

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2018

**THE INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AND RETENTION AND GREENS
FOUR-DIMENSIONAL MODEL OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Susan Farris

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Farris, Susan, "THE INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AND RETENTION AND GREENS FOUR-DIMENSIONAL MODEL OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP" (2018). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1887.
<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/1887>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khggerty@memphis.edu.

THE INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER JOB
SATISFACTION AND RETENTION AND GREEN'S FOUR-DIMENSIONAL
MODEL OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

by

Susan Locker Farris

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Major: Leadership and Policy Studies

The University of Memphis

May, 2018

Acknowledgements

This particular journey ends with this my 68th year. It began with an off-hand 30-year old question of where I saw myself in years to come and my reply of, "With a doctorate." Life has intervened and delayed the goal but not the desire. My gratitude is inclusive of many:

To my daughter, Dr. Leigh Alice Farris, and my daughter-in-law, Dr. Karen Bell Farris, you two have been my role models.

To my son, Greg Farris, it takes a strong man to support and to succeed with female voices in your head.

To my dissertation committee of Dr. Reginald Leon Green, Dr. Louis A. Franceschini, III, Dr. Charisse Atibagos Gulosino, and Dr. Steven Leonice Nelson, thank you for your guidance, support and patience.

To Dr. Timothy Fite, Dr. Donald Hopper, and Dr. James Mitchell, thank you for your belief in and affirmation of the process and its ultimate outcome.

To Alpha Cohort, University of Memphis - Lambuth, we started this adventure together and I look forward to your successes.

To my friend, colleague, and proofreader, Jane Forsythe, thank you for your willingness to listen when I whined, cried, and complained and then put it all in the proper perspective and format!

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of their schools' implementation of Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, their level of satisfaction with their schools as "a good place to work and learn" and their intent to remain professionally employed there. Represented by responses to twenty items selected from the 2013 state-wide administration of the *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning* survey in Tennessee (*TELL Tennessee*), school-level means at 248 high schools were obtained for each of four five-item scales that were intended to measure each dimension of Green's model. Along with a grand mean computed across all twenty items and denoting a school's overall implementation of the model, school-level indices were also computed for the mean level of satisfaction that the respondents expressed as well as for the percent of respondents who indicated their intention to keep working at the same school the following year.

After merging all of these data with covariates pertinent to student and faculty characteristics, five sets of two hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to determine the effect of model implementation on each outcome. Across all ten regressions, higher scores on Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership proved to be systematically related both to higher percentages of faculty intending to remain at the school and to higher levels of satisfaction with the school as "a good place to work and learn." While demographic variables pertinent to faculty appeared to have no relationship to either of the two outcomes, the percent of minority students at the school evidenced consistently negative associations with them both. Although the school-wide

percent of students on free and reduced lunch was also systematically negatively linked to teacher satisfaction, this was not to the case for teacher retention.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1 Introduction	1
Background of the Study	4
Theoretical Framework	5
Purpose of Study	13
Statement of the Problem	13
Research Questions	13
Significance of the Study	15
Definitions of Terms	15
Limitations of the Study	16
Organization of the Study	16
2 Review of Literature	18
Organizational Impact	26
Job Satisfaction	27
Rapport Among Teachers	31
Low Level Turnover	32
Teacher Migration (Movers) Matters	33
Green's Four-Dimensional Model of Leadership	34
Summary	37
3 Methodology	39
Overall Methodology	41
Instrument Content and History	43
Evidence of the Validity and Reliability of the TELL	45
Focus of the Present Study and Description of Sample	46
Demographic Characteristics of Sample: Individual Level	46
Demographic Characteristics of Sample: Institutional Level	47
Validity and Reliability of the Independent Variable	50
4 Results	54
Descriptive Statistics	56
Outcomes Common to All Five Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses	58
Block One Outcomes: Student Demographic Variables	59
Block Two Outcomes: Faculty Demographic Variables	60
Summary: Block One through Three Outcomes	61
Research Question One	61
Research Question Two	65
Research Question Three	68
Research Question Four	72
Research Question Five	76
Summary	77

5	Discussion, Summary and Conclusions	80
	Discussion of the Findings	83
	Commonalities in Five Demographic Variables across the Research Questions	85
	Impact of Dimension One	87
	Impact of Dimension Two	87
	Impact of Dimension Three	88
	Impact of Dimension Four	89
	Summary	90
	Conclusion	95
	Recommendations for Further Study	97
	References	99

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample at the Individual Level (N=61341)	49
2. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample at the Institutional Level (N=248)	50
3. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Item and Scale by Dimension	52
4. Matrix of Zero-Order Correlations between Control Variables in the Model and Measures of Teacher Retention and Overall Satisfaction (N=248)	57
5. Matrix of Zero-Order Correlations between Leadership Dimension Scores and Other Variables in the Model (N=248)	59
6. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension One Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N=248)	63
7. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension One Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N=248)	64
8. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Two Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N=248)	66
9. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Two Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N=248)	67
10. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Three Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N=248)	70
11. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Three Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N=248)	71
12. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Four Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N=248)	74

13. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Four Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N=248)	75
14. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Overall Implementation Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N=248)	78
15. Hierarchical Regression Summary of Overall Implementation Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N=248)	79

Chapter One

Introduction

For many schools across the nation, as one academic year ends and schools begin planning for the upcoming academic year, it is not curricula or budgets that worry administrators but teacher staffing. Annually, retirement and non-renewals are a given but the challenges of unexpected teacher resignations or transfer requests have human resource departments scrambling to fill positions in a short period of time.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) Policy Brief (2007) estimated that teacher turnover is costing the nation approximately \$7 billion annually. While these are economic costs, there are corresponding educational costs.

Carroll and Fulton (2004) listed the economic costs of teacher turnover as:

- Lost tuition and tax support for preparing new teachers who leave
- Recruiting, advertising, interviewing, hiring, training new teachers
- Lost investment in professional development, improved skills, curriculum knowledge (p. 2)

and the educational costs as:

- Experienced teachers overburdened by needs of inexperienced colleagues
- Loss of community within the school and with parents
- Lost continuity and stability for students (p. 2)

Additionally, impact of teacher turnover has the potential to harm student achievement. "Turnover may affect achievement because the teachers who replace those who left are either more or less effective. Alternatively, even where arriving and leaving teachers are equally effective, turnover may cause a broad disruption that impacts all

students, including students of teachers who did not transition” (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2012).

The national teacher turnover rate has decreased slightly from 16.7% in 2007 to the latest report of 15.8% (Goldring, Taie, & Riddle, 2014). Literature abounds with studies defining the reasons for teacher turnover whether for “leavers,” defined as teachers leaving the profession; or for “movers,” defined as teachers transferring between schools whether within the same district, to neighboring districts or further afield (Flynt & Morton, 2009; Miller, 2011). Multiple sources (Boyd et al., 2009; Carroll & Fulton, 2004; Fuller, Waite, Miller, & Irribarra, 2013; Miller, 2011) list reasons given at separation as low pay, lack of respect, lack of professional support, poor school leadership, and personal. Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017) writing for the Learning Policy Institute report reasons from a 2012-13 survey as: dissatisfaction with testing and accountability pressures; lack of administrative support; dissatisfaction with teaching as a career; and dissatisfaction with working conditions.

The Wing Institute, a non-profit advocacy organization for K-12 education, explains the impact:

Decades of data attest to high rates of teacher turnover. Almost half of new teachers leave the profession within 5 years. For the past 10 years, turnover has leveled off at a disconcerting 16% per year. High turnover impedes student performance and diverts resources away from efforts to improve schools. It places large numbers of inexperienced, less effective teachers in classrooms, resulting in increased recruiting, hiring, and training budgets. With effective retention, the United States could save a meaningful portion of the \$2.2 billion spent annually on replacing teachers. Research shows that increases in teacher turnover consistently correspond with decreases in achievement in core academic subjects. Attrition disproportionately affects schools with the greatest needs, low-achieving and high-poverty schools. Chronic turnover also negatively impacts a school’s culture, increasing student disciplinary problems and principal turnover. It damages collegiality, adding chaos and complexity to schoolwide operations and perpetuating new cycles of turnover. Effective interventions can remediate this

situation, but they require administrators' long-term commitment to improve the learning environment and working conditions (<https://www.winginstitute.org/quality-teachers-retention>).

However, research on why teachers choose to remain in the profession is not as extensive. As districts address teacher turnover, ascertaining the motivational factors of transitioning teachers that relate to job satisfaction and professional decisions may aid in identifying influences that are amenable to increasing retention. This study examines the impact of leadership on the “stayers,” those whose retention placed them in their home or assigned schools for sequential years and their intent to remain at that school. The study is based on the leadership theory and model by Reginald Leon Green and set forth in his book, *The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership: A Framework for leading 21st Century Schools* (2010) and data from the 2013 school climate survey in Tennessee, *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL)*. The TELL instrument has eight climate related constructs: Time, Facilities and Resources, Community Support and Involvement, Managing Student Conduct, Teacher Leadership, School Leadership, Professional Development, and Instructional Practices and Support. Narrowly, data (teacher survey responses) are reviewed from 248 Tennessee secondary level institutions. Teacher demographic data reported are: total number of years of teaching experience, number of years at the school and the grades served by the respondents' school. There are also indicators of the respondents' level of satisfaction with the school as “overall...a good place to work and learn” as well as an index of their “immediate professional intentions.” Student demographic data are: students on free/reduced lunch, minority students and students with disabilities as well as selected secondary level academic measures.

R. L. Green, the model developer, selected five TELL survey items that he deemed reflective of leadership concepts expressed in each of his four leadership dimensions: Understanding Self and Others, Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life, Building Bridges through Relationships, and Engaging in Leadership Best Practices. The twenty items are considered representative of school climate conditions that would define a school as a “good place to work and learn.” Identifying the social and transformative factors (e.g. interactions with colleagues and administrators, organizational culture) that have the greatest influence on job satisfaction as a measure of a school as a “good place to work and learn” is key to understanding teachers’ professional transition decisions.

Background of the Study

R.L. Green merged the tenets of Peter Senge’s Social Systems Theory and Robert Owens’s Open System Theory to introduce his Social Systems Theory in *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards* (2005). Central to his theory is the interdependency of individuals in a school setting. Green (2010) further elaborated, “There is social interaction between and among individuals who work in a school house – an interdependency. When school leaders have a strong understanding of individuals and groups who work in the schoolhouse, they can foster interpersonal relationships and structure the school for effective teaching and learning” (p. 53).

A public school cannot be separated from the population it serves. With effective leadership, a school and its community will gain insight into its structures and relationships, redefine its vision and mission, and reevaluate its policies. With a more

inclusive organizational framework of “collaborative teaming, inclusive standard of excellence, flexibility, decentralization and distributive leadership” (Green, 2010, p. 102), a school leader must be responsive to and guide the school in an open social system where a collaborative spirit between internal and external environments benefits all stakeholders in the school community.

Green’s Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership (2010) focuses on the “behavior of the leaders, their influence on the followers, the structure of the organization and other factors that influence academic achievement of students” (p. 72). In implementing the four dimensions, leaders position themselves “with an integrated approach to collaboratively lead schools” (p. 73).

Theoretical Framework

In the preface of *The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership: A Framework for leading 21st Century Schools* (2010), Green acknowledges the challenges of 21st-century school leadership.

We are in a new era that requires school leaders to know themselves and the individuals with whom they work and serve. They have to understand the complexities of organizational life, build bridges through relationships, and utilize best practices to enhance teaching and learning. Additionally, they must have a vision that is communicated to all stakeholders, be able to build trust with colleagues, and be skilled in distributing leadership roles throughout the organization (p. iii).

The fact that lack of administrative support or poor school leadership is one of the main reasons listed at separation is significant and supports Green’s perspectives on school leadership as a means of retaining quality teachers in the nation’s public schools and building public schools into strong learning organizations.

