs who left large urban school districts identified large caseloads as a main reason for leaving. Similarly, a study by Hagaman and Casey (2017) discovered that 9 of 13 focus groups reported caseload size was associated with new teacher attrition; interestingly, preservice and early career SETs mentioned this, but administrators did not. The majority of the participants in this study agreed that their teaching duties are aligned with positive working conditions which included administration allowing autonomy, having a clean campus, feelings that the students enjoy coming to school, and allowing time to complete "things that need to get done."

Coworker Relations

Findings by Ansley et al. (2019) discovered there are significant connections between satisfaction with work and workplace relationships. Similarly, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2011) showed that social relationships with coworkers are implicitly related to job satisfaction, facilitated through a sense of belonging. Studies that have examined a teachers' reasons for why they stayed or left identified collegial support as a significant

78

contributor (DeMik, 2008; Hagaman & Casey, 2018; López-Estrada & Koyama, 2010). Furthermore, research by Perryman and Calvert (2019) found that 'colleagues' was mentioned as an enjoyable factor for teachers that remained teaching and a study by Grossman and Thompson (2004) reported that collegial supports may increase a teachers' learning, help navigate a schools' structure, and provide emotional support.

Support from colleagues has proven to be vital in helping SETs be more effective in their roles, as research has shown that positive collegial supports are associated with more positive career outcomes (Gilmore et al, 2022; Jones et al., 2013). Colleagues help SETs, particularly new SETs, understand their responsibilities through collaboration regarding curriculum and instruction as well as provide mentorship that supports a SET's ability to make sense or their roles (Jones et al., 2013). Some researchers suggest that collegial support may be particularly important for SETs because they depend on collaboration to synchronize services and to safeguard a student's meaningful inclusion in a general education setting (Billingsley et al., 2019).

Research suggests that a positive collegial climate and social support system appears to be essential for keeping early career teachers in the profession (Pogodzinki et al., 2013; Pomaki et al., 2010). The support that SETs receive from colleagues may increase their feelings of commitment to their job (Jones et al., 2013), which could potentially reduce influences of job stress (Gilmore & Sandilos, 2023). Kaff (2004) found that 51% of SETs who planned to leave the field felt that having more opportunities to co-teach and collaborate with general education teachers would be an enticement to remain. The research mentioned in this current section clearly conveys to this study, as the majority of the participants relayed that having positive relationships with coworkers is an encouraging part of their job.

Additional Findings

It is worth noting that all participants in this study have remained in the same school district and campus their entire careers as SETs. Organizational commitment can be utilized as a forecast for turnover intention because it give details on the strength of an individual's association, identification, and involvement in an organization (Mowday at el., 1979). Commitment to an organization is instilled in employees who feel their contributions are valued (Meilami, 2021). Furthermore, if organizational commitment and support are strong and positive, high job satisfaction is provided (Soegandhi, 2013).

Implications and Recommendations

Despite heightened attention on why SETs leave the field, knowledge related to attrition of SETs is limited when compared to general education teachers (Hagaman & Casey. 2017). Additionally, there are studies that indicate reasons why SETs leave the field but there is minimal research that examines why some SETs remain in the field. Furthermore, current studies regarding those SETs that leave or remain are largely quantitative which require discrete and brief statements regarding their reasons for attrition (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019); thus, this qualitative study fills that disparity.

This study provided unique qualitative data in the issue of SET retention which could assist education leaders and authors/instructors of educator preparation programming in understanding the reasons why some experienced SETs remain in the field; ultimately conveying interventions to combat the SET shortage. This study also implies that if we are to support current SETs, and attract and retain new professionals in the field, we need to expand the lens by which we seek to understand what is required for them to remain in the field of special education. This study presented two critical areas in which the focus of this new "lens" allowed recommendations for interventions

concerning SETs and their remaining in the field; educator preparation programs and education leader training/supports.

Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) and Professional Development (PD)

Good preparation does not always imply preparing teachers for best practices, it also means preparing them for the unanticipated and the realities of teaching (Gümüş, 2015). Leko et al. (2015) argue that high quality EPP is vital to develop successful and committed SETs; however, initial preparation is not sufficient in ensuring these new teachers have the skills necessary perform effective practices. Gesel at el. (2021) report that special education teachers and general education teachers position the supports they are given for teaching students with high incidence disabilities, including PDs, as somewhat insufficient. Professional development and other training could be specifically important to SETs given that, in 2016, 32% did not study special education (Gilmore et al., 2022). Given the high numbers of educators that fill SETs' roles who may not have had adequate training, providing high quality PD is one path to potentially shape a SET's working conditions (Gilmore & Sandilos, 2023).

Hagaman and Casey (2018) stated that early career SETs reported not enough PD or training as being their third out of five highest reasons they saw SETs leaving the field. Furthermore, studies indicate that SETs who experience meaningful PD result in higher rates of job satisfaction (Grant, 2017; Wasburn-Moses, 2005). With that stated, skilling prospective, preservice, and current SETs through EPPs and PDs regarding situations that might arise, decision making, advocacy (for self and students), and describing the actual realities of teaching in the special education arena would assist in their entering and/or remaining in the field. The EPPs and PDs may involve dialogue with experienced SETs who have remained in the field of special education and intend to stay.

Teachers that are at a high career point are a valuable resource for mentoring teachers that are early in their career because they have collective knowledge and skills required to make changes (Elfers, 2017). Mentoring has been shown to reduce workload and stress that is often experienced by a new teacher and has been proven to improve retention among novice teachers (Ansley et al., 2016). Furthermore, inexperienced SETs need supports through mentoring which may include modeling, goal setting, feedback and observation (Isreal et al,. 2013). Intentional mentoring with effective SETs can offer genuine insights and support. This would require careful attention to the pairing of teachers with not just those with more experience but those that have been effective in navigating their teaching careers. It would also be beneficial if the mentors were assigned to the same campus as the mentee when possible. Being assigned to the same campus would support quick access and the mentor having "unique to the campus" knowledge.

Education Leader Training/Supports

The leadership of principals can have an effect on a teacher's work life and experiences (Kars & Inandi, 2018). A principal's leadership plays a major role in determining the experiences of teachers and students, as well as a school's climate (Baptiste, 2019). Lack of administrator support adversely impacts teachers in many ways such as teachers' feelings, school systems and policies, and challenges that are associated with issues related to students, parents and others (McMahon et al., 2017). Woulfin and Jones (2021) argue that school leaders should gather and analyze evidence on SETs' knowledge, dispositions, skills, and working conditions and use this evidence to design PDs for these educators. The SETs in this study stated that they have strong support in the leadership of their campuses and/or their district, therefore, it would be highly beneficial for education leaders to speak with (or read about) SETs that have remained, to gain insight into their perceptions and experiences. According to Samuels (2018), school

leaders who effectively manage SETs have to be one part lawyer, one part counselor, and somewhat fearless. Furthermore, it would benefit education leaders to network with leaders who have proven to retain SETs. This information would contribute to the leaders' knowledge bases and hopefully provide interventions regarding SET attrition.

A common factor that spurs teachers to leave the professions is poor working conditions (Geiger & Pivovarova, 2018). Decisions regarding teacher workloads are under management of school leaders (Gilmore & Sandilos, 2023). Bettini et al. (2019) state that leaders should take into consideration ways to improve SETs' working conditions. It would be beneficial for education leaders to first understand what SETs identify as "positive" working conditions (this may be specific to school districts or campuses) and may involve focus groups, discussions, or literature reviews. Second, once a definition of positive working conditions has been determined, a viable means to get to and maintain these conditions is critical. This may also involve partnering with EPPs and special education certification programs that utilize SETs who have demonstrated commitment to working in special education.

According to this study, having positive relationships (an intrinsic factor) with coworkers is an asset toward remaining in the field. Teacher-coworker relationships affect a teacher's efficacy, so improving these relationships tends to increase their level of professional efficacy (Rodriguez-Mantilla & Fernadez-Diaz, 2017). Yavuzkurt and Kiral (2020) determined that teacher's perceptions of friendship opportunity significantly predict their job satisfaction. Unfortunately, new SETs often have restricted access to coworkers in their schools, which has been cited as a reason for attrition (Billingsley, 2004; Jones et al., 2013). Having coworkers (and friends) one can "count on" is important in being content, thus school leaders should be educated in understanding this concept and pursue and support social interaction among SETs (and other peers).