Green (2010) proposes four dimensions of principal leadership. Green's first dimension, "Understanding Self and Others," explores the critical value of self-exploration and self-evaluation in preparing to lead others. Without an objective review of personal values and beliefs and understanding how those values and beliefs influence behavior, school leaders cannot understand how individuals they work with and serve may interpret their actions. Green (2010) lists four outcomes from an understanding of self: receptivity to feedback as a mechanism of personal and professional growth; inquiry as an exploratory tool for self efficacy; direction as tenacity to achieve an established vision by controlling one's own responses when faced with confounding external forces; and insight as the realization of the uniqueness of the leader as an individual.

Green (2010) titles his second dimension as "Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life." School organizational life is a complex interaction of climate, culture and people. Green (2010) notes that schools function in an open social system "dependent on the flow of information and resources from their external environment, and their activities are subject to laws, policies, and procedures that are often enacted by agencies that exist in their external environment" (p. 69). External and internal forces test leadership. A leader's communication and decision-making skills will determine the effectiveness of the school in moving forward in a changing environment.

It is in this dimension that Green (2010) discusses the school leader's role of establishing and retaining a quality-teaching faculty. Because both "movers" and "leavers" often cite school leader behavior as a reason for separation, the role of the principal is critical to guiding the organization and its stakeholders toward a common goal. In doing so, a principal must know his staff as professionals and as individuals with goals and

aspirations. He must know what professional support to provide to whom in the form of mentoring, professional development, career advancement and/or leadership opportunities. The principal must realize the impact that his/her behavior has on the individual teacher and the collective faculty. A principal must recognize that a quality school cannot operate without a quality faculty and must acknowledge the contributions made by the teachers to the ultimate success of schooling - student learning.

In the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL, formerly known as ISLLC Standards), Standard 6: *Professional Capacity of School Personnel* states, “Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student’s academic success and well-being” (p. 14).

The document further elucidates particular effective actions:

Effective leaders:

- a) Recruit, hire, support, develop, and retain effective and caring teachers and other professional staff and form them into an educationally effective faculty.
- b) Plan for and manage staff turnover and succession, providing opportunities for effective induction and mentoring of new personnel.
- c) Develop teachers’ and staff members’ professional knowledge, skills, and practice through differentiated opportunities for learning and growth, guided by understanding of professional and adult learning and development.
- d) Foster continuous improvement of individual and collective instructional capacity to achieve outcomes envisioned for each student.
- e) Deliver actionable feedback about instruction and other professional practice through valid, research-anchored systems of supervision and evaluation to support the development of teachers’ and staff members’ knowledge, skills, and practice.

- f) Empower and motivate teachers and staff to the highest levels of professional practice and to continuous learning and improvement.
- g) Develop the capacity, opportunities, and support for teacher leadership and leadership from other members of the school community.
- h) Promote the personal and professional health, well-being, and work-life balance of faculty and staff.
- i) Tend to their own learning and effectiveness through reflection, study, and improvement, maintaining a healthy work-life balance (p.14).

Similarly, Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) describes in the its Administrator Evaluation Rubric: “Induction, support, retention, and growth – Collaborates with others to induct, support, retain and grow/extend effective teachers based on evidence of student and teacher outcomes” (TEAM Administrator Evaluation Rubric, Indicator C3, 2013).

On school leadership and professional support, the following are applicable.

Miller (2011) in her dissertation theorizes:

According to Maslow (1954) students’ lower level needs, physiological (food, water, sleep), safety, and love/belonging must be met prior to their being able to learn. Perhaps teachers’ lower level needs must be met as well for them to be effective in the classroom. The teachers may be older, wiser, and hopefully more mature than their students, but they still need care and nurturing. Whatever leaders can do to help ensure that these lower level needs of teachers are met, thus easing the teachers’ mental and emotional loads, should be done. My theory is that this would help in retaining veteran teachers (p.10).

Fuller, Waite, Miller, and Iribarra (2013) find:

At the same time, simply attending to individual rewards may distract policy makers and district leaders from building social cohesion within the entire school organization. Greater progress in reducing turnover may result from building resourceful school leadership, nurturing stronger collaboration and trust, and ensuring that all teachers are pulling in the same direction, mutually confident that

achievement can be lifted. Teachers appear to be more loyal to their school when they are meaningfully engaged with each other, not simply toiling alone inside their classroom (p. 25).

Boyd et al. (2009) state:

In many ways, this is good news from a policy perspective for it is difficult to change the student demographics of a school, as evidenced by school desegregation policies. In contrast, school contextual factors such as administrative support are more policy-amenable. This study suggests that policies aimed at improving school administration may be effective at reducing teacher turnover (p. 15).

PSEL and TEAM standards of leadership combined with the above findings suggests that reducing teacher turnover is possible with effective leadership, collaborative culture, mentoring, and induction programs

Green (2010) in his third dimension, “Building Bridges Through Relationships,” speaks to “how effective leaders remove fear and intimidation from the workplace, free the human spirit to be creative, and build a capacity for self and others to lead (p. 130).

To build positive relationships, school leaders must take the initiative in developing relationships. As in any relationship, trust is a foundational piece for school level relationships (Fullan, 2003; Green, 2010; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Murphy, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

However, trust is a complex idea. Trust is built over time. Trust in a school environment is developed in partnership and involves valuing, respecting, and appreciating individuals in a dynamic process (Green, 2010). Fullan (2003), citing Reina and Reina (1991), cautions, “trust will not evolve through mere invitation, good will, and expectation” (p. 66). Nor is trust building a happenstance, but an orchestrated endeavor (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). Fullan (2003) goes on to reference the work of Reina and

Reina (1991) in their discussion of transactional trust stating that trust is “reciprocal” and “created incrementally” (p. 65).

The collective efficacy of a school is built on trust. Collective efficacy is relational. Collective efficacy drives school effectiveness at all levels. Therefore, trust becomes the operational component that underpins relationships in schools. Like Green (2010), Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) relate trust to social processes in schools that include “communication, collaboration, climate, organizational citizenship, and proliferation of rules” (p. 581).

On trust and communication, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) report organizations characterized by high trust find members “more likely to disclose more accurate, relevant, and complete data about problems” as well as “more willing to share their thoughts, feelings, and ideas” (p. 581). The superior-subordinate positional roles in high trust environments find “subordinates express high levels of confidence in the accuracy of information coming from the superior, a desire for interaction with the superior, and satisfaction with the communication with the superior” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, p. 581).

Green (2010) encourages building communication skills through effective professional development to ensure that an institutionalized system of communication is developed over time “removing the surprise factor” and “establishing rapport” (p. 142-143).

Collaboration built on trust is the antithesis of collaboration that is offered “simply to increase their (teachers) satisfaction, loyalty, and acceptance of decisions” and is seen as “contrived collaboration”(Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, p. 582). Tschannen-

Moran and Hoy (2000) stress trust as the means to “overcoming barriers to collaboration including conflict avoidance, destructive competitiveness, and low levels of teacher efficacy” and to foster joint decision-making by utilizing (and trusting) the knowledge and skills of teachers; thereby, giving teachers voice, “confident that their interests will be well looked after” (p. 582). Green (2010) concurs that the collaborative process gives voice, values the individual within the group setting, and minimizes competition. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) offer that collaborations are “not pressure cookers of guilt and perfectionism, but slow-boiling pots that allow vulnerabilities to be voiced and doubts to be articulated (p. 114).

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) cite several studies as they write: “The climate of the school can be one that cultivates trust or one that makes trust difficult to foster. As the climate of the school becomes more open, trust is reinforced” (p. 582). There is a causal link between supportive leadership exhibited by the principal and teachers’ degree of trust of the principal. In addition, the interpersonal relationships and behaviors among teachers engender collegial trust (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

Organizational citizenship is dependent on leadership behaviors and the leader’s ability to inspire others to go beyond the requirements of the job. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) describe the summative effect of building relational trust and translating that trust into communication and collaboration that informs school climate:

In sum, there is compelling evidence that trust is important in regard to the processes required for the smooth functioning of schools. Trust is related to positive school climate, to productive communication, to participative decision processes, and to organizational willingness to go beyond the minimum requirements of their job description. When trust is absent, organizations may see a profusion of rules as a substitute means of keeping participants in line, which can be counterproductive to the purposes of school. Trust makes a difference in

student achievement, teachers' collective sense of efficacy, and overall school effectiveness. If schools are to function well, they need trust (p. 584).

In his fourth dimension "Engaging in Leadership Best Practices," Green (2010) speaks of "leadership practices for educational renewal" (p. 151). With these few words, Green (2010) merges components of his three earlier described dimensions with the powerful tool of best practices in leadership and how to use them "to implement change, make decisions, communicate with stakeholders and manage conflict" (p. 153). Under these four keystone concepts, Green (2010) establishes Thirteen Core Competencies for leaders seeking to transform schools from one level to another and aligns the competencies with PSEL standards. Under these core competencies, Green (2010) asserts implications for leadership that directly relate to teacher retention.

- Effective school leaders foster a shared vision of student learning.
- Effective 21st-century school leaders develop teacher leaders, lead instruction in professional learning community, and engage parents and members of the community in the educational process.
- Effective school leaders foster a program of professional development for self and others.
- Distributive leadership is becoming a standard of practice, as 21st-century school leadership is so challenging that no one individual single-handedly can meet the challenge.
- School leaders tend to be most effective when they afford individuals throughout the organization the flexibility to participate in problem solving that leads to organizational goal attainment (p. 171).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of their schools' implementation of Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, their level of satisfaction with their schools as "a good place to work and learn" and their intent to remain professionally employed in their schools.

Data from the 2013 state-wide administration of the *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning* survey in Tennessee (*TELL* Tennessee) has not been analyzed for teachers' perceptions as "a good place to work and learn" and their intent to remain professionally employed in their schools as it relates to a model of leadership. Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership is the context for interpreting selected responses from the 2013 *TELL* Tennessee survey.

Statement of the Problem

According to Goldring, Taie, and Riddle (2014), the national teacher turnover rate is 15.8%. Teacher turnover (mobility and attrition) creates economic and educational costs for school districts. Literature indicates that principal leadership is elemental in teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention. There is little information that identifies the behaviors and characteristics of principal leadership that contribute to job satisfaction and retention.

Research Questions

Represented by responses to twenty items selected from the 2013 state-wide administration of the *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning* survey in Tennessee (*TELL* Tennessee), the dimensions under consideration are specified in the five research questions following:

- 1) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding Self and Others"—the first dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*
- 2) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life"—the second dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*
- 3) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Building Bridges through Relationships"—the third dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*
- 4) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Engaging in Leadership Best Practices"—the fourth dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the mean level of*

satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?

- 5) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of their schools' overall implementation of Green's model of educational leadership, the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*

Significance of the Study

While teacher turnover, whether leaving the profession or moving to another location, is often discussed and analyzed, the majority of teachers remain in their assigned schools, the “stayers.” Investigating the variables related to turnover in light of the attitude of “stayers” may inform leader preparation programs and school leaders themselves in stabilizing school environments to better serve students.

Definition of Terms

1. *Teacher*: A school-based individual who holds a valid Tennessee teaching license and is employed full-time in a public school.
2. *Teacher Turnover*: Major changes in a teacher's employment status from one school year to the next.
3. *Teacher Mobility*: Term used to describe teachers who leave one teaching assignment for another teaching assignment.
4. *Teacher Attrition*: Term used to describe teachers who leave the teaching profession for other employment.
5. *Stayer*: A teacher who remains in a school and/or in teaching.

6. *Leaver*: A teacher who leaves the profession.
7. *Mover*: A teacher who moves to another school or district.
8. *Teacher Job Satisfaction*: “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (Locke, 1968, p. 10).
9. *Professional intention*: A professional decision to remain in a school/district, transfer to another school/district or leave the teaching profession.
10. *Working conditions*: “The physical features of the work place, the organizational structure, and the sociological, political, psychological and educational features of the work environment” (Ladd, 2009, p. 6).

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to the State of Tennessee and secondary teachers who responded to the 2013 TELL Tennessee Survey. The data analyses are based on teachers’ responses to 20 survey questions. Because the TELL Tennessee Survey relies on teachers’ perceptions, the actually working conditions are not known. Perceptual data is limited by emotional states (including reaction to policy changes such as NCLB and RTTT) at a particular point in time.

Organization of the Study

This study contains five chapters. The first chapter includes an introduction to the study, background of the study, theoretical framework, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, definition of terms, and organization of the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of literature associated with professional intentions to remain in or to transition from a current teaching assignment and the

organizational impact of leadership on attrition and mobility. Chapter 3 specifies the procedures and methods used to collect, to analyze and to report the data. Chapter 4 informs the results and provides an analysis of the data. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations for further study.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Politicians and the press have cast America's public schools and the teachers and administrators who staff public schools in disparaging light. Berliner and Glass (2014) write:

Teachers have become the punching bag for all sorts of problems faced by our nation, but these are problems that teachers cannot influence. It is illogical to lay so much blame for so many of the ills of society on a profession with so little power to affect much more than the lives of 30 or so students in a class. Our 3.3 million public school teachers show remarkably high rates of educating our youth humanely and competently, even though hampered in doing that by government policies such as No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top and other actions that have curtailed both their humanity and their competency (p. 50).

Bracey (2002) offered similar comments, "...each time the United States faces a social crisis of some kind, the schools get blamed" (p. 44). He continues: "Currently, there is an attempt to create malaise by arguing that schools are not, somehow, equipping students to cope with the unspecified "future." The future is always available for scare tactics because no one knows what the future will look like" (p. 45-46).

On February 20, 1961 in a Special Message to the Congress on Education, President John F Kennedy stated:

Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.... The human mind is our fundamental resource.

Fifty years later, in their book title, Friedman and Mandelbaum (2011) cried *That Used To Be Us*.

Multiple initiatives or reform movements have resulted from this perceived failure of public school education and public school teachers. Michael Fullan (2003), Mike

Schmoker (2011) and Thomas Friedman and Michael Mandelbaum (2011), in separate works, address the role of quality public education for all students as a non-negotiable if the United States' role is to remain as a world leader and a purveyor of the American Dream.

You don't have to go very far into the question of the role of public education in a democracy before discovering the moral purpose is the heart of the matter. The best case for public education has always been that it is for a common good. Everyone, ultimately, has a stake in the caliber of schools, and education is everyone's business. The quality of the public education system relates directly to the quality of life that people enjoy (whether as parents, employers, or citizens), with a strong public education system as the cornerstone of a civil, prosperous, and democratic society (Fullan, p. 3).

...there is absolutely no reason that a K-12 education cannot provide virtually all students with what they need to be active, informed citizens, effective workers....education would be attainable for all (Schmoker, p. 27).

...raising math, science, reading, and creativity levels in American schools is the key determinant of economic growth, and economic growth is the key to national power and influence as well as individual well-being (Friedman & Mandelbaum, p. 108).

If the goal of a quality public education is student achievement for all students regardless of demographic or economic determinants, it is critical to understand the relationship between school leaders, teacher retention and job satisfaction. Education reform movements fail to incentivize a strong cadre of school leaders. School leaders are second only to teachers in increasing student achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Waldstrom, 2004). School leadership is oft cited as a primary factor in teacher retention, "principal leadership, an orderly schooling environment, greater classroom autonomy, and increased professional development predict lower teacher turnover after controlling for student and teacher demographics" (Boyd et al., 2011).

Over the last three decades, there have been critical findings and offered remedies for the reported failures of public education: Teach for America (TFA), No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and Race to the Top (RTTT). In addition, the current political climate may have profound impact on educational policies and funding.

From a 1989 senior thesis to a multimillion-dollar non-profit, Wendy Koop's *Teach for America* offers recent high-performing college graduates the opportunity to "teach" for two years in high poverty urban or rural schools. The organization's web page touts TFA's inception as a solution to a century of poor academic outcomes for low-income children, a national teacher shortage and a demand for a more competitive workforce with skills for an emerging global economy (www.teachforamerica.org).

TFA recruits participate in an intensive five-week training prior to entering a classroom. TFA provides ongoing support and professional development during the two-year commitment period (Clark, Isenberg, Liu, Makowsky, & Zukiewicz, 2017). Clark, Isenberg, Liu, Makowsky, and Zukiewicz (2017) cite two experimental studies on the effectiveness of TFA teachers. The first study by Decker et al. (2004) involved students in grades 1-5. Students with TFA teachers achieved as well as students with non-TFA teachers in reading and significantly better in math by 0.15 standard deviations. In the second study with middle and high school math teachers, Clark et al. (2013) found that students of TFA teachers outperformed students of non-TFA teachers by 0.07 standard deviations.

In an experimental design, Clark et al. (2017) studied lower elementary grades comparing effectiveness of TFA and non-TFA teachers (traditional and alternative certifications) in pre-K through Grade 2. They found that TFA teachers "had a positive,

statistically significant effect on student reading achievement of 0.12 standard deviations, or about 1.3 months of learning for the average student in these grades nationwide” (p. xviii). Similarly, TFA teachers in grades 1 and 2 “had a positive effect on student math achievement of 0.16 standard deviations, or 1.5 additional months of learning” (p. xviii). What Works Clearinghouse (2016, August) reviewed seven studies of TFA impact on student achievement and found TFA teachers have positive impact on math achievement, potential impact on science achievement and no significant impact on social studies or English language arts achievement for students in pre-K- 12.

TFA has its champions and its detractors. Both experimental and non-experimental studies have yielded mixed results (Clark et al., 2017). Looking at non-achievement data, Clark et al. (2017) found that TFA teachers provided less favorable ratings for job satisfaction including much lower ratings on principal’s leadership and vision (27.1%) than the comparison non-TFA group (72.4%). The second finding is on teacher retention. When responding to *Do not plan to spend rest of career as a classroom teacher*, 87.5% of TFA teachers indicated they did not plan to do so compared with 26.3% of the non-TFA teachers (Clark et al., 2017). Gottfried and Straubhaar (2015) reported similar results from their qualitative study of 30 TFA teachers stating only a minority in the group entered the classroom with any intention of a career as a classroom teacher.

The designed two-year tenure of TFA participants and their low ratings for job satisfaction is supported by the low retention of TFA members beyond the commitment period. Reported low ratings on principal leadership and vision are either the results of their experiences in assigned schools which are often high-poverty, high minority urban

or rural; or the alternative licensing pathway that lacks the components of traditional educational pathways in understanding pedagogy.

In 2001, Congress passed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. Its goal was to make education accessible and accountable for disadvantaged students; students in poverty, minorities, students with disabilities and English Language Learners. As part of the act, NCLB said that all teachers had to be “highly qualified” in the subject they taught. Under NCLB, “highly qualified” status was based on teaching credentials, namely, a bachelor’s degree, fully licensed by the state in the content and demonstrated competence in the content. Tucker and Stronge (2005) in their book, *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning* distinguish between highly qualified and highly effective:

While licensure or certification is a significant indicator of teacher quality, these factors alone are insufficient for teacher effectiveness. As discussed earlier, teacher effectiveness is characterized by a far more complex set of qualities than one's professional preparation. It includes dispositions and an array of planning, organizational, instructional, and assessment skills. Effective teachers are able to envision instructional goals for their students, then draw upon their knowledge and training to help students achieve success. A “highly qualified” teacher is certainly a good starting point, but most of us would want our child to have a highly effective teacher whose teaching effort yields high rates of student learning.

In 2009, the Center for Public Education published the following findings in

“Does highly qualified mean highly effective?”

- There is mixed evidence whether the factors commonly associated with teacher quality actually indicate whether teachers are effective in the classroom. In particular, taken alone, each of the criteria for “highly qualified teacher” status under NCLB is only weakly associated with effectiveness. Research has shown that teachers without these qualities are ineffective. But there is little evidence that meeting HQT standards alone means that teachers are likely to be “highly effective,” producing the gains needed to narrow gaps.
- No single teacher characteristic stands out as a must-have quality for effective teaching. However, some characteristics are more closely related to student achievement than others. For this reason, districts and schools should look at multiple criteria when hiring and assigning teachers.

- There are clear differences between schools based on the percentage of teachers who possess the characteristics associated with effectiveness. Schools with high enrollments of low-income and/or minority youth tend to have fewer effective teachers than others. This suggests that more needs to be done to reduce inequities in the distribution of effective teachers.

NCLB offered that teacher credentialing through “highly qualified” status would increase teacher effectiveness, thereby increasing student achievement. The strong measure of NCLB was the emphasis on all students. While no one argues against the necessity of quality teacher preparation and licensing, there was little indication that “highly qualified” equated “highly effective.” Creating a culture of high expectations and a climate centered on a vision of personal successes for students and teachers with strong organizational leadership were missing in the legislation simply because such critical factors cannot be legislated.

In 2011, Race to the Top (RTTT), an Obama era competitive education grant initiative, funding was awarded on reforms that centered on four specific goals, one of which was “recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed the most.” (U.S. Department of Education, www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html). Tennessee was one of two states to receive funding in the first round of awards. In the final Executive Summary (November, 2015) titled *Fundamental Change: Innovation in America’s schools under Race to the Top*, the U.S Department of Education published highlights from RTTT implementation. Among these were Tennessee’s development and implementation of principal and teacher evaluation models. Later research would investigate the impact of RTTT and performance-based teacher evaluation on teacher job satisfaction. Ingersoll (2001) linked teacher job satisfaction with the likelihood of changing schools or

professions. Using the Tennessee model to examine how rigorous value-added measures impacted job satisfaction among teachers, Koedel, Li, Springer, and Tan (2017) looked for causal relationships between performance ratings and job satisfaction. They report, “teachers who receive higher (lower) ratings indicate that they are more (less) satisfied in teaching than otherwise similar teachers who receive lower (higher) ratings (p. 269).

RTTT provided states financial incentives to improve teacher effectiveness through evaluation. In Tennessee, one of the original grantees, the value-added system had been in place prior to the grant award but with little impact on a teacher’s annual status. Following RTTT, the evaluation system impacted hiring, retention and tenure. Additionally, the Tennessee Department of Education Administrator Evaluation Model introduced an evaluation system for principals to “help instructional leaders develop the type of leadership practices directly related to substantial gains in student achievement” (p. 2). Critical to the Administrator’s Rubric is inducting, supporting, retaining and growing educators and fostering a culture of teaching and learning to enhance job satisfaction.

Teach for America, No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top each addressed in some manner the front line teacher and placed them in the line of fire. The uncertainty of the Trump administration’s education policy does little to illuminate the road ahead for teachers. Kelly Manus, interim director of legislative affairs at the Education Trust, is quoted in an April 26, 2017 NY Times article, “The good states need the cover of the federal government, and the bad actors need to be pushed by the federal government” (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/26/us/politics/trump-education-policy-review.html>)

Local school district will continue to bemoan and to ameliorate teacher turnover in staffing schools.

These three chapters in public education contribute to the continued discussion of teacher attrition and teacher mobility. The lens of scrutiny seems to be on individual teacher characteristics: teacher flight from high poverty high minority schools (TFA), teacher quality as measured by credentialing (NCLB), or teacher performance as measured by value-added components of evaluation systems (RTTT). However, organizational structure of America's public schools should bear similar scrutiny. Consideration of the role of the school leader and the working conditions that contribute to job satisfaction as elements of organizational structure is critical to identifying factors that influence teacher retention.