More than anything, education leaders need to listen to the teachers if hoping for a "turnaround" in the SET retention rate. Education leaders should call upon SETs whose paths have more likely than not, revealed some ups and some downs, but have ultimately resulted in a positive journey. In other words, instead of continuing to study why they leave, let's look through a new lens focusing on "why they remain."

Recommendations for Future Research

Researchers might consider reviewing previous literature to articulate specific interventions that may enhance the working conditions if SETs. These studies should include interpersonal, leadership, and administrative activities that support SETs, to establish how these activities associate with SET attrition and retention. Researchers should then evaluate the effects of the interventions to improve SET retention and consider disseminating the findings to broad groups such as campus and district-based leaders.

One of this study's participant requirements was having continued to work with special education students with behavioral challenges. More research is needed to convey why alternate groups of SETs remain in the field. For example, study those SETs that solely work with students with behavioral challenges, those that work in a self-contained classroom, or those that work in hard to staff or rural schools/districts.

Researchers should consider in depth accounts regarding a SET's reason to leave the field. According to Clandin et al. (2015) teachers do not decide to leave at one particular time, instead they consider their options over time and with others in their social groups. Studies that investigate the actual process by which they decide to leave or studies that follow a SET from the time they enter the field until the time they leave is warranted.

Conclusion

This study sought to examine the perceptions and experiences of SETs who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. Although it was evident that the participants' roles varied, data produced by examining the perceptions and experiences of these teachers revealed similar themes regarding a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic factors via Herzberg's two-factor theory and their remaining in the field of special education. An employee's job satisfaction is not influenced by a single factor (Nabi et al., 2017) but a set of workplace norms and practices might be taken as inviting for staff retention (Irabor & Okoloe, 2019). Consistent with Herzberg, as we seek to support and retain current and future SETs, we need to improve specific intrinsic and extrinsic factors such as work itself, achievement, supervisor/leadership quality, working conditions, and coworker relations.

There are many studies that have inquired why teachers leave the field of education, however, there are fewer that have explored special education teachers specifically. Current studies of SETs that leave or remain are largely quantitative (Billingsley & Betinni, 2019). This qualitative study filled that void as it revealed possible interventions and suggestions for education leaders and authors/instructors of educator programming to assist in reducing the special education teacher shortage. This chapter provided a discussion of the findings, implications and recommendation, and concluded with some considerations for future research.

REFERENCES

Abeson, A., Bolick, N., & Hass, J. (1976). Due process of law: Background and intent. In
    F. J. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard, & M. L. LaVor (Eds.), *Public Policy and*
    *the Education of Exceptional Children (*pp. 22-32). Reston, VA: The Council for
    Exceptional Children.

Abraham, & Prasetyo, Y. T. (2021). Macroergonomics-based approach in job satisfaction
    of senior high school teachers in a school in Mindoro using Herzberg's two-factor
    theory. *2021 IEEE 8th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and*
    Applications (ICIEA), 106–109.
    https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIEA52957.2021.9436756

About IDEA. (2020, November 24). Retrieved from https://sites.ed.gov/idea/about-idea/

Acquah, A., Nsiah, T., Antie, E., & Otoo, B. (2021). Literature review on theories
    motivation. *EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review*, *9*(5),
    25–29. https://doi.org/10.36713/epra6848

Adnot, M., Dee, T., Katz, V., & Wyckoff, J. (2016). Teacher turnover, teacher quality
    and student achievement in DCPS. Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis
    of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

Agai-Demjaha T., Bislimovska, J. K., & Mijakoski, D. (2015). Level of work related
    stress among teachers in elementary schools. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of*
    Medical Sciences, *3*(3), 484–488. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2015.076

Agaiâ, T., Minov, J., Stoleski, S., & Zafirova, B. (2015). Stress causing factors among
    teachers in elementary schools and their relationship with demographic and job
    characteristics. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, *3*(3), 493–
    499. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2015.077

Albrecht S. F., Johns B. H., Mounstevens J., Olorunda O. (2009). Working conditions as

    risk or resiliency factors for teachers of students with emotional and behavioral

    disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46, 1006–1022.

Allen, M. (2017). *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vols. 1-

    4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411

Aloe, A. M., Shisler, S. M., Norris, B. D., Nickerson, A. B., & Rinker, T. W. (2014). A

    multivariate meta-analysis of student misbehavior and teacher burnout.

    Educational Research Review, 12, 30–44. http://dx.doi

    .org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.05.003

Alshmemri, M., Shahwan-Akl, L., & Maude, P. (2017). Herzberg's two-factor theory.

    Life Science Journal, 14(5), 12-16.

Andrews, A. & Brown, J. L. (2015) Discrepancies in the ideal perceptions and the current

    experiences of special education teachers. *Journal of Education and Training*

    Studies, 3 (6), pp. 126–31.

Ansley, B. M., Houchins, D. & Varjas, K. (2016) 'Optimizing special educator wellness

    and job performance through stress management.' *TEACHING Exceptional*

    Children, 48, pp. 176–85.

Ansley, B. M., Houchins, D., & Varjas, C. (2019). Cultivating positive work contexts that

    promote teacher job satisfaction and retention in high-need schools. *Journal of*

    Special Education Leadership, *32*(1), 3–16.

Aria, A., Jafari, P., & Behifar, M. (2019). Authentic leadership and teachers' intention to

    stay: The mediating role of perceived organizational support and psychological

    capital. *World Journal of Education*, *9*(3), 67.

    https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v9n3p67

ASAH. (2016, Winter/Spring). New education law changes the landscape: What does it mean for your child? *Parents Connection, 17(*1). Retrieved from http://asah.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/09/ParentsConnect-Winter-2016- web.pdf

Audemard, J. (2020). Objectifying contextual effects. The use of snowball sampling in political sociology. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique, 145(1)*, 30–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/0759106319888703

Bahia, Freire, I., Amaral, A., & Teresa Estrela, M. (2013). The emotional dimension of teaching in a group of Portuguese teachers. *Teachers and Teaching, Theory and Practice*, *19*(3), 275–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2012.754160

Ballaro, J. & Meade, K. (2021). Factors determining job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for forensic scientists. *Organization Development Journal*, *39*(2), 37–51.

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

Baptiste, M. (2019). No teacher left behind: The impact of principal leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction and student success. *Journal of International education and leadership*, *9*(1), n1.

Barnes, G., Crowe, E., Schaefer, B. (2007). The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED497176.pdf

Barnes, & Spangenburg, J. M. (2018). When leadership fails – A view from the lens of four employees. *American Journal of Business Education, 11*(3), 49–54. *https://doi.org/10.19030/ajbe.v11i3.10188*

Baxter, P., Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*, 544–559.

Benitez Ojeda, A., & Carugno, P. (2021). Special Education. National Center for

     Biotechnology Information. Retrieved October 25, 2021, from

     https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK499857/.

Berry, A. B. (2012). The relationship of perceived support to satisfaction and

     commitment for special education teachers in rural areas. *Rural Special Education*

     Quarterly, 31(1), 3–14. doi:10.1177/875687051203100102

Bettini, E. A., Gilmour, A. F., Williams, T. O., & Billingsley, B. (2019). Predicting

     special and general educators' intent to continue teaching using conservation of

     resources theory. *Exceptional Children*. doi: 10.1177/0014402919870464

Bettini E., Jones N. D., Brownell M. T., Conroy M., Leite W. (2018). Relationships

     between novices' social resources and workload manageability. *Journal of*

     Special Education, 52(2), 113–126. https://doi.org10.1177/0022466918775432

Bettini, E. A., Jones, N., Brownell, M., Conroy, M., Park, Y., Leite, W., Crockett, J. &

     Benedict, A. (2017) Workload manageability among novice special and general

     educators: relationships with emotional exhaustion and career intentions.

     Remedial and Special Education, 38, pp. 246–56.

Bettini, Cheyney, K., Wang, J., & Leko, C. (2015). Job design: An administrator's guide

     to supporting and retaining special educators. *Intervention in School and*

     Clinic, 50(4), 221–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451214532346

Billingsley, B. (2021). What factors do you think influence special education teacher

     turnover? Retrieved September 29, 2021, from

     https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/tchr-ret/cresource/q1/p01/

Billingsley, B., & Bettini, E. (2019). Special education teacher attrition and retention: A

     review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *89*(5), 697–744.

     https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319862495

Billingsley, B. S. (2004). Special education teacher retention and attrition: A critical analysis of the research literature. *The Journal of Special Education*, *38*(1), 39–55.

Billingsley, B., Bettini, E., Mathews, H. M., & Mcleskey, J. (2020). Improving working conditions to support special educators' effectiveness: A call for leadership. Teacher Education and Special Education: *The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 43*(1), 7-27. doi:10.1177/0888406419880353

Billingsley, B., Bettini, E., & Jones, N. D. (2019). Supporting special education teacher induction through high-leverage practices. *Remedial and Special Education*, *40*(6), 365–379. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932518816826

Billingsley, B., & Bettini, E. (2019). Special education teacher attrition and retention: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 89*(5), 697–744. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319862495

Billingsley B., Bettini E., Williams T. (2017). Teacher racial/ethnic diversity: Distribution of special and general educators of color across schools. *Remedial and Special Education*. Advance online publication.

Billingsley, B. S. (2004). Special education teacher retention and attrition: A critical analysis of the research literature. *Journal of Special Education, 38*(1), 39–55.

Billingsley, B. (2007). A case study of special education teacher attrition in an urban district. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 10*, 11–20.

Billingsley, B. S., Carlson, E., & Klein, S. (2004). The working conditions and induction support of early career special educators. Exceptional Children, 70, 333–347. doi:10.1177/001440290407000305

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*(13), 1802–1811. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870

Blair, E. (2016). A reflexive exploration of two qualitative data coding techniques. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.2458/azu_jmmss.v6i1.18772

Boe, E. E. (2006). Long-term trends in the national demand, supply, and shortage of special education teachers. *The Journal of Special Education*, *40*(3), 138–150.

Boe, E. E., Cook, L. H. (2006). The chronic and increasing shortage of fully certified teachers in special and general education. *Exceptional Children, 72*, 443-460. doi:10.1177/001440290607200404

Borkar, V. (2016). Positive school climate and positive education: Impact on students wellbeing. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing, 7*(8), 861-862.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *37*(5), 662–683. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131610121969460

Bottiani, J. H., Duran, C. A. K., Pas, E. T., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2019). Teacher stress and burnout in urban middle schools: Associations with job demands, resources, and effective classroom practices. *Journal of School Psychology*, *77*, 36–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.10.002

Boyer, L. & Gillespie, P. (2000) Keeping the committed. *TEACHING Exceptional Children, 33*, pp. 10–5.

Brewer, E.W., & Burgess, D. (2005). Professor's role in motivating students to attend class. *Journal of STEM Teacher Education, 42*, 23-47.

Brudney, Jeffrey L, and Stephen E Condrey. (1993). Pay for performance: Explaining the
      differences in managerial motivation. *Public Productivity & Management
      Review, 17*(2):129–144.

Brunsting, N. C., Sreckovic, M. A. & Lane, K. L. (2014) Special education teacher
      burnout: a synthesis of research from 1979 to 2013. *Education and Treatment of
      Children, 37*, pp. 681–712.

Bušatlić, S., & Mujabašić, A. (2018). Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction
      comparative study between private and public high school teachers in Canton
      Sarajevo. *International Journal of Business Management & Research*, *8*(6), 27–48.
      https://doi.org/10.24247/ijbmrdec20184

Butina. (2015). A narrative approach to qualitative inquiry. *Clinical Laboratory
      Science*, *28*(3), 190–196. https://doi.org/10.29074/ascls.28.3.190

Carver-Thomas, D. (2018). Diversifying the teaching profession: How to recruit and
      retain teachers of color. Palo Alto, CA: *Learning Policy Institute*. Retrieved from
      https://learningpolicyinstitute. org/sites/default/files/product-files/Diversifying_
      Teaching_Profession_REPORT_0.pdf

Carver-Thomas, D. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters
      and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy
      Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/454.278.

CEEDAR Center. (2020). *Preparing and retaining effective special education teachers:
      Short term strategies for long-term solutions* (A
      policy brief). https://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-
      content/uploads/2020/01/CEEDAR-GTL

Chambers, C. R. (2007). Siblings of individuals with disabilities who enter careers in the disability field. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *30*(3), 115–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640703000301

Chiong, C., Menzies, L., & Parameshwaran, M. (2017). Why do long-serving teachers stay in the teaching profession? analysing the motivations of teachers with 10 or more years' experience in England. *British Educational Research Journal*, *43*(6), 1083–1110. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3302

Chung, C. M., & Harding, C. (2009). Investigating burnout and psychological well-being of staff working with people with intellectual disabilities and challenging behaviour: The role of personality. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 22*(6), 549-560. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1468-3148.2009.00507.x

Clandinin D. J., Long J., Schaefer L., Downey C. A., Steeves E. P. (2015). Early career teacher attrition: intentions of teachers beginning. *Teaching Education*, 26, 1–16.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1989). Narrative and story in practice and research. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED309681

Clandinin, D.J. (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry*. London, UK: Routledge.

Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School climate and social–emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *104*(4), 1189–1204. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029356

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice*. London: Althouse Press.

Conley, S., & You, S. (2017). Key influences on special education teachers' intentions to leave: The effects of administrative support and teacher team efficacy in a mediational model. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45*, 521-540. doi:10.1177/1741143 215608859

Cook, B. G., Haggerty, N., & Smith, G. (2019). Leadership and instruction: Evidence-based practices in special education. In J. Crockett, B. Billingsley, & M. L. Boscardin (Eds.), *Handbook of Leadership and Administration for Special Education* (pp. 18-38). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cormier, C. (2021). They do it for the culture: Analyzing why black men enter the field of special education. *Multiple Voices Disability, Race, and Language Intersections in Special Education*, *20*(2), 24–37.

Cowan, J., Goldhaber, D., Hayes, K., Theobald, R. (2016). Missing elements in the discussion of teacher shortages. *Educational Researcher, 45*, 460-462. doi:10.3102/0013189X16679145

Crane, S. J., & Iwanicki, E. F. (1986). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and burnout among special education teachers. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*(2), 24–31.

Creswell, John W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* Sage Publications.

Darrow, A. (2016). The every student succeeds act (ESSA). *General Music Today, 30*(1), 41–44. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1048371316658327

Davis, K. C. & Palladino, J. M. (2011). Compassion fatigue among secondary special education teachers: A case study about job stress and burnout, pp. 1–68. (accessed 3 November 2017).

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2009). Veteran teachers: Commitment, resilience and quality retention. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, *15*(4), 441-457.

DeFranzo, S. E. (2018). *Difference between qualitative and quantitative research*. Retrieved March 26, 2019, https://www.snapsurveys.com/blog/qualitative-vs-quantitative-research/

DeMatthews, D. E., Kotok, S., & Serafini, A. (2019). Administrators' roles: Providing special educators opportunities to learn and enact effective reading practices for students with EBD. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1942775119838308

DeMatthews, & Knight, D. S. (2019). Denying special education to students in need: A case of accountability, compliance, and fear in a Texas elementary school. *The Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, *22*(1), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/1555458918786988

DeMik S. A. (2008). Experiencing attrition of special education teachers through narrative inquiry. *High School Journal*, 92, 22–32.

Dewey, J., Sindelar, P., Bettini, E., Leko, C., Boe, E., Rosenberg, M. (2017). Declining special education teacher employment, 2005–2012. *Exceptional Children, 83*, 315–329. doi:10.1177/0014402916684620

Dion, M. J. (2006). *The impact of workplace incivility and occupational stress on the job satisfaction and turnover intention of acute care nurses*: University of Connecticut.

Diliberti, M. K., & Schwartz, H. L. (2021, August 16). The K–12 pandemic staffing and

        budget crises have not panned out yet. Retrieved November 3, 2021, from

        https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA956-3.html

Dosek, T. (2021). Snowball sampling and facebook: How social media can help access

        hard-to-reach populations. PS: *Political Science & Politics, 54*(4), 651-655.

        doi:10.1017/S104909652100041X

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best*

        practices for enhancing student achievement. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Edgar, E. L., & Rosa-Lugo, L. (2007). The critical shortage of speech-language

        pathologists in the public school setting: Features of the work environment.

        Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 38, 31–46.

        doi:10.1044/0161- 1461(2007/004)

Een, N., Uah, M., Rina, M., Psi, M.Pd, Mohd Norazmi bin Nordin. (2021). Arifin C.

        Noor's drama "Matahari Di Sebuah Jalan Kecil" as a media for literature learning

        in senior high school: A study of the structure and psychological value.

        Psychology and Education (2021) 58(2): 11315-11328.