In 2001, Richard Ingersoll published *Teacher Turnover and Teacher Shortage: An Organizational Analysis*. He offers that much of the existing research had centered on what kind of teachers were likely to "turnover" and why. He further notes that most previous research was based on individual teacher characteristics. Ingersoll elaborates "there are also significant effects of school characteristics and organizational conditions on turnover" including "other factors, such as teacher job dissatisfaction" as well as "inadequate support from school administration,...and limited faculty input into school decision-making (p. 501).

Ingersoll (2001) offers five salient points from his research. First, research has focused on turnover as an individual teacher characteristic, not from an organizational viewpoint. Second, teacher job dissatisfaction has been often overlooked as a factor in teacher turnover. Third, a sense of community and cohesion among teachers is important.

Fourth, low level teacher turnover is normal and may have positive effects. Fifth, teacher migration (moving from school or district) may be as important to individual schools/districts as teacher attrition (leaving the profession).

Ingersoll's seminal publication in 2001 has served as a precursor to major studies that would elucidate many of his findings on teacher turnover, job satisfaction and teacher retention. Central to Ingersoll's findings and the findings of others are the roles of the organizational contexts including influences of leadership and collegiality as components of job satisfaction and ultimately, teachers' decision on remaining in a given school.

Organizational Impact

An organization is more than an organizational chart of hierarchical arrangements and levels of responsibility and reporting. An organization speaks of vision and mission, of a culture and a climate, of individuals and of teaming, and of a work environment. Critical to any organization is leadership. In public education, leadership with the greatest impact on teachers is the school principal (Boyd et al., 2011; Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2012; Grissom, Viano, & Selin, 2015; Kraft, Marinell, & Yee, 2016).

Kraft, Marinell, and Yee (2016) studied school organizational contexts, teacher turnover and student achievement. Four broad contexts are described: leadership, expectations, relationships, and safety. Using survey data, they found that all four factors were associated with reducing teacher turnover. The four dimensions are explained by these variances: Leadership (including attributes of principals' leadership and quality of professional development), 21%; Academic expectations for students, 18%; Relationships (primarily teacher relationships and collaboration), 14%; and, Safety

(student behavior and level of school safety), 11%. As the variables related to teacher turnover, the authors found that the four school organizational context measures showed that “schools with higher quality contexts experience lower turnover” (p.1428).

Job Satisfaction

Teaching is a job for which individuals are paid. Therefore, satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with teaching is job-related. The most often used definition of job satisfaction is that of Edwin Locke (Saari & Judge, 2004). Locke (1968) defines job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

Job satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values. Job dissatisfaction is the unpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one’s job values or as entailing disvalue. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceives it is offering or entailing (p.10).

In Ingersoll’s 2001 study, four reasons recorded for “movers” across all schools were, in rank order, school staffing action, personal, job dissatisfaction, and to pursue other jobs. For “leavers,” the four top reasons were personal, retirement, job dissatisfaction, and to pursue other jobs. The 14 reasons for job dissatisfaction were identified. The top two reasons were poor salary and inadequate administrative support for “movers” and poor salary and lack of student motivation for “leavers.” Other factors can be grouped as workload and policy (class size, inadequate preparation time, intrusions on teaching time) and lack of collegial relationships (perceived incompetence of peers, lack of faculty influence) (Table 5).

Subsequent to Ingersoll’s 2001 study, other studies have examined student demographics and working conditions as they relate to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction

and teacher turnover. Allensworth, Poinciak, and Mazzeo (2004) writing for the Consortium on Chicago School Research found that schools serving low-income, minority students turn over half of their staff every three years. However, Horng (2009) counters, “Schools with less favorable working conditions have greater difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers and consequently have higher rates of turnover” (p. 690). Horng (2009) sought to “disentangle” working conditions and student demographics noting in her study of a California elementary school district, “By avoiding unattractive working conditions, teachers may inadvertently – rather than purposefully – be avoiding low-income students, low-performing students, and students of color” (p. 693). Her findings support “working conditions, not student body characteristics, are more powerful determinants of where teachers choose to work” (p. 708).

Using a 2008 working condition survey given to all Massachusetts teachers, Johnson, Kraft, and Papay (2011) discuss how research into school working conditions has led to new understandings and may be more predictive of teacher turnover.

Concerned with the turnover in schools with high percentages of low-income and minority students, Johnson et al. (2011) identify nine key work condition elements: colleagues, community support, facilities, governance, principal, professional expertise, resources, school culture, and time. Johnson et al. (2011) voice their findings:

We find that the measures of school environment explain away much of the apparent relationship between teacher satisfaction and student demographic characteristics. The conditions in which teachers work matter a great deal to them and, ultimately, to their students. Teachers are more satisfied and plan to stay longer in schools that have a positive work context, independent of the school’s student demographics. Furthermore, although a wide range of working conditions matter to teachers, the specific elements of the work environment that matter most to teachers are not narrowly conceived working conditions such as clean and well-maintained facilities or access to modern technology. Instead, it is the social conditions – the school’s culture, the principal’s leadership and relationship

among colleagues – that predominate in predicting teachers’ job satisfaction and career plans (Abstract).

Perrachione, Rosser, and Petersen (2008) describe teacher job satisfaction in terms outcomes and influences. Outcomes include retention, attrition, and absenteeism and influences are demographic variables, job-related characteristics and work experiences. Retention is positively associated with job satisfaction while absenteeism and attrition are increasingly predictive of job dissatisfaction (Perrachione, Rosser, & Petersen, 2008). In their research of randomly selected Missouri public school elementary teachers, Perrachione et al. (2008) identified that both intrinsic and extrinsic variables were indicative of job satisfaction while only extrinsic factors were indicative of job dissatisfaction. Employing a qualitative study with open-ended questions, intrinsic motivators for job satisfaction included working with students, job satisfaction, and personal teaching efficacy. Extrinsic motivators of job satisfaction were good students, teacher support, positive school environment, and small class size. Extrinsic influencers of job dissatisfaction included role overload, low salary, parent support, student behavior, large class size (Perrachione et al., 2008).

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2015) look at job satisfaction and professional intention. In a qualitative study, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2015) found that job satisfaction resulted from the intrinsic values associated with teaching: “working with children, the actual process of teaching, and seeing their students learn and develop” (p. 188). Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2015) note that the diversity in student learning abilities often lead to stress because of the time required to plan differentiation and feelings of incompetence in meeting all levels of need.

Saari and Judge (2004) suggested that there is a strong predictive correlation between job satisfaction and job performance for complex professional jobs. Further, they found dissatisfied employees more likely to quit or to be absent from work.

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2015) note that a high workload was a stressor leading to absenteeism and career choice decisions. Froese-Germain (2014) writing for the Canadian Teachers' Federation cites multiple studies (many by teacher unions) stating, "teacher working conditions are student learning conditions" (p. 8). Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2015) and Froese-Germain (2014) posit that it is not only workload but work intensification with high-stakes testing and accountability models that create stress and may impact teacher recruitment and retention.

In a large urban school district, Green and Munoz (2016) examined job satisfaction predictors for new teachers, a group most likely to experience turnover. These predictors included teacher personal characteristics, general job facets (salary, benefits) and teacher specific job facets. "The findings indicate that overall job satisfaction correlates significantly with preparedness, school leadership, independence, time, and benefits" (p. 116).

Boyd et al. (2009) looked at school contextual factors surveying "leavers" and first year teachers. Their work points to the impact of working conditions and administrative support in teachers' decisions to stay or leave. By far, the greatest influence on career decisions points to administrative support. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) cited statistics that report 75% of teachers who demonstrated ongoing commitment credited good leadership with sustaining the commitment. A majority of the remaining 25% who exhibited declining commitment indicated that poor leadership as a

key-contributing factor.

Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) talk of the five Cs of *professional capital*. The five Cs are capability, commitment, career, culture and contexts or conditions of teaching.

Capabilities are “skills and qualities that lead to accomplishment” (p. 55).

Commitment is an emotional state as well as a moral value. It is purpose plus drive and direction. It has consistent effects on perceived and actual effectiveness in relation to student achievement. For most teachers, commitment is not just a personal virtue but something that is profoundly affected by what happens at work and what happens in their life (p. 61).

If two to three components (personal life, professional life and school) are positive, commitment is likely to be strong. If all three are weak, then commitment declines. “Three strikes and you’re out” (p. 61). Teachers may survive one weak component with sufficient support.

Rapport Among Teachers

Johnson, Berg, and Donaldson (2005) state “that teachers are influenced by the quality of their work with fellow teachers and administrators” and teacher retention increases “when schools are organized for productive collegial work...”(p. 67). Fuller et al. (2013) offer that “...the social cohesion of the school organization, including shared perceptions of resourceful school leaders, along with the trust and commitment to lifting achievement held in common by teachers within a school, perhaps contributing to the likelihood of remaining in or exiting from one’s school” (p. 2). Simon and Johnson (2013) offered “the caliber of collegial relationships” along with “the quality of school leadership” and “specific aspects of school culture” as influencers of teachers’ satisfaction and career decisions (p. 21). They support their findings with research that suggest that “three factors support teachers’ work with their colleagues: an inclusive

environment characterized by respect and trust among colleagues, formal structures that promote collaboration, and the presence of a shared mission among teachers” (p. 27).

Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) find that teachers with sustained commitment feel excellent colleagues are critical. Conversely, Ingersoll (2001) lists one reason for job dissatisfaction is perceived lack of professional competence of colleagues.

Low Level Turnover

...that a low level employee turnover is normal and efficacious in a well-managed organization. Too little turnover of employees is tied to stagnancy in organizations; effective organizations usually both promote and benefit from a limited degree of turnover by eliminating low-caliber performers and bringing in "new blood" to facilitate innovation (Ingersoll, 2001, p. 504).

Ronfeldt, Loeb, and Wyckoff (2012) concur writing “some amount of turnover may in fact be beneficial to institutions and individuals” (p. 1). They too see benefits in better job matches and new ideas. In fact, if a less effective individual leaves, benefits may be enhanced. In the monograph *The Irreplaceables*, published by TNTP (formerly *The New Teacher Project*), the writers cautioned that retaining ineffective teachers just to increase the retention rate defied common sense. TNTP research showed that schools have a “three in four chance of replacing a low-performing teacher with a new hire who will be more effective right away...” (p.8). Hanushek and Rivkin (2010) add “Quite generally, turnover per se is thought to be bad, and exiting teachers are thought to be more productive. These concerns stand in stark contrast to much of labor search theory, where early career turnover provides a mechanism for improving job matches that benefit both workers and firms” (p.1). Saari and Judge (2004) stress that concept of matching right employee with the most appropriate job that hopefully increases job satisfaction. In Jim Collins (2001) words “get the right people on the bus, the right people in the right

seat, and the wrong people off the bus, then we'll figure out how to take it someplace great" (p. 41).

Teacher Migration (Movers) Matters

At local levels, the distinction between movers and leavers is moot. Each teacher moving or leaving creates a vacancy that must be filled. Both conditions have educational and economic effects on the school/district. Recognizing opportunities and constraints as seen through the lens of the mover/leaver might conversely aid in identifying factors related to job satisfaction and professional intentions.

Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) find that teacher career level (beginning, middle or ending) and commitment level can be staged and may be an influential mixture of life/career/generational values. Each stage or phase has commitment and capability characteristics. Phase 1 (0-7 years) is commitment building, requiring support and facing challenges but progressing to identity and efficacy in the classroom. Phase 2 (8-23 years) is managing changes often with growing tensions and work-life transitions creating challenges to motivation and commitment. Characterized by declining motivation and lagging commitment, Phase 3 encompasses 24-31+ years (Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012).