Eichinger, J. (2000). Job stress and satisfaction among special education teachers: Effects

        of gender and social role orientation. *International Journal of Disability,*

        Development, and Education, 47, 399–412.

Elfers, A., Plecki, M., & Van Windekens, A. (2017). *Understanding teacher retention*

        and mobility in Washington state. Final report, University of Washington.

        Retrieved

        from https://education.uw.edu/sites/default/files/profiles/faculty/elfers/UW_Teach

        er_Report_Jan2017.pdf

Emery, C. R. & Barker, K. J. (2007). The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict, 11(1), 77-90.

Emery, D. W., & Vandenberg, B. (2010). Special education teacher burnout and act. *International Journal of Special Education*, *25*(3), 119–131.

Evans, C., & Lewis, J. (2018). *Analysing semi-structured interviews using thematic analysis: Exploring voluntary civic participation among adults*. Sage Research Methods. Retrieved March 7, 2023, from https://methods.sagepub.com/dataset/interviews-thematic-civic-participation

Every Student Succeeds Act [ESSA], Text - S.1177 - 114th Congress (2015–2016). https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1177/text.

Fall, A. M., & Billingsley, B. (2011). Disparities in work conditions among early career special educators in high- and low-poverty districts. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*, 64-78. doi:10.1177/0741932510361264

Febriantina, S., Suparno, S., Marsofiyati, M., & Aliyyah, R. R. (2020). How school culture and teacher's work stress impact on teacher's job satisfaction. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *19*(8), 409–423. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.8.22

Feng, L., & Sass, T. R. (2013). What makes special education teachers special? Teacher training and achievement of students with disabilities. *Economics of Education Review, 36*, 122-134. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.06.006

Fimian, M. J. (1986). Social support and occupational stress in special education. *Exceptional Children, 52*, 436–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440298605200505

Fish, W. W., Stephens, T. L. (2010). Special education: A career of choice. *Remedial and Special Education, 31*, 400-407

Frahm, & Cianca, M. (2021). Will they stay or will they go? Leadership behaviors that increase teacher retention in rural schools. *The Rural Educator (Fort Collins, Colo.)*, *42*(3), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.35608/ruraled.v42i3.1151

Fried, R. (2001). *The passionate teacher: A practical guide*. Boston: Beacon Press

Gangwar, N., Baisakha, D., KV, R., Sambargi, S., & Hedge, S. (2022). Employees locked at home: Revisiting motivation theory-An analytical study. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, *6*(3), 9860–9878.

García, E., & Weiss, E., (2020). A policy agenda to address the teacher shortage in U.S. public schools. (Perfect storm in the teacher labor market series). *Economic Policy Institute*. https://www.epi.org/publication/a-policy-agenda-to-address-the-teacher-shortage-in-u-s-public-schools/

Garza, J. & Taliaferro, D. (2021). Job satisfaction among home healthcare nurses. *Home Healthcare Now, 39* (1), 20-24. doi: 10.1097/NHH.0000000000000921

Geiger, T., & Pivovarova, M. (2018). The effects of working conditions on teacher retention. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*(6), 604–625. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1457524

Gesel S. A., Foreman-Murray L., Gilmour A. F. (2021). Sufficiency of teachers' access to resources and supports for students with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 45(3), 204–226. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/08884064211046237

Gilmour, A. F., & Wehby, J. H. (2020). The association between teaching students with disabilities and teacher turnover. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 112*(5), 1042-1060. doi:10.1037/edu0000394

Gilmour A. F., Sandilos L. E., Pilny W. V., Schwartz S., Wehby J. H. (2022). Teaching

    students with emotional/behavioral disorders: Teachers' burnout profiles and

    classroom management. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 30(1),

    16–28. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/gknqhx

Gilmour, A. F., & Sandilos, L. E. (2023). The crucial role of administrators in shaping

    working conditions for teachers of students with EBD. *Journal of Emotional and*

    Behavioral Disorders, 106342662211499.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/10634266221149933

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine

Grant, M. (2017) 'A case study of factors that influence the attrition or retention of

    special education teachers.' Journal of the American Academy of Special

    Education Professionals, 11, pp. 77–84.

Grant, A. A., Jeon, L., & Buettner, C. K. (2019). Relating early childhood teachers'

    working conditions and well-being to their turnover intentions. *Educational*

    Psychology, *39*(3), 294–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1543856

Greig, A. D., Taylor, M. J., & MacKay, T. (2007). *Doing research with children*. Sage.

Griffin, C. C., Kilgore, K. L., Winn, J. A., Otis-Wilborn, A., Hou, W., & Garvan, C. W.

    (2009). First-year special educators: The influence of school and classroom

    context factors on their accomplishments and problems. *Teacher Education and*

    Special Education, 32, 45–63. doi:10.1177/0888406408330870

Grissom, J. A. (2012). Revisiting the impact of participative decision making on public

    employee retention: The moderating influence of effective managers. *American*

    Review of Public Administration, 20, 1–19.

Grossman P., Thompson C. (2004). District policy and beginning teachers: A lens on

    teacher learning. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26, 281–301

Grossman, P., & Thompson, C. (2008). Learning from curriculum materials: Scaffolds

    for new teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(8), 2014–2026.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.05.002

Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and

    retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational

    Research, 76*, 173-208. doi:10.3102/00346543076002173

Gümüş, S. (2015). Learning to teach special education: A balancing act of assumptions,

    reality, and best practice. *Cogent Education*, *2*(1), 1055095.

Guetterman, T. (2015, May 25). *Descriptions of sampling practices within five

    approaches to ...* DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. Retrieved

    March 7, 2023, from

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280775771_Descriptions_of_Sampling_P

    ractices_Within_Five_Approaches_to_Qualitative_Research_in_Education_and_th

    e_Health_Sciences

Hagaman, J. L., & Casey, K. J. (2018). Teacher attrition in special education:

    Perspectives from the field. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *41*(4),

    277–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417725797

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

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

    513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001

Hansen, D.T. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching: Toward a teacher's creed*.

    New York: Teachers College Press

Hanushek, E. A. & Rivkin, S. G., (2006). Teacher Quality. *Handbook of the Economics

    of Education Vol. 2*, Ser. Amsterdam: North Holland, pp. 1052–1078). essay,

    Elsevier B.V.

Harris, S. P., Davies, R. S., Christensen, S. S., Hanks, J., & Bowles, B. (2019). Teacher attrition: Differences in stakeholder perceptions of teacher work conditions. *Education Sciences*, *9*(4), 300. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9040300

Heneman, R. L., & Werner, J. M. (2005). *Merit pay: Linking pay to performance in a changing world.*: IAP.

Hensel, J. M., Lunsky, Y., & Dewa, C. S. (2012). Exposure to client aggression and burnout among community staff who support adults with intellectual disabilities in Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 59*(9), 910-915. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01493.x

Herzberg, F., Mausnes, B., Peterson, R., & Capwell, D. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of Research and opinion. .* APA PsycNet. Retrieved March 7, 2023, from https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.127.3301.751.b

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

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World Publishing.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, 46*, 53–62.

Herzberg, F. (1971). *Work and the nature of man.* New York, NY: World Publishing.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Synderman, B. B. (1993). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Herzberg, F. (2015). *One more time: How do you motivate employees?* Harvard Business Review. Retrieved March 7, 2023, from https://hbr.org/2003/01/one-more-time-how-do-you-motivate-employees

Hester, Bridges, S. A., & Rollins, L. H. (2020). "Overworked and underappreciated":
Special education teachers describe stress and attrition. *Teacher
Development*, *24*(3), 348–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2020.1767189

Higher Education Consortium for Special Education (2021, February). *The shortage of
special education teachers and higher education faculty*. HECSE.

Hirano, Rowe, D., Lindstrom, L., & Chan, P. (2018). Systemic barriers to family
involvement in transition planning for youth with disabilities: A qualitative
metasynthesis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *27*(11), 3440–3456.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1189-y

Hodge, M.C. (2020). *Transformational leadership among superintendents and its role in
principal job satisfaction.* Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne. ProQuest
Dissertations Publishing.

Hoerr, T. (2017, Summer). Educators need grit too! *Educational Leadership*, 60-64.

Hoppey, & McLeskey, J. (2013). A case study of principal leadership in an effective
inclusive school. *The Journal of Special Education, 46*(4), 245–256.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466910390507

Humphrey, S. R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational,
social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and
theoretical expansion of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied
Psychology, 92*(5), 1332–1356.

Hur, Y. (2018). Testing Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation in the public sector:
Is it applicable to public managers?. *Public Organiz Rev* 18**,** 329–343 (2018).
https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s11115-017-0379-1

IDEA, (2004). Individuals with Disabilities Act, PL-145, 1975.

IDEA, 2018. Sec. 300.08, Child with a disability. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/a/300.8

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004)

Imran, R., Allil, K., & Mahmoud, A. B. (2017). Teacher's turnover intentions.
International Journal of Educational Management, *31*(6), 828–842.
https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-05-2016-0131

Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., Stuckey, D., & Collins, G. (2018). *Seven trends: The*
transformation of the teaching force. Updated October 2018. Philadelphia, PA:
CPRE Research Reports. https://doi.org/10.1037/e579212012-001

Irabor I., & Okolie U. (2019). A review of employees' job satisfaction and its affect on
their retention. *Annals of "Spiru Haret" University. Economic Series (English*
Ed.), *19*(2), 93–114. https://doi.org/10.26458/1924

Isaacs, A., Raymond, A., Jacob, A., & Hawkings, P. (2020). Job satisfaction of rural
medical interns: A qualitative study. *The Australian Journal of Rural*
Health, *28*(3), 245–251. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajr.12633

Israel M., Carnahan R., Snyder K. K., Williamson P. (2013). Supporting new teachers of
students with significant disabilities through virtual coaching: A proposed
model. *Remedial and Special Education*, 34, 195–204.

Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and
emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of*
Educational Research, *79*(1), 491–525. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693

Johnson, S. M. (2006). *The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention, and*
effectiveness. Working Paper. National Education Association Research
Department. Johnson, S. M. (2019). *Where teachers thrive: Organizing schools*
for success. Harvard Education Press.

Johnson, S. (2019). *Where teachers thrive: Organizing schools for success*. Harvard
Education Press.

Jones N. D., Youngs P., Frank K. A. (2013). The role of school-based colleagues in shaping the commitment of novice special and general education teachers. *Exceptional Children*, 79(3), 365–383. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/001440291307900303

Jurkowski, S., & Müller, B. (2018). Co-teaching in inclusive classes: The development of multi-professional cooperation in teaching dyads. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 75*, 224–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. tate.2018.06.017

Kaff, M. (2004). Multitasking is multitaxing: Why special educators are leaving the field. *Preventing School Failure, 48*, 10–17.

Kalkan, Ü., Altınay Aksal, F., Altınay Gazi, Z., Atasoy, R., & Dağlı, G. (2020). The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles, school culture, and organizational image. *SAGE Open, 10*(1). https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/2158244020902081

Karimi, M. N., & Fallah, N. (2021). Academic burnout, shame, intrinsic motivation and teacher affective support among Iranian EFL learners: A structural equation modeling approach. *Current Psychology*, *40*(4), 2026+. https://link-gale-com.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/apps/doc/A657666704/AONE?u=txshracd2589&sid=book mark-AONE&xid=70f62ed6

Kars, M., & Inandi, Y. (2018). Relationship between school principals' leadership behaviors and teachers' organizational trust. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 74*, 145-164. doi:10.14689/ejer.2018.74.8

Kaye, E. K. (Ed.). (2002). *Requirements for Certification of Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators for Elementary and Secondary Schools (67th ed.).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press Kaarbo, J., Beasley, R. K. (1999). A

practical guide to the comparative case study method in political psychology. *Political Psychology, 20*, 369–391.

Klein, A. (2020). *Does Essa require teachers to be highly qualified?* Education Week. Retrieved June 27, 2022, from https://www.edweek.org/policy-politics/does-essa-require-teachers-to-be-highly-qualified/2018/07#:~:text=The%20longer%20answer%3A%20ESSA%20got,are%20teaching%20and%20state%20certification

Kraft, Matthew A., and John P. Papay. 2014. Can professional environments in schools promote teacher development? Explaining heterogeneity in returns to teaching experience. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 36, no. 4*: 476–500.

Kruger, D. (1988). *An Introduction to Phenomenological Psychology*. Cape Town: Juta.

Lavian, H. (2014). Masters of weaving: the complex role of special education teachers. *Teachers and Teaching, Theory and Practice*, *21*(1), 103–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014.928123

Learning Policy Institute. 2017. *What's the Cost of Teacher Turnover? (calculator)*. September 2017.

Lee, D. J., Kruger, S., Whang, M. J., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2014).Validating a customer well-being index related to natural wildlife tourism. *Tour Manag. Elsevier*. 2014;45:171–80.

Lee V., Loeb. (2000). School size in Chicago elementary schools: Effects on teachers' attitudes and students' achievement. *American Education Research Journal*, 37(1), 3–31. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/1163470

Legislative Analyst Office. (2013) Overview of special education in California.Leko, M. M., Smith, S. W. (2010). Retaining beginning special educators. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 45*, 321-325. doi:10.1177/1053451209353441

Leko M. M., Brownell M. T., Sindelar P. T., Kiely M. T. (2015). Envisioning the future
of special education personnel preparation in a standards-based era. *Exceptional
Children*, 82, 25–43.

Lesh, J. J., Shatz, K., Harris-Looby, J., Roberts, C. (2017). Why stay? A
phenomenological look at special education teacher retention. *International
Journal of Education and Human Developments,* 3, 12–24.

Levin, J., Berg-Jacobsen, A., Atchinson, D., Lee, K., Vontsolos, E. (2015).
Massachusetts study of teacher supply and demand: Trends and projections.
Retrieved from https://www.air.org/resource/massachusetts-study-teacher-supply-
and-demand-trends-and-projections

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial
and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 1297–1343.

Legal Institute. (n.d.) *Cornell Law School*.
https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/1003

López-Estrada V., Koyama M. (2010). Retaining Mexican American special education
teachers in Texas. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 9, 82–97.

Manuel, J., & Carter, D. (2016). Sustaining hope and possibility: early-career English
teachers' perspectives on their first years of teaching. *English in Australia*, *51*(1).

Martin, K. F., Lloyd, J. W., Kauffman, J. M., & Coyne, M. (1995). Teachers' perceptions
of educational placement decisions for pupils with emotional or behavioral
disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 20*, 106–117.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/019874299502000205

McCray, E. D., Butler, T. W., Bettini, E. (2014). What are the roles of general and special
educators in inclusive schools? In McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., Spooner, F.,

Algozzine, B. (Eds.), *Handbook of effective inclusive schools* (pp. 80-106). New York, NY: Routledge.

McDowell, J. R., (2017). Burningout: The effect of burnout in special education. *BYU Education & LJ, 2017(1)*), Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1394&context=elj

McLaughlin, M. J. (2010). Evolving interpretations of educational equity and students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 76*, 265-278. doi:10.1177/001440291007600302

McLean, L., Abry, T., Taylor, M., Jimenez, M., & Granger, K. (2017). Teachers' mental health and perceptions of school climate across the transition from training to teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 65*, 230-240. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.018

McLean, L., Taylor, M., & Jimenez, M. (2019). Career choice motivations in teacher training as predictors of burnout and career optimism in the first year of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *85*(1), 204-214.

McLeod, S. A. (2019). Qualitative vs. quantitative research. *Simply psychology*, *30*.

McLeskey, J., Billingsley, B. S. (2008). How does the quality and stability of the teaching force influence the research-to-practice gap? A perspective on the teacher shortage in special education. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*, 293–305.

McLeskey, J. & Waldron, N. L. (2012) Setting the direction: the role of the principal in developing effective, inclusive school. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 24*, pp. 51–60.

McLeskey, McLean, L., Abry, T., Taylor, M., Jimenez, M., & Granger, K. (2017).
Teachers' mental health and perceptions of school climate across the transition
from training to teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 65, 230-240.
doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.018

McLeskey, J., Waldron, N., & Redd, L. (2014). A case study of a highly effective,
inclusive elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education, 48*, 59-70.
doi:10.1177/0022466912440455

McMahon, S. D., Reaves, S., McConnell, E. A., Peist, E., & Ruiz, L. (2017). The ecology
of teachers' experiences with violence and lack of administrative support.
American Journal of Community Psychology, *60*(3-4), 502–515.
https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12202

Mearns, J., & Cain, J. E. (2003). Relationships between teachers' occupational stress and
their burnout and distress: Roles of coping and negative mood regulation
expectancies. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping: An International Journal, 16*(1), 71–
82. https://doi.org/10.1080/1061580021000057040

Meilani, Y. F. C. P., Tan, J. D., Murwani, F. D., Bernarto, I., & Sudibjo, N. (2021).
Motivating and retaining generation z faculty members in private
universities. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *11*(1), 245-255.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Attrition. *In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved June
8, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/attrition

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Burnout. *In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved June
8, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/burnout

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Retention. *In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved June
8, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/retention

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Public school. *In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved

      June 8, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/public school

Metlife Survey of the American Teacher – Department of Education, 2014.