Johnson et al. (2005) note "...novice teachers' decisions to remain in the profession are tied to their sense of classroom efficacy. ...the feeling that they are teaching students well – strongly affected their decisions to change school or to exit the profession altogether" (p. 87). Perrachione et al. (2008) found in their study that teachers with greater than five years of experience listed personal teaching efficacy as the number one reason they remained in teaching.

Green's Four-Dimensional Model of Leadership

Three recurrent influencers of teacher retention stand out in the literature: organizational complexity, the concept of job satisfaction and rapport among teachers. Inextricably interwoven with these themes is principal leadership. Does Green's Four-Dimensional Model of Leadership (2010) support the inter-relatedness of these three components? Is Green's model a sustainable model of leadership that can positively influence teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention?

Reporting for The Wallace Foundation, Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) state:

Different forms of leadership are described in the literature using adjectives such as "instructional," "participative," "democratic," "transformational," "moral," "strategic" and the like. But these labels primarily capture different stylistic or methodological approaches to accomplishing the same two essential objectives critical to any organization's effectiveness: helping the organization set a defensible set of directions and influencing members to move in those directions. Leadership is both this simple and this complex.

Green (2013) makes a similar statement:

The school is an organizational system in which people function to achieve established goals. The school has a culture, a climate, and a structure. The effective leader manages these elements in ways that allow the organization to achieve its goals while the needs of the employees are being met. However, in schools, there are many factors that influence the manner in which individuals and groups behave and the extent to which they are willing to achieve established goals. Among these factors are leader behavior; environmental influences; and the beliefs, values, and needs of individuals and groups (p. 127).

Green (2010) presents an organizational model of leadership as a tripartite relationship leading to a leader's behavior: the organizational environment encompassing culture, climate and nurturing; individual and group behavior defined by motivation, relationships and collaboration; and management exercised through leadership strategies, skills, and techniques.

In his first dimension, *Understanding Self and Others*, Green (2010) lists outcomes for leaders to understand self and others. For understanding self, “the result is an increased capacity to lead with the ability to monitor and adjust their leadership behavior as warranted by various situations. Self-understanding is tantamount to leader effectiveness...” (p. 44). The benefits for understanding others are: “(1) an opportunity for school leaders to fulfill the psychological contract of followers; (2) an opportunity for school leaders to utilize follower creativity, and (3) an opportunity for school leaders to acquire follower commitment to goal attainment” (p. 55). In their research findings, Thibodeaux, Labat, Lee, and Labat (2015) found that “principal leadership plays a critical role in the retention of teachers, and it suggests that administrators should be aware of how their leadership style and behaviors impact the teachers they lead” (p. 246). Boyd et al (2011) note in their literature review that there exists a “positive correlation between school leadership (specifically, school administrators knowing staff members’ problems) and teacher autonomy (specifically, teachers influence over school policy)” (p. 309) and is related to teacher retention.

Green’s (2010) second and third dimensions, *Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life*, and *Building Bridges through Relationships* are difficult to separate. These dimensions bring together culture, climate, structure and the interaction of people (including principal-teacher and teacher-teacher). Any of these four facets alone is daunting but the interplay of the four poses enormous challenges for principals. Green (2010) quotes Senge, “Learning organizations are places where people continually expand their capacity to create results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people

are continually learning to learn together” (p. 65).

Ingersoll (2001) introduced teacher turnover from an organizational perspective maintaining that “teacher turnover and, in turn, school staffing cannot be fully understood without closely examining the characteristics of the organization that employ teachers” and stressed the need to “address the organizational sources of low retention” (p. 501). In their study, Johnson et al. (2011) stated, “We found that schools with strong principal leadership, collegial relationships and school culture were schools where teachers were more satisfied and students experienced greater academic growth” (p. 35). Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017) in their literature review found that “school leadership, collegial relationships, and school culture of particular importance to teacher retention” continuing with “school leaders have an effect on most aspects of school operations” (p. 29). Their conclusion was “that more effective principals are associated with higher rates of teacher satisfaction and lower teacher turnover, especially in high-needs schools” (p. 29). Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017) define administrative support as “an administrator’s ability to encourage and acknowledge staff, to communicate a clear vision, and generally run a school well” (p. 29).

Simon and Johnson (2013) address respect and trust and collaboration and support as essentials in their research in high-poverty schools. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) cite several studies as they write: “The climate of the school can be one that cultivates trust or one that makes trust difficult to foster. As the climate of the school becomes more open, trust is reinforced” (p. 582). There is a causal link between supportive leadership exhibited by the principal and teachers’ degree of trust of the principal. In addition, the

interpersonal relationships and behaviors among teachers engender collegial trust (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

In addressing *Engaging in Leadership Best Practices*, Green (2010) emphasizes leading and directing as opposed to responding and reacting. This is an investigative role for a school leader as the school leader researches the effectiveness of best practices. To initiate a best practice, the leader must facilitate a shared vision, decide how to implement change, communicate expectations, and manage conflict. Simon and Johnson (2013) designate the principal as a general manager, an instructional leader, and an inclusive decision-maker. Effective principals must function in all three roles. Boyd et al. (2011) draw from multiple research studies and state “principals’ effect on school operations through motivating teachers and students, identifying and articulating vision and goals, developing high expectations, fostering communication, allocating resources, and developing organizational structures to support instruction” (p. 328).

Summary

Multiple research studies, working papers, and journal articles on job satisfaction and teacher retention and its reciprocal, teacher turnover, cite confounding factors associated with working conditions – lack of school leadership, lack of respect, lack of professional support, and lack of collegiality – as predictors of teacher attrition and teacher mobility (Boyd et al., 2009; Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2012; Eliophotou-Menon & Ioannou, 2016; Carroll & Fulton, 2004; Green & Munoz, 2016; Thibodeaux, Labat, Lee, & Labat, 2015; Horng, 2009; Johnson, Kraft, & Papay, 2011; Kukla-Avevedo, 2009; Miller, 2013; Simon & Johnson, 2013; Slaalvik & Slaalvik, 2017). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) found in 2011-2012, about 95 percent of public

school teachers who agreed that the administration in their schools was supportive were satisfied with their jobs. This perception of administrative support is one of the social working conditions most often cited in literature as a determinant of teacher retention (Boyd et al., 2009; Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2012; Eliophotou-Menon & Ioannou, 2016; Carroll & Fulton, 2004; Green & Munoz, 2016; Thibodeaux et al., 2015; Horng, 2009; Johnson et al., 2011; Kukla-Avevedo, 2009; Miller, 2013; Simon & Johnson, 2013; Slaalvik & Slaalvik, 2017). Green (2010) advocates for his four dimensions of principal leadership as an approach to building a strong organizational structure that promotes job satisfaction and, subsequently, teacher retention.

Recent research finds that a correlation between student demographics (often seen as a driver of teacher turnover) and teacher turnover can be explained largely by less than adequate working conditions that are often found in schools with high poverty and high minority populations, not the students' demographics (Grissom et al., 2015; Horng, 2009; Johnson et al., 2011). Simon and Johnson (2013) summarizes their study, "...when teacher turnover is analyzed from an organizational perspective, the poor working conditions common among America's neediest schools explains away most, if not all, of the relationship between student characteristics and teacher attrition. This is important because, unlike demographic characteristics of students, working conditions can be changed" (p. 40).

Chapter Three

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of their schools' implementation of Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, their level of satisfaction with their schools as "a good place to work and learn" and their intent to remain professionally employed there. Represented by responses to twenty items selected from the 2013 state-wide administration of the *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning* survey in Tennessee (TELL Tennessee), the dimensions under consideration are specified in the five research questions following:

- 6) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding Self and Others"—the first dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*
- 7) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life"—the second dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*
- 8) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has*

implemented practices related to “Building Bridges through Relationships”—the third dimension of Green’s model of educational leadership—the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?

9) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers’ perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to “Engaging in Leadership Best Practices” —the fourth dimension of Green’s model of educational leadership—the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*

10) *Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers’ perceptions of their schools’ overall implementation of Green’s model of educational leadership, the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school, and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there?*

The present chapter continues with an explanation of the general methodology employed in this study—specifically, secondary analysis of an existing set of survey data. Immediately following is a description of the *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Questionnaire* from which these survey data were derived and a discussion of that instrument’s psychometric properties. In the next section, an outline is provided of the conditions under which the secondary data specific to this study were collected, supplemented by tables that statistically describe the set of Tennessee teachers whose responses constitute the present dataset. Inclusive of a discussion of the source and

meaning of the control, independent, and dependent variables employed in this study, the final section of the chapter provides a statement of the analytic strategies to be employed in answering the research questions previously stated.

Overall Methodology

According to Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998), research is usually categorized in terms of its general methodology, as qualitative, quantitative, experimental, or non-experimental. When employing a quantitative approach, questionnaires, tests, records, standardized observation instruments, and existing databases can serve as appropriate sources for data (Patton, 1997). Common to the quantitative approach is the utilization of data from human samples and the placing of that the data in predetermined categories for statistical analysis, the intended result being an unbiased and objective interpretation of data (Creswell, 2008).

Drawing upon existing data sources, the researcher approached the five research questions posed by this study quantitatively and non-experimentally, working in a mode of inquiry commonly referred to as “analysis of secondary data” or more simply “secondary analysis.”

According to Hakim (1982), secondary data analysis may be defined as “further analysis of an existing data-set which presents interpretations, conclusions, or knowledge additional to, or different from, those presented in the first report on the data collection and its results” (p. 1). On this definition, specific uses to which such analyses may be put include:

- Condensed reports (such as social area analysis based on selected social indicators)

- More detailed reports (offering additional detail on the same topic)
- Reports which focus on a particular sub-topic (such as unemployment) or social group (such as ethnic minority)
- Reports angled towards a particular policy issue or question
- Analyses based on a conceptual framework or theory not applied to the original analysis
- Re-analyses which take advantage of more sophisticated analytical techniques to test hypotheses and answer questions in a more comprehensive and succinct manner than in the original report. (Hakim, 1982, p. 1)

Given the uses Hakim outlined, the present study would appear to lend itself to secondary analysis in at least three respects. First, as a way to organize the original observations, it employs Green's four-dimensional model of leadership, "a conceptual framework or theory not applied to the original analysis" (Hakim, 1982, p.1). As is, the *TELL* is simply a loosely-coupled inventory of constructs aimed at measuring climate; use of the system of ideas that the Green's model represents brings to bear several streams of research into what factors are critical for making schools more effective. Second, in merging the perceptual data derived from the *TELL* instrument with other data sources—specifically those dealing with school demographics and student outcomes—the study enables additional insight into how attention to very specific aspects of the school's climate might make for more a satisfied, stable, and productive school community. Finally, going beyond a simple description of questionnaire outcomes in terms of frequencies and percentages, as exemplified by the myriad *TELL* reports that have been published online, the present study applies somewhat "more sophisticated

analytical techniques to . . . answer questions” (Hakim, p. 1) that were either not fully addressed or were unaddressed previously.

Instrument Context and History

A review of the literature indicates that a wide variety of measures of the school environment—whether conceived of under the aegis of “school climate,” “learning environment” “teacher working conditions,” etc.—are in use. Witcher (1993) reviewed several of these measures and found that those that resulted in the most reliable assessments were those that generated information about multiple aspects of the school—including “an emphasis on academics, an ambience of caring, a motivating curriculum, professional collegiality, and closeness to parents and community.” According to Witcher, these most reliable instruments were also easy for respondents to understand, were appropriate to several levels of schooling and possessed of adequate evidence of psychometric validity and reliability.