Milanowski, A., & Odden, A. (2007). *A new approach to the cost of teacher*

      turnover. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved

      from https://www.crpe.org/sites/default/files/wp_sfrp13_milanowskiodden_aug08

      _0.pdf

Mills, S., & Rose, J. (2011). The relationship between challenging behaviour, burnout

      and cognitive variables in staff working with people who have intellectual

      disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 55*(9), 844-857. https://

      doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01438.x

Mintz, K. & Wasserman, D. Caring for people with disabilities: An ethics of

      respect. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 2020 Jan;50(1):44-45.

Mitchell, B. B., Deshler, D. D., & Lenz, B. K. B. H. (2012). Examining the role of the

      special educator in a response to intervention model. *Learning Disabilities, 10*,

      53–74.

Monnin, K., Day, J., Strimel, M., Dye, K., & M.Ed. (n.d.). *Why now is the perfect time to*

      solve the special education teacher shortage. Council for Exceptional Children.

      Retrieved October 25, 2021, from https://exceptionalchildren.org/blog/why-now-

      perfect-time-solve-special-education-teacher-shortage. National Education

      Association. (2019). Special

      education. https://ra.nea.org/search/special+education/

Motulsky, S. (2021). Is member checking the gold standard of quality in qualitative

      research? (2021). *Qualitative Psychology (Washington, D.C.)*, *8*(3), 389–406.

      https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000215

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of

  organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior, 14(2),* 224-247

Myers, J. A., Gilbert, K., & Sindelar, P. (2020). Does alternative route preparation meet

  the requirements of IDEA assurance 14? A policy analysis. *Teacher Education*

  and Special Education, *43*(4), 332–342.

  https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406420912374

Nabi, M.N., Ahmed, A.A.J., & Rahman, M.S. (2017). The empirical study on human

  resource management practices with special reference to job satisfaction and

  employee turnover at investment corporation of Bangladesh. *Human Resource*

  Management Research, 7(1). 54-64.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021, May). Retrieved October 31, 2021, from

  https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgg

National Education Association. (2019). Rankings of the states 2019 and estimates of

  school statistics 2020. NEA Research, July 2020.

National Research Council. (2001). *Educating children with autism*. Washington, DC:

  National Academy Press.

Nias, J. (1981). Teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction: Herzberg's "Two-Factor"

  hypothesis revisited. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *2*(3), 235–246.

  http://www.jstor.org/stable/1392621

Nurhasanah, E., Maspuroh, U., Marlina, R., & Nordin, M. N. (2021). As a media for

  literature learning in senior high school: A study of the structure and

  psychological value. *Psychology and Education (2021) 58*(2): 11315-11328.

Ogba, F. N., Onyishi, C. N., Victor-Aigbodion, V., Abada, I. M., Eze, U. N.,

  Obiweluozo, P. E.,…Onwu, A. O. (2020). Managing job stress in teachers of

  children with autism: A rational emotive occupational health coaching control

110

trial. *Medicine (Baltimore)*, *99*(36), e21651–e21651.

https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000021651

Ozsoy, E. (2019). An empirical test of Herzberg's two-factor motivation theory.

Marketing and Management of Innovations, 1, 11-20.

http://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2019.1-01.

Papay, C. K., & Bambara, L. M. (2014). Best practices in transition to adult life for youth

with intellectual disabilities. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional*

Individuals, *37*(3), 136–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143413486693

Paquette, K. R., and S. A. Reig. 2016. Stressors and coping strategies through the lens of

early childhood/special education pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher*

Education 57: 51–58. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2016.03.009

Park, & Johnson, K. R. (2019). Job satisfaction, work engagement, and turnover intention

of CTE health science teachers. *International Journal for Research in Vocational*

Education and Training, *6*(3), 224–242. https://doi.org/10.13152/IJRVET.6.3.2

Partner, A. (2020). Teacher turnover: What you need to know. Retrieved September 27,

2021, from https://content.acsa.org/articles/teacher-turnover-what-you-need-to-

know

Patton M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and*

practice (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Perryman, J., & Calvert, G. (2019). What motivates people to teach, and why do they

leave? Accountability, performativity and teacher retention. *British Journal of*

Educational Studies, *68*(1), 3–23.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2019.1589417

Phillippi, J., & Lauderdale, J. (2018). A Guide to Field Notes for Qualitative Research:

    Context and Conversation. *Qualitative Health Research*, *28*(3), 381–388.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317697102

Pogodzinski, B., Youngs, P., & Frank, K. (2013). Collegial climate and novice teachers'

    intent to remain teaching. *American Journal of Education, 120*(1), 27–

    54. https://doi.org/10.1086/673123Prather-Jones, B. (2011b). "Some people aren't

    cut out for it": The role personality factors in the careers of teachers of students

    with EBD. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*, 179–191.

    doi:10.1177/0741932510362195

Pomaki, G., DeLongis, A., Frey, D., Short, K., & Woehrle, T. (2010). When the going

    gets tough: Direct, buffering and indirect effects of social support on turnover

    intention. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(6), 1340–

    1346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.03.007

Probst, T. M., Brett, J. M., Drasgow, F. (2002). The impact of job insecurity on employee

    work attitudes, job adaptation, and organizational withdrawal behaviors. In: J.

    Brett and F. Drasgow (Eds), *The psychology of work: Theoretically based*

    empirical research, (pp. 141-168). Mahwah, NJ: Psychology Press.

Protopapas A, Parrila R. Is Dyslexia a Brain Disorder*? Brain Sci. 2018 Apr 05;8*(4)

Pullen, P. C., Hallahan, D. P. (2015). What is special education instruction? In Bateman,

    B., Lloyd, J. W., Tankersley, M. (Eds.), *Enduring Issues in Special Education:*

    Personal Perspectives (pp. 37-50). New York, NY: Routledge.

Reitman, G. C., & Dunnick-Karge, B. (2019). Investing in teacher support leads to

    teacher retention: Six supports administrators should consider for new teachers.

    Multicultural Education, *27*(1), 7–18.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *15*(2), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486

Robertson, & Singleton, J. D. (2010). Comparison of Traditional Versus Alternative Preparation of Special Education Teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *33*(3), 213–224. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406409359904

Rodriguez-Mantilla, J. M., & Fernandez-Diaz, J. (2017). The effect of interpersonal relationships on burnout syndrome in Secondary Education teachers. *Psicothema*, *29*(3), 370–377. https://doi.org/doi: 10.7334/psicothema2016.309

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

Rosenberg, M. S., Sindelar, P. T., & Hardman, M. L. (2004). Preparing highly qualified teachers for students with emotional or behavioral disorders: The impact of NCLB and IDEA. *Behavioral Disorders*, *29*(3), 266–278. https://doi.org/10.1177/019874290402900308

Ruble, & McGrew, J. H. (2013). Teacher and child predictors of achieving IEP goals of children with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *43*(12), 2748–2763. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-013-1884-x

Sachau, D. (2007). The motivation-hygiene theory: Herzberg and the positive psychology movement. *Human Resurrecting Resource Development Review, 6*(4), 377–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484307307546

Sakallı Gümüş, S. (2015). Learning to teach special education: A balancing act of assumptions, reality, and best practice. *Cogent Education, 2*(1), 1055095. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2015.1055095

Samuels. (2018). The important role principals play in special education. *Education Week*, *38*(9), 26–26.

Samuels, C. (2015, December 10). What does ESSA mean for special education? Spotlight on special education. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/ edweek/speced/2015/12/essa_special_education.html

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, *14*(3), 204–220. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966406

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453.