A school climate instrument that is widely thought to meet these requirements is the *Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning Questionnaire (TELL)*. Originally developed in 2002 by the New Teacher Center (NTC), the instrument made its debut in North Carolina but since then has been administered across 18 states to nearly 1.5 million educators (New Teacher Center, 2016). Currently being implemented in six states and in three metropolitan school districts, the *TELL* continues to provide information to both policymakers and practitioners about the following eight research-based constructs:

- Time—Available time to plan, to collaborate, to provide instruction, and to eliminate barriers in order to maximize instructional time during the school day

- Facilities and Resources—Availability of instructional, technology, office, communication, and school resources to teachers
- Community Support and Involvement—Community and parent/guardian communication and influence in the school
- Managing Student Conduct—Policies and practices to address student conduct issues and ensure a safe school environment
- Teacher Leadership—Teacher involvement in decisions that impact classroom and school practices
- School Leadership—The ability of school leadership to create trusting, supportive environments and address teacher concerns
- Professional Development—Availability and quality of learning opportunities for educators to enhance their teaching
- Instructional Practices and Support—Data and support available to teachers to improve instruction and student learning. (*TELL Tennessee Research Brief*, 2013).

In addition to information about these eight climate-related constructs, the *TELL* also makes available a modicum of demographic data about the respondent, including their total years of teaching experience, number of years at the school, and the grades served by the respondents' school. Finally, also included among the data yielded by the *TELL* are synoptic indicators of the respondents' level of satisfaction with the school as "overall . . . a good place to work and learn" as well as an index of their "immediate professional intentions." These professional intentions embrace such choices as to whether the respondent intends to remain at his/her current school, to transfer to another

school or district, or to leave the classroom for another position, either administrative, non-administrative, or entirely outside of education.

Evidence of the Validity and Reliability of the TELL

Some degree of informal or *prima facie* evidence of the validity of the *TELL* instrument seems inherent in the instrument's longevity and widespread adoption. This sort of testimonial evidence aside, however, resources provided on the *TELL TN* website not only chart the evolution of the instrument's "content validity" but also report on statistical analyses pertinent to the reliability and "structural validity" of the eight research-based constructs alluded to previously. As summarized in a Spring 2013 research brief published on the *TELL TN* website, the items developed for the first iteration of the instrument originated in one part from a wide-ranging literature review of research on the role of working conditions on teacher dissatisfaction and teacher mobility and in another part from School and Staffing Survey data. Over and above these issues of "content validity," the same research brief also points to studies done to establish the instrument's "structural validity." Using data taken from 400,000 teachers from 5,000 schools in 12 states, Swanlund (2011) used a combination of factor analysis and "Rasch measurement modeling" to examine the dimensionality of the instrument. In his analyses, Swanlund found more constructs (13) than the eight that the instrument purported to measure. However, Swanlund went on to note that the additional constructs seemed also to fit comfortably within the eight-construct framework, with the additional five clusters of items serving to refine four of the original domains. When an early wave of *TELL Tennessee* data was analyzed using an approach similar to Swanlund's, the analyst

identified 10 constructs, with the Facilities and Resources construct and Instructional Practices and Support construct each splitting into two subsets.

To sum up, all statistical analyses carried out on the *TELL* to date suggest that the original instrument and its variants do in the main “measure what they purport to measure” (Popham, 2016) but that more fine-grained conclusions may be drawn about specific groups of items within two or three of the constructs.

Focus of the Present Study and Description of Sample

Informed by the *TELL*'s precedent use in the legacy Memphis City Schools as an element of the district's partnership with the Gates Foundation, the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) subsequently adopted the *TELL* as its measure of choice with respect to school climate issues (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2016). Using school-and district level online reports derived from the second of two *TELL* administrations sponsored by the TDOE, University of Memphis, Department of Leadership students and faculty subsequently mounted a series of pilot studies that involved the manipulation of the online *TELL* data and their merging with other TDOE school demographic and student achievement information. When the New Teacher Center was made aware of these efforts, they made available to the U of M Leadership students and faculty the entire *TELL* Tennessee dataset for 2013, this dataset populated with some 61,341 observations linked to 1668 educational institutions.

Demographic Characteristics of Sample: Individual Level

As Table 1 shows, about 44% of the 60,000 plus sample counted themselves as being from elementary institutions, roughly equal proportions linked themselves to middle schools (27.5%) and high schools (27.9%), and less than 1% indicated their

connection to some “special” educational site (0.5%). Absent about 2% of all respondents who did not declare what position they occupied at their institution, nearly 90% of the respondents remaining indicated that they were teachers (89.1%), about equal numbers listed themselves as either principals (1.8%) or assistant principals (2.0), and the rest as some “other” education professional. While about 2% of the respondents also failed to indicate how long they had been an educator, slightly more than 45% indicated that their careers spanned 10 or fewer years (45.1%), while slightly fewer than 54% indicated that their careers exceeded 10 years (53.6%). With respect to school tenure, more than half of the respondents noted that they had been at their current schools six or fewer years, while a little less than half put their tenure at more than six years.

Demographic Characteristics of Sample: Institutional Level

After aggregating these data to the school level and merging them with additional information obtained from the TDOE website, some 248 secondary-level institutions were found to have non-missing values on the intake and outcome variables that were projected for use in this study. As shown in Table 2, with respect to intake variables pertinent to students, TDOE statistics indicated that on average slightly more than 50% of such students qualify for free and reduced lunch (53.36%), a little less than one-quarter could be categorized as being non-White (23.35%), and about 13% might be classified as subject to some sort of learning disability (12.23%). As also shown in Table 2, with respect to intake variables pertinent to faculty, responses to *TELL* items indicated that, on average, somewhat more than half of educators at these institutions claimed more than 10 years of experience (55.14%) while a somewhat smaller proportion indicated their having been employed at their present school more than six years (51.41%).

In terms of the school's functioning as an academic institution, TDOE accountability data indicates that, averaged across three years, the percent of students proficient and advanced approached 50% in Algebra ($M = 48.3\%$, $SD = 13.62$) and 60% in English ($M = 59.24\%$, $SD = 12.70$). Consistent with these figures, the three-year ACT composite for these high schools was approximately 19.0 ($M = 18.90$, $SD = 1.76$), significantly less than the national ACT composite norm of 21.0 (at <http://www.act.org/content/dam/act/unsecured/documents/NormsChartMCandComposite-Web2015-16.pdf>). These outcomes notwithstanding, both the attendance rate and the graduation rate for these 248 schools were quite high, exceeding 90% in the former instance ($M = 93.50$, $SD = 1.91$) and nearing 90% in the latter instance ($M = 88.77$, $SD = 6.10$). Given these outcomes, it is perhaps not surprising that over 80% of the faculty at the school intend to continue teaching there ($M = 83.47$, $SD = 8.44$) and tend to agree on average that their school is "a good place to work and learn" ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.21$).

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample at the Individual Level (N = 61341)

Characteristic	<i>f</i>	%
School Level		
Elementary	24185	44.3
High	15130	27.7
Middle	15039	27.5
Special	279	0.5
Position		
Teacher	54633	89.1
Principal	1107	1.8
Assistant Principal	1213	2.0
Other Education Professional	3199	5.2
Not Answered	1189	1.9
Years of Experience		
First Year	3552	5.8
2-3 Years	5698	9.3
4-6 Years	8051	13.1
7-10 Years	9782	15.9
11-20 Years	18412	30.0
20+ years	14471	23.6
Not Answered	1375	2.2
Years at the School		
First Year	8392	13.7
2-3 Years	10906	17.8
4-6 Years	11799	19.2
7-10 Years	10394	16.9
11-20 Years	12194	19.9
20+ years	5686	9.3
Not Answered	1970	3.2

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample: Institutional Level (N = 248)

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Students on F/R Lunch (%)	53.36	17.17
Minority Students (%)	23.35	26.07
Students w/ Disabilities (%)	12.23	6.00
Teachers > 10 Years Experience (%)	55.14	10.91
Teachers > 10 Years Tenure (%)	51.41	11.84
Graduation Rate 2010-12 (%)	88.77	6.10
Attendance Rate 2010-2012 (%)	93.50	1.91
ACT Composite Score 2010-2012 (M)	18.90	1.76
Algebra I Proficiency 2010-12 (%)	48.30	13.62
English II Proficiency 2010-2012 (%)	59.24	12.70
Stayers (%)	83.74	8.44
Level of Satisfaction w/the School (<i>M</i>)	3.13	0.21

Validity and Reliability of the Independent Variable

With respect to capturing the four dimensions of Green's model, the model developer himself reviewed the *TELL* items and selected five that in his view best represented the concepts that each dimension embraced. Presented in Table 3 is the final selection of items by dimension. Provided therein are the means and standard deviations for each item, as well as for the dimension and instrument as a whole. Also provided is the Cronbach's *alpha* statistic, which indicates the extent to which each set of items exhibits internal consistency reliability. A review of these statistics indicates that each scale exhibits a level of reliability far above minimum levels of acceptability ($\alpha \geq .70$).

Analysis

For each of the five research questions, hierarchical multiple regression will be employed to arrive at the extent of relationship between the outcome variables—that is, 1) the percent of school “stayers” and 2) the percent of school faculty “satisfied” overall with the school climate—and the four dimensions of Green’s leadership model taken individually and combined. After entering three “student-oriented” variables in the first block (Percent Free/Reduced Lunch, Percent Minority, and Percent Students with Disabilities); and two “faculty- oriented” variables in the second block (Percent of Faculty with More than 10 Years’ Experience, Percent of Faculty with More than Six Years’ Tenure), a measure pertinent to Green’s model will be entered in the final block. The statistical significance of this final entry will be noted with respect to explaining the outcome, over and above the contribution of the previous blocks of variables. Where statistical significance is observed, it may be concluded that the either one aspect or the whole of Green’s model to some extent heightens or detracts from the faculty outcome in question. Where statistical significance is not observed, it may be concluded that the individual dimension or the model in the aggregate has no impact on the faculty outcome, either intention or satisfaction.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Each Item and Scale by Dimension

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dimension 1 Scale ($\alpha = .86$)	3.08	0.184
1. The faculty and leadership have a shared vision.	3.02	0.276
2. Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.	3.33	0.191
3. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.	3.03	0.270
4. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.	3.12	0.172
5. Provided supports (i.e., instructional coaching, PLCs, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.	2.92	0.219
Dimension 2 Scale ($\alpha = .77$)	3.02	0.129
1. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.	2.85	0.289
2. Teachers have adequate space to work productively.	3.17	0.275
3. The physical environment of classrooms in this school supports teaching and learning.	3.16	0.292
4. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect.	2.96	0.357
5. Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.	2.96	0.308

Table 3 (Continued)

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dimension 3 Scale ($\alpha = .87$)	2.94	0.188
1. This school maintains clear, two-way communication with parents/guardians and the community.	3.06	0.206
2. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.	3.08	0.261
3. Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles.	3.11	0.215
4. Professional development provides teachers with strategies to involve families and other community members as active partners.	2.60	0.246
5. Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.	2.84	0.225
Dimension 4 Scale ($\alpha = .87$)	3.09	0.186
1. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials.	3.01	0.255
2. The school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning.	3.33	0.191
3. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.	3.10	0.232
4. The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.	2.95	0.267
5. Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.	3.07	0.200
All 20 Items ($\alpha = .95$)	3.03	0.181

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study is to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their school has implemented Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, the intent of these teachers to remain professionally employed there, and their level of satisfaction with their school as "a good place to work and learn." Deriving from this overall purpose are the five more specific research questions following:

Research Question One:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding Self and Others"—the first dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

Research Question Two:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life"—the second dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

Research Question Three:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Building Bridges through Relationships"—the third dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

Research Question Four:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Engaging in Leadership Best Practices"—the fourth dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

Research Question Five:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of their schools' overall implementation of Green's model of educational leadership, the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

The chapter opens with an inspection of the descriptive statistics underwriting the multiple regression analyses employed to answer the five research questions.

Accompanied by brief discussions, summaries of the aforementioned multiple regression analyses are provided for each research question in turn. A brief synopsis of what was learned from these analyses concludes the chapter.

Descriptive Statistics

Inspection of the zero-order correlation matrix that summarizes the relationships between the five “control” variables and the two dependent variables employed in these analyses suggests that four of the controls are relevant to explaining variation in the latter (see Table 4). With respect to student demographic variables and this study’s two outcomes of interest, negative relationships are consistently demonstrated. Of those that evidence statistical significance, the weakest correlation observed is that between the percent of students on free and reduced lunch and the percent of teacher “stayers” ($r = -.16, p < .01$) while the strongest observed is that between the percent of minority students and the percent of teacher “stayers” ($r = -.29, p < .01$). As regards the mean level of teacher satisfaction, the relationships observed between it and the percent of students on free and reduced lunch variables ($r = -.25, p < .01$) and between it and the percent of minority students ($r = -.26, p < .01$) are of nearly equal strength.

Where student demographic variables are inversely related to the two outcomes of interest in this study, the positively-signed faculty demographic variables appear to enable such outcomes. As seen in Table 4, the percent of faculty with more than 10 years’ experience both significantly and positively correlates with the percent of teacher “stayers” (at $r = .30, p < .01$) and the mean level of teacher satisfaction (at $r = .14, p < .05$). Likewise and as also seen in Table 4, the percent of faculty with more than six years’ tenure significantly and positively correlates both with the percent of teacher “stayers” ($r = .14, p < .01$) and with the mean level of teacher satisfaction (at $r = .34, p < .05$). Insofar as both of these faculty-oriented variables concern teachers persisting over time, the faculty experience and faculty tenure variables are themselves inter-

correlated ($r = .70, p < .01$). Similarly, as a teacher’s “satisfaction” with their professional situation would seem naturally to promote their continuing to work there, this study’s two outcomes of interest are also positively, if only moderately, correlated ($r = .42, p < .01$).

Table 4

Matrix of Zero-Order Correlations between Control Variables in the Model and Measures of Teacher Retention and Overall Satisfaction (N = 248)

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. F/R Lunch Students (%)	.41**	.22**	-.22**	-.24**	-.16**	-.25**
2. Minority Students (%)		.04	-.28**	-.53**	-.29**	-.26**
3. LD Students			.00	.01	.04	.09
4. Faculty Experience (%)				.70**	.30**	.14*
5. Faculty Tenure (%)					.34**	.14*
6. Stayers (%)						.42**
7. Satisfaction (<i>M</i>)						

* $p < .05$, two-tailed; ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Indicating that schools’ implementation of Green’s model is, for the most part, independent of their institutional characteristics is the matrix of zero-order correlations highlighting the relationships between each of the four dimensions examined in this study and the control and dependent variables previously considered (see Table 5). While schools with greater numbers of students on free and reduced lunch, minority students, and more experienced and longer tenured faculty do not appear to implement the four dimensions of Green’s model at a rate that differs systematically from others, schools with higher percentages of LD students are perceived to do so more thoroughly. At those schools, moderate correlations are observed between the percentage of students classified as learning disabled and scores on the model as a whole ($r = .20, p < .01$) as well as for

each of its four constituent dimensions, somewhat more strongly for dimension one ($r = .22, p < .01$) and somewhat less strongly for dimension three ($r = .16, p < .01$). Apropos this study's dependent variables, the implementation of Green's four-dimensional model appears to be consistently and positively related to both, although systematically stronger correlations are observed for the mean level of teacher satisfaction than for the percentage of teacher "stayers." Among this set of ten correlations, scores on leadership dimension two demonstrate the strongest relationships with the mean level of teacher satisfaction ($r = .58, p < .01$) as well as with the percentage of teacher "stayers" ($r = .40, p < .01$). Conversely, among the set of ten correlations, scores on leadership dimension four demonstrate the weakest relationships with the mean level of teacher satisfaction ($r = .34, p < .01$) and the percentage of teacher "stayers" ($r = .49, p < .01$).

Outcomes Common to All Five Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

For the five hierarchical multiple regressions that were conducted to answer the research questions, the statistical outcomes were identical for blocks one and two. They differed only with respect to block three and the inclusion of the model dimension named for that particular question. In attempting to fit these five regression models to the data, procedures outlined by Field (2013, p. 316) were followed to check for linearity and unusual cases and to determine whether the statistical assumptions of homoscedasticity, normality, and independence were tenable. With no violations of these assumptions observed, final regressions were executed with the results following.

Table 5

Matrix of Zero-Order Correlations between Leadership Dimension Scores and Other Variables in the Model (N = 248)

Variable	1	2	3	4	All
F/R Lunch Students (%)	.02	-.04	-.01	.06	.00
Minority Students (%)	.01	-.11	.01	.03	-.02
LD Students (%)	.22**	.19**	.16*	.19**	.20**
Faculty Experience (%)	.03	.05	.04	.00	.03
Faculty Tenure (%)	-.02	.06	.02	.04	.01
Stayers (%)	.37**	.40**	.38**	.34**	.39**
Satisfaction (<i>M</i>)	.53**	.58**	.53**	.49**	.57**

* $p < .05$, two-tailed; ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Block One Outcomes: Student Demographic Variables

As presented in Tables 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14, the three student demographic variables included in block one collectively explain a statistically significant proportion of the variance in the percent of faculty “stayers” ($F(3, 244) = 8.09, p < .001, R^2 = .090$), but only the percent of minority students proves to significantly predict that outcome ($\beta = -0.26, t = -3.91, p < .001$). Contrastingly, as presented in Tables 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15, all three student demographic variables are statistically significant predictors of teacher satisfaction, with the percent of students on free and reduced lunch having the highest *beta* weight and thus the greatest importance among the three variables ($\beta = -0.21, t = -3.15, p = .002$). With the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.17, t = -2.58, p = .010$) and the percent of LD students ($\beta = 0.14, t = 2.31, p = .022$) also proving to be statistically significant predictors of teachers’ overall satisfaction, the combined set of

block one variables makes for a comparatively better fit of the model to the data ($F(3, 244) = 10.15, p < .001, R^2 = .111$).

Block Two Outcomes: Faculty Demographic Variables

With respect to the percent of teacher “stayers,” including the two faculty-oriented demographic variables in block two results in a somewhat improved fit of the model to the data ($F(5, 242) = 8.45, p < .001, R^2 = .149$), explaining a statistically significant 5.9% of the variation over and above that of the previous block (F Change (2, 242) = 8.25, $p < .001$). Individually considered, however, neither the percent of faculty with more than ten years’ experience nor the percent of faculty with more than six years’ tenure are statistically significant predictors of the percent of school “stayers” given the results of the t -tests.

Regarding the level of teacher satisfaction with the school, faculty-oriented demographic variables also prove not to be statistically significant predictors, neither improving the fit of the model ($F(5, 242) = 6.31, p < .001, R^2 = .115$), nor increasing the proportion of variance explained in the outcome to a statistically significant degree (F Change (2, 242) = 6.01, $p = .549$). As regards the student demographic variables in the analysis, there is little change in the order and magnitude of their importance given the two outcomes of interest. Apropos the percent of teacher stayers, the percentage of minority students remains the only predictive variable ($\beta = -0.16, t = -2.06, p = .041$). As for faculty satisfaction, all three student demographic variables remain significantly related to the outcome: with the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch ranked first in importance ($\beta = -0.20, t = -2.98, p = .003$), followed by the percent of minority

students ($\beta = -0.19, t = -2.476, p = .014$), followed by the percentage of LD students ($\beta = 0.14, t = 2.30, p = .022$).

Summary: Block One through Three Outcomes

To sum up the results of the analyses to this point, what appears to be largely determinative of the two outcomes are student demographics. While faculty experience seems to have a marginal impact on teacher satisfaction, characteristics of other faculty do not seem to factor into high school teachers' professed intention to "stay" at their schools or to how they feel about their jobs. What the implementation of Green's framework may add to the models previously described, whether in part or as a whole, is given in turn for each of the analyses following.

Research Question One:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding Self and Others"—the first dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

Of the five control variables entered previously in regression blocks one and two, only one of the five is found to be statistically significant once perceptions of "Understanding Self and Others" (i.e., Leadership Dimension One) is included in the block three of the model (see Table 6). With the percent of faculty with more than six years' tenure falling just short of being a significant predictor ($\beta = 0.17, t = 1.93, p = .054$), the percent of minority students is the sole control variable observed to exercise an influence on teachers' intention to "stay" at their current schools

($\beta = -0.15, t = -2.17, p = .031$). Countering this potentially negative influence is the positive one emerging from the school's implementation of Leadership Dimension One. Enhancing the overall "fit" of the model to the data and increasing the proportion of variance explained by nearly 14%, ($F(6, 241) = 15.75, p < .001, R^2 = .282$), scores on Leadership Dimension One are clearly linked to the percent of teacher "stayers" ($\beta = 0.38, t = 6.68, p = .000$).

Results similar to the ones previously described are observed with respect to the level of teacher satisfaction with the school (see Table 7). As with the percent of "stayers," the inclusion of Leadership Dimension One results in a significant improvement in the overall "fit" of the model to the data ($F(6, 241) = 24.89, p < .001$), as well as a large increase in the proportion of variance explained in the outcome ($F(1, 241) = 104.36, p < .001, R^2 = .383$). The percent of students on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.19, t = -3.29, p = .001$) and the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.18, t = -2.84, p = .005$) represent significantly negative influences on teacher satisfaction, while no influence seems attributable to either of the faculty-oriented demographic variables or to the percent of LD students.

Table 6

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension One Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Retention	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 8.09, p < .001, R^2 = .090$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	-1.02	0.307
Minority Students (%)	-0.08	0.02	-0.26	-3.91	0.000
LD Students (%)	0.10	0.09	0.07	1.11	0.270
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 8.45, p < .001, R^2 = .149,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 8.25, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.68	0.499
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.16	-2.06	0.041
LD Students (%)	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.97	0.331
Faculty Experience (%)	0.12	0.07	0.16	1.84	0.067
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.10	0.07	0.13	1.39	0.166
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 15.75, p < .001, R^2 = .282,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 44.66, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.03	-0.56	0.575
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.15	-2.17	0.031
LD Students (%)	-0.04	0.08	-0.03	-0.48	0.633
Faculty Experience (%)	0.10	0.06	0.12	1.57	0.117
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.12	0.06	0.17	1.93	0.054
Leadership Dimension One	17.37	2.60	0.38	6.68	0.000

Table 7

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension One Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Satisfaction	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 10.15, p < .001, R^2 = .111$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.21	-3.15	0.002
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.17	-2.58	0.010
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.31	0.022
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 6.31, p < .001, R^2 = .115,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 6.01, $p = .549$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.20	-2.98	0.003
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-2.47	0.014
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.30	0.022
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.09	1.09	0.276
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.08	-0.82	0.412
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 24.89, p < .001, R^2 = .383,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 104.36, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-3.29	0.001
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.18	-2.84	0.005
LD Students (%)	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.37	0.711
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.66	0.513
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.03	-0.33	0.741
Leadership Dimension One	0.62	0.06	0.53	10.22	0.000

Research Question Two:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life"—the second dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

As shown in Table 8, including the perceived implementation of the second dimension of Green's model contributes an additional 14% to the proportion of variance explained in the percent of teachers intending to remain at their schools, once student and faculty characteristics are statistically controlled. Warranting this conclusion are the block three statistics on the one hand ($F(1, 241) = 43.29, p < .001, R^2 = .278$) and the t -test for the significance of the Leadership Dimension variable on the other ($\beta = .037, t = 6.58, p < .001$). Given the influence of Leadership Dimension Two, no impact on teacher retention is observed for either the student demographic or the faculty demographic control variables.