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children, 74*, 392– 416 doi:10.1177/001440290707300401

Sfard, A., & Prusak, A. (2005). Telling identities: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity. *Educational Researcher, 34*, 14–22.10.3102/0013189X034004014

Sharp, T. P. (2008). Job satisfaction among psychiatric registered nurses in New England. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, 15*(5), 374–378. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2850.2007.01239.x

Shepherd, K. G., Fowler, S., McCormick, J., Wilson, C. L., & Morgan, D. (2016). The search for role clarity: Challenges and implications for special education teacher preparation. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 39*(2), 83–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406416637904

Sindelar, P. T., Fisher, T. L., & Myers, J. A. (2019). The landscape of special education licensure, 2016. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 42*, 101–116.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave
the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and
emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(6), 1029–1038.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.001

Skaalvik E. M., Skaalvik S. (2017). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy: Relations
and consequences. In McIntyre T. M., McIntyre S. E., Francis D. J.
(Eds.), *Educator Stress* (pp. 101–125). Springer.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Dimensions of teacher burnout: Relations with
potential stressors at school. *Social Psychology of Education: An International
Journal, 20*(4), 775–790. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9391-0

Smith, A., Brice, C., Collins, A., McNamara, R., & Matthews, V. (2000). Scale of
occupational stress: A further analysis of the impact of demographic factors and
type of job.

Smith, L. (1978). An evolving logic of participant observation, educational ethnography,
and other case studies. In L. Shulman (Ed.), *Review of Researching Education*
(pp. 316- 377). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Soegandhi, V. M. (2013). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan loyalitas kerja terhadap
organizational citizenship behavior pada karyawan PT. *Surya Timur Sakti Jatim.
Agora, 1(1)*, 808-819

Sonday, A., Ramugondo, E., & Kathard, H. (2020). *Case study and narrative inquiry as
merged methodologies: A critical narrative perspective.* International Journal of
Qualitative Methods. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920937880

Sorensen, Lucy C., and Helen Ladd. 2018. The hidden costs of teacher turnover. *National
Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER)
Working Paper No. 203-0918-1.*

Special Education Teachers. Data USA. (2020). Retrieved April 21, 2022, from

  https://datausa.io/profile/soc/special-education-teachers

Squillaci, & Hofmann, V. (2021). Working in inclusive or non-inclusive contexts:

  Relations between collaborative variables and special education teachers'

  burnout. *Frontiers in Education (Lausanne), 6.*

  https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.640227

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

  Publications.

Stefanidis, A., & Strogilos, V. (2015). Union gives strength: Mainstream and special

  education teachers' responsibilities in inclusive co-taught classrooms.

  Educational Studies, 41, 393–413. https://doi.org/10.

  1080/03055698.2015.1018872

Stephens, T. & Fish, W. (2010). Motivational factors toward pursuing a career in special

  education. *Education, 130 (4)*, pp. 581–594.

Stewart-Banks, B., Kuofie, M., & Hakim, A. (2015). Education leadership styles impact

  on work performance and morale of staff. *Journal of Marketing and Management*,

  6(2), 87–105.

Stringer, C., Didham, J., & Theivananthampillai, P. (2011). Motivation, pay satisfaction,

  and job satisfaction of front-line employees. *Qualitative Research in Accounting*

  & Management, 8(2), 161–179.

Sullivan, K., Barkowski, E., Lindsay, J., Lazarev, V., Nguyen, T., Newman, D., & Lin, L.

  (2017, December). *Trends in teacher mobility in Texas and associations with*

  teacher, student, and school characteristics (REL Report No. 2018-283). Regional

  Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from https://files.eric.

  ed.gov/fulltext/ED578907.pdf

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., and Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S. learning policy institute*. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/coming-crisis-teaching

Texas Education Agency. (2015). Becoming a certified Texas educator through an alternative education program.

Texas Education Agency. (2019, August 18). *Life skills*. Texas Education Agency. Retrieved March 23, 2023, from https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/news-and-multimedia/iamtxed/sy-2016-2017/life-skills

Texas Project First, 2022, https://texasprojectfirst.org/

Texas Special Education Certification & Requirements. Special Education Guide. (2021, November 29). Retrieved May 21, 2022, from https://www.specialeducationguide.com/teacher-certification/texas/

Thant, & Chang, Y. (2021). Determinants of public employee job satisfaction in Myanmar: Focus on Herzberg's two factor theory. *Public Organization Review, 21*(1), 157–175. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-020-00481-6

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 357–385. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907

Theobald, R. J., Goldhaber, D. D., Naito, N., & Stein, M. L. (2021). The special education teacher pipeline: Teacher preparation, workforce entry, and retention. *Exceptional Children*, *88*(1), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/00144029211010162

The White House. (2021a). Fact sheet: The American families plan. Briefing Room. https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/28/fact-sheet-the-american-families-plan/

The White House. (2021b). Priorities. The White

     House. https://www.whitehouse.gov/priorities/

Thornton, B., Peltier, G. & Medina, R. (2007). Reducing the special education teacher

     shortage. *Clearing House, 80*, pp. 233–8.

Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction: The

     importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational*

     Review, 73(1), 71–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2022, October 4). *Special education teachers:*

     Occupational outlook handbook. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved

     February 11, 2023, from https://www.bls.gov/ooh/education-training-and-

     library/special-education-teachers.htm

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017). Special education teachers. Retrieved From

     http://www.bls.gov/ooh/education-training-and-library/special-education

     teachers.htm

U.S. Department of Education (2002). New No Child Left Behind.

     https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ110/html/ PLAW-

     107publ110.htm

U.S. Department of Education. (2021). Teacher shortage

     areas. https://tsa.ed.gov/#/reports

Usmani, F. (2022). *Herzberg's two factor theory of motivation: Definition, example, Pros*

     & Cons. Parsadi. Retrieved February 16, 2023, from

     https://parsadi.com/herzbergs-two-factor-theory/

Velickovic, K., Rahm Hallberg, I., Axelsson, U., Borrebaeck, C. A. K., Rydén, L.,

     Johnsson, P., & Månsson, J. (2020). Psychometric properties of the Connor-

     Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) in a non-clinical population in

Sweden. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 18*(1), 132–132.
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01383-3

Wakeman, S. Y., Browder, D. M., Flowers, C., & Ahlgrim Delzell, L. (2006). Principals'
knowledge of fundamental and current issues in special education. *NASSP
Bulletin, 90*, 153–174.

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors
contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure track
faculty: Findings from a qualitative study. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3),
411–434.

Wasburn-Moses, L. (2005) 'How to keep your special education teachers?' Principal
Leadership, 5, pp. 35–8.

Watlington, E., Shockley, R., Guglielmino, P., Felsher, R. (2010). The high cost of
leaving: An analysis of the cost of teacher turnover. *Journal of Education
Finance, 36*, 22-37. doi:10.1353/jef.0.0028

Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2014). Beginning teachers' motivations,
effectiveness and wellbeing. *In NAFOL Year Book 2014*: *Once a teacher-always
a teacher?* (pp. 53-64). Fagbokforlaget Vigmostad & Bjorke AS.

Whitney, C. R., & Candelaria, C. A. (2017). The effects of no child left behind on
children's socioemotional outcomes. *AERA Open, 3*(3), 233285841772632–.
https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858417726324

Weiskopf, P. E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. *Exceptional
Children, 47(*1), 18–23.

Welman, J. C., & Kruger, S. J. (1999). Research methodology for the business and
administrative sciences. South Africa: International Thompson.

Westling, D. L. (2010). Teachers and challenging behavior: Knowledge, views, and practices. *Remedial and Special Education, 31*, 48–63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741932508327466

Williams, J., and C. Dikes. 2015. The implications of demographic variables as related to burnout among a sample of special education teachers. *Education* 135 (3): 337–345

Williamson, P., Hoppey, D., McLeskey, J., Bergmann, E., & Moore, H. (2019). Trends in LRE placement rates over the past 25 years. *The Journal of Special Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0022466919855052

Wisniewski, L., & Gargiulo, R. M. (1997). Occupational stress and burnout among special educators: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Special Education, 31*(3), 325–346. https://doi.org/10.1177/002246699703100303

Woulfin, S. L., & Jones, B. (2021). Special development: The nature, content, and structure of special education teachers' professional learning opportunities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *100*, 103277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103277

Yavuzkurt, & Kıral, E. (2020). The Relationship Between Workplace Friendship and Job Satisfaction in Educational Organizations. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, *16*(5), 404–425. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2020.277.25

Yazan, B. (2015). You learn best when you're in there: ESOL teacher learning in the practicum. *CATESOL Journal*, *27*(2), 171-199.

Zettel, J. J., & Ballard, J. (1979). The Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975 PL 94-142: Its History, Origins, and Concepts. *Journal of Education, 161*(3), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205747916100303

Zhang, D., Wang, Q., Losinski, M. & Katsiyannis, A. (2014). An examination of preservice teachers' intentions to choose careers in special education. *Journal of*

Teacher Education, 65 (2), pp. 156–171. https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0022487113510743

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

Why They Stay

Q1 Dear Invitee:

Greetings! You are being solicited to complete an online survey that will gather demographic information as well as allow you to provide contact information for further interview. The data obtained from this study may allow for the development of interventions to address the special education teacher shortage.   Please try to answer all questions. Filling out the following survey is entirely voluntary but answering each response will make the survey most useful. This survey takes approximately 2 minutes to complete and all of your responses will be kept completely confidential. No obvious undue risks will be endured and you may stop your participation at any time. In addition, you will not benefit directly from your participation in the study.   Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and your willingness to further participate in this study is implied if you proceed with completing the survey. Your completion of this survey is greatly appreciated and invaluable. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact Dr. Elizabeth Beavers (beaversea@uhcl.edu) or myself (newsomj3916@uhcl.edu).

Thank you and kind regards,

Jeanne Newsom, M.Ed.

Q12 Are you willing to be contacted for an interview? The interview will take approximately 30-45 minutes. You may choose to be interviewed virtually or in person. As already indicated, the data gained from this study may allow for the development of interventions to address the special education teacher shortage.

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

Q9 So that we may schedule an interview, how do you prefer to be contacted? I will ask you to provide your contact information below.

○ Phone (1)

○ Email (2)

○ Text (3)

Q15 Do you prefer to be interviewed in person (location to be mutually determined) or virtually?

○ In person (1)

○ Virtually (2)

Q3 Are you currently employed as a special education teacher?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

Q4 In your experience, have you been a teacher for students with behavioral challenges (regardless of the student's diagnosis or eligibility classification)?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

Q5 How many years have you been employed as a special educator?

○ Less than five years (1)

○ Five to ten years (2)

○ ten years or more (3)

Q6 Describe the type of school setting in which you teach:

○ Public (1)

○ Private (2)

○ Other (3) _____

Q16 In what type of special education classroom setting do you teach?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q7 How many years have you been teaching in the same school district as a special education teacher? Though you may have taught at different schools (or not), this question seeks to confirm your years of teaching in your current school district.

○ Less than 5 years (4)

○ More than 5 years (6)

Q8 Please provide your first name:

_____

Q11 Please provide your preferred email address:

_____

Q10 Please provide your phone number:

_____

Q13 How do you identify your gender?

○ Male (1)

○ Female (2)

○ Non-binary / third gender (3)

○ other (4)

○ Prefer not to answer (5)

Q14 Which of the following best matches your racial identity? You may check more than one.

○ Black or African American (1)

○ American Indian or Alaska Native (2)

○ Asian (3)

○ White or Caucasian (4)

○ Other (5)

○ Prefer not to answer (6)

Why they stay: Consent

Q1 **Thank you for your potential interest in my study.**

The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences of special education teachers who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. This study's goal is to examine the factors relating to why some experienced special education teachers stay in the field to determine practices that contribute to their retention.

Protections, Risk, and Benefits:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or you may decide to stop your participation at any time. You are being asked to read the information below carefully and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to participate. There are no anticipated risks associated with participation in this study. There is no direct benefit received from your participation in this study, but your participation will help the investigator to better understand factors related to why some special education teachers stay in the field to possibly determine practices that can contribute to special education teacher retention.

Confidentiality of Records:

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. The data collected from the study will be used for educational and publication purposes, however, you will not be identified by name. For federal audit purposes, the participant's

documentation for this research project will be maintained and safeguarded by the Principal Investigator or Faculty Sponsor for a minimum of three years after completion of the study. After that time, the participant's documentation may be destroyed.

Compensation:

There is no financial compensation to be offered for participation in the study. The investigator has the right to withdraw you from this study at any time.

Contact Information for Questions or Problems:

The investigator will offer to answer all of your questions. If you have additional questions during the course of this study about the research or any related problem, you may contact the Principal Investigator, Jeanne Newsom by telephone at 713-775-3400 or by email at newsomj3916@uhcl.edu. The Faculty Sponsor, Elizabeth Beavers Ph.D. may be contacted by telephone at 281-283-7600 or email at BeaversEA@uhcl.edu.

Consent:

Your digital consent below acknowledges your voluntary participation in this research project. Such participation does not release the investigator(s), institution(s), sponsor(s) or granting agency(ies) from their professional and ethical responsibility to you. By signing the form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights. The purpose of this study, procedures to be followed, and explanation of risks or benefits have been explained to you. You have been allowed to ask questions and your questions have been answered to your satisfaction. You have been told who to contact if you have additional questions. You have read this consent form and voluntarily agree to participate as a subject in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent at any time by contacting the Principle

Investigator or Student Researcher/Faculty Sponsor. You will be given a copy of the consent form you have signed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE (UHCL) COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS HAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS PROJECT. ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE UHCL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (281.283.3015). ALL RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT ARE CARRIED OUT BY INVESTIGATORS AT UHCL ARE GOVERNED BY REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. (FEDERALWIDE ASSURANCE #FWA00004068

Do you consent to participate in this study?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

Q3 Please provide your name:

_____

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

Informed Consent gained: Yes   No

Location of interview:_____

Guide Script prior to interview (via ZOOM or in person):

I'd like to thank you once again for being willing to participate in the interview phase of my study. As you are already aware, my study seeks to examine the experiences of special education teachers who have remained in the same public school district and who have continued working with special education students with behavioral challenges for five or more years. I will be examining factors that contribute to the retention of experienced special education teachers in Texas public schools. Specifically, the study will analyze special education teacher retention, in hopes to assist in combatting the ongoing and growing special education teacher shortage. Our interview today will last approximately 45 minutes during which I will be asking you about general demographics and about your experiences regarding the field of special education. Through email, you completed a consent form indicating that I have your permission (or not) to video and audio record this interview (Zoom platform for video recording only). Are you still okay with me audio and video recording (or not) our conversation today? ___Yes ___No

If yes: Thank you!

If at any point you want me to turn off the recording, keep something you said off the record, or not answer any of the questions, please let me know. I will also be taking written notes of our conversation. Before we begin the interview, do you have any questions? [Discuss questions]. If any questions arise at any point in this interview (or after the interview), feel free to ask or contact me via email at any time. I would be more than happy to answer your questions. First, I will ask general demographic questions that will be followed by 22 open-ended questions. If you prefer not to answer any of these general questions, please let me know.

What is your age range?

25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74+

What is your highest level of education?

Bachelor's degree	Master's degree	Doctoral

What other certification related to education do you hold besides special education (if any)? _____

_____

Did you receive special education certification through the regular or alternative track?

Regular	Alternative

How many years have you been in the field of education?

0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	30+

How many of those years have been spent in the field of special education?

0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	30+

_____

Open-ended interview questions:
1. What other roles (or assignments) if any, have you held while working in the field of education?
2. Tell me about your journey into the field of special education.
3. What is your current assignment?
4. Tell me what your typical day entails?
5. If I were considering entering the special education field,
6. Tell me about the required duties of your job.
7. Do you feel fully prepared to fulfill your required daily/weekly duties (yes, somewhat, no), and why?
8. Tell me about your campus/school climate (School climate refers to the quality and character of school life. School climate is based on patterns of students', parents' and school personnel's experience of school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organizational structures).
9. Tell me about your district leadership regarding special education.
10. Tell me about your current administration/school leadership regarding special education.
11. Can you recall a significant moment or moments with your students and/or families that made you smile, happy, and/or proud? If so, please explain.
12. Can you recall a significant moment or moments with your students and/or families that made you upset or uncomfortable? If so, please explain.
13. Can you recall a significant moment or moments with your campus (with staff and/or administration) that made you smile, happy, and/or proud? If so, please explain.
14. Can you recall a significant moment or moments with your campus or district (with staff and/or administration) that made you feel upset or uncomfortable? If so, please explain.

15. Are you satisfied with your current job/assignment? Please explain why?
16. What do you think is a major factor or factors in SET retention (SET teachers that remain)?
17. What do you think is a major factor or factors in SET attrition (SET teachers that leave/quit)?
18. If you had one wish which would make teaching and remaining in the special education field more attractive, what would it be? Why?
19. You stated in the survey that you have been (or are) a teacher for students with behavioral challenges. Can you explain?
20. Tell me about your behavior management style. In other words, how do you combat negative behaviors (either stop them from occurring or when they occur).
21. Why do you stay in the field of special education and in your current district?
22. Is there anything else you'd like to mention or clarify?