As shown in Table 9, while higher percentages of students on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.18, t = -3.19, p < .001$) and higher percentages of minority students ($\beta = -0.13, t = -2.01, p = .046$) are negatively associated with teacher satisfaction, higher scores on Leadership Dimension Two prove to be positively linked to that outcome ($\beta = 0.55, t = 10.77, p < .001$). As with the regression analysis involving the percent of faculty "stayers," no impact on the level of satisfaction is observed for either of the faculty demographic control variables or for the percent of LD students.

Table 8

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Two Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Retention	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 8.09, p < .001, R^2 = .090$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	-1.02	0.307
Minority Students (%)	-0.08	0.02	-0.26	-3.91	0.000
LD Students (%)	0.10	0.09	0.07	1.11	0.270
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 8.45, p < .001, R^2 = .149,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 8.25, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.68	0.499
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.16	-2.06	0.041
LD Students (%)	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.97	0.331
Faculty Experience (%)	0.12	0.07	0.16	1.84	0.067
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.10	0.07	0.13	1.39	0.166
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 15.48, p < .001, R^2 = .278,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 43.29, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.01	0.03	-0.03	-0.48	0.634
Minority Students (%)	-0.04	0.02	-0.11	-1.63	0.105
LD Students (%)	-0.02	0.08	-0.02	-0.29	0.771
Faculty Experience (%)	0.11	0.06	0.14	1.83	0.069
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.11	0.06	0.15	1.67	0.096
Leadership Dimension Two	14.66	2.23	0.37	6.58	0.000

Table 9

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Two Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Satisfaction	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 10.15, p < .001, R^2 = .111$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.21	-3.15	0.002
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.17	-2.58	0.010
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.31	0.022
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 6.31, p < .001, R^2 = .115,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 6.01, $p = .549$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.20	-2.98	0.003
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-2.47	0.014
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.30	0.022
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.09	1.09	0.276
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.08	-0.82	0.412
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 280) = 27.10, p < .001, R^2 = .403$					
F Change (1, 241) = 116.07, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.18	-3.19	0.002
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.13	-2.01	0.046
LD Students (%)	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.57	0.571
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.08	1.06	0.292
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.06	-0.73	0.469
Leadership Dimension Two	0.55	0.05	0.55	10.77	0.000

Research Question Three:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Building Bridges through Relationships"—the third dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

As mentioned previously, the model statistics for the regression of student and faculty characteristics on the percent of faculty intending to remain at the school are the same for blocks one and two (see Table 10). When scores on Leadership Dimension Three are included in block three, no impact is observed for the percent of students who are on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.03, t = -0.44, p = .663$) or the percent of students with disabilities ($\beta = -0.00, t = -0.04, p = .970$). Likewise, neither faculty experience ($\beta = 0.14, t = 1.74, p = .083$) nor faculty tenure ($\beta = 0.14, t = 1.61, p = .108$) appear to be significantly linked to the outcome. However, increasing the proportion of variance explained among faculty "stayers" by nearly 14% is the addition of Leadership Dimension Three ($F(1, 241) = 44.59, p < .001$). Along with the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.17, t = -2.36, p = .019$), it is one of two variables in the analysis that seems to influence teacher retention, and of those two, by far the most important ($\beta = 0.37, t = 6.68, p < .001$).

As Table 11 shows, while neither faculty experience ($\beta = 0.07, t = 0.91, p = .366$) nor faculty tenure ($\beta = -0.07, t = -0.82, p = .412$) appear to be significantly linked to the level of faculty satisfaction with the school, scores on Leadership Dimension Three would appear to influence such scores decisively. Evidencing that association are the test

results for the increase in R^2 ($F(1, 241) = 99.43, p < .001, R^2 = .374$) as well as those for the Leadership Dimension score itself ($\beta = 0.52, t = 9.97, p < .001$). The significantly positive influence exercised by the school's implementation of "Building Bridges through Relationships" helps to counter the negative influence on teacher satisfaction statistically attributable to the percent of students on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.18, t = -3.08, p = .002$) and the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.20, t = -3.11, p = .002$).

Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Three Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Retention	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 8.09, p < .001, R^2 = .090$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	-1.02	0.307
Minority Students (%)	-0.08	0.02	-0.26	-3.91	0.000
LD Students (%)	0.10	0.09	0.07	1.11	0.270
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 8.45, p < .001, R^2 = .149,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 8.25, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.68	0.499
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.16	-2.06	0.041
LD Students (%)	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.97	0.331
Faculty Experience (%)	0.12	0.07	0.16	1.84	0.067
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.10	0.07	0.13	1.39	0.166
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 15.74, p < .001, R^2 = .282,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 44.59, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.01	0.03	-0.03	-0.44	0.663
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.17	-2.36	0.019
LD Students (%)	0.00	0.08	0.00	-0.04	0.970
Faculty Experience (%)	0.11	0.06	0.14	1.74	0.083
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.10	0.06	0.14	1.61	0.108
Leadership Dimension Three	16.61	2.49	0.37	6.68	0.000

Table 11

*Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Three Scores on Teachers'**Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N = 248)*

Source on Satisfaction	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 10.15, p < .001, R^2 = .111$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.21	-3.15	0.002
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.17	-2.58	0.010
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.31	0.022
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 6.31, p < .001, R^2 = .115,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 6.01, $p = .549$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.20	-2.98	0.003
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-2.47	0.014
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.30	0.022
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.09	1.09	0.276
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.08	-0.82	0.412
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 23.97, p < .001, R^2 = .374,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 99.43, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.18	-3.08	0.002
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.20	-3.11	0.002
LD Students (%)	0.00	0.00	0.06	1.08	0.282
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.91	0.366
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.07	-0.82	0.412
Leadership Dimension Three	0.58	0.06	0.52	9.97	0.000

Not associated with the outcome are the remaining variables in the analysis.

These include the percent of students on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.05, t = -0.76, p = .445$), the percent of LD students ($\beta = -0.01, t = -0.12, p = .901$), the percent of faculty with more than 10 years' experience ($\beta = 0.14, t = 1.77, p = .079$), and the percent of faculty with more than six years' tenure ($\beta = 0.16, t = 1.77, p = .077$).

Research Question Four:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Engaging in Leadership Best Practices" —the fourth dimension of Green's model of educational leadership—the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

When regressed on the percent of faculty "stayers," Leadership Dimension Four scores yields results that are similar to those seen for previous analyses. Broadly concerned with "best practices" not addressed by the other three dimensions, the Dimension Four results shown in Table 12 seem positively and robustly to enable teacher retention ($\beta = 0.35, t = 6.22, p = .000$). As with results discussed above, the contribution of the Dimension score to explaining variation in the outcome far outweighs the only other factor included in the analyses that was thought to have an impact on the outcome: specifically, the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.16, t = -2.21, p = .028$). Not associated with the outcome are the remaining variables in the analysis. These include the percent of students on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.05, t = -0.76, p = .445$), the percent of LD students ($\beta = -0.01, t = -0.12, p = .901$), the percent of faculty with more than 10

years' experience ($\beta = 0.14, t = 1.77, p = .079$), and the percent of faculty with more than six years' tenure ($\beta = 0.16, t = 1.77, p = .077$).

With respect to block three of the regression involving the level of faculty satisfaction and Leadership Dimension Four scores (see Table 13), both the percent of students on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.21, t = -3.53, p = .001$) and the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.19, t = -2.87, p = .004$) appear to exercise some influence. Given the size of *beta* coefficient, however, the influence exercised by Leadership Dimension Four can be seen to be the greatest, as suggested both by the "change" statistics for block three (F Change (1, 241) = 88.33, $p < .001$) and the *t*-test for the Leadership variable itself ($\beta = 0.50, t = 9.40, p = .000$). No statistical link with teacher satisfaction is observed for either faculty-oriented variable or for the percent of LD students.

Table 12

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Four Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Retention	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 8.09, p < .001, R^2 = .090$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	-1.02	0.307
Minority Students (%)	-0.08	0.02	-0.26	-3.91	0.000
LD Students (%)	0.10	0.09	0.07	1.11	0.270
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 8.45, p < .001, R^2 = .149,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 8.25, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.68	0.499
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.16	-2.06	0.041
LD Students (%)	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.97	0.331
Faculty Experience (%)	0.12	0.07	0.16	1.84	0.067
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.10	0.07	0.13	1.39	0.166
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 14.59, p < .001, R^2 = .266,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 38.74, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.76	0.445
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.16	-2.21	0.028
LD Students (%)	-0.01	0.08	-0.01	-0.12	0.901
Faculty Experience (%)	0.11	0.06	0.14	1.77	0.079
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.11	0.06	0.16	1.77	0.077
Leadership Dimension Four	15.89	2.55	0.35	6.22	0.000

Table 13

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Leadership Dimension Four Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Satisfaction	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 10.15, p < .001, R^2 = .111$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.21	-3.15	0.002
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.17	-2.58	0.010
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.31	0.022
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 6.31, p < .001, R^2 = .115,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 6.01, $p = .549$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.20	-2.98	0.003
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-2.47	0.014
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.30	0.022
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.09	1.09	0.276
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.08	-0.82	0.412
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 21.87, p < .001, R^2 = .353,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 88.33 $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.21	-3.53	0.001
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-2.87	0.004
LD Students (%)	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.90	0.371
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.95	0.342
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.54	0.592
Leadership Dimension Four	0.56	0.06	0.50	9.40	0.000

Research Question Five:

Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of their schools' overall implementation of Green's model of educational leadership, the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

Given with the results seen for the four previous regressions, it may be inferred that the Leadership aggregate measure qualifies as a significant positive predictor both of the percent of faculty planning to remain professionally employed at the school as well as of the level of satisfaction that such faculty express with being employed there. As with such previously described regression analyses and as shown in Table 14, neither the percent of students on free and reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.03, t = -0.54, p = .587$) nor the percent of students with disabilities ($\beta = -0.02, t = -0.40, p = .687$) are statistically significantly linked to teacher retention. Likewise adding nothing more to the model are the percent of faculty with more than ten years' experience ($\beta = 0.13, t = 1.72, p = .087$) and the percent of faculty with more than six years' tenure ($\beta = 0.16, t = 1.80, p = .078$). On the plus side, as with previous models, both the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.15, t = 1.94, p = .053$) and the aggregate Leadership measure ($\beta = 0.39, t = 7.04, p = .000$) are observed to influence retention, albeit in opposing ways. The addition of this last variable increases the proportion of variance explained in the outcome by nearly 15%.

As with previous regressions involving satisfaction scores, the regression model is dominated by the explanatory power of the Leadership measure ($\beta = 0.56, t = 11.06, p = .000$), with its addition in block three increasing the R^2 statistic by nearly 30%. Also influencing this statistic to roughly the same extent are the percent of students on free and

reduced lunch ($\beta = -0.19$, $t = -3.33$, $p = .001$) and the percent of minority students ($\beta = -0.17$, $t = -2.75$, $p = .006$). Not observed to be statistically significant in the final block of the analysis are faculty experience ($\beta = 0.06$, $t = 0.87$, $p = .385$), faculty tenure ($\beta = -0.05$, $t = -0.58$, $p = .565$) and the percent of LD students ($\beta = 0.03$, $t = 0.49$, $p = .628$).

Summary

In the five sets of regression analyses conducted on 248 high schools, higher scores on Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership were systematically related both to higher percentages of faculty intending to remain at the school and to higher levels of satisfaction with the school as "a good place to work and learn." While demographic variables pertinent to faculty appeared to have no relationship to either of the two outcomes, the percent of minority students at the school evidenced consistently negative associations with them both. The percent of students on free and reduced lunch was negatively linked to teacher satisfaction but not teacher retention.

Table 14

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Overall Implementation Scores on the Percent of Teachers Intending to Remain at Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Retention	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 8.09, p < .001, R^2 = .090$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	-1.02	0.307
Minority Students (%)	-0.08	0.02	-0.26	-3.91	0.000
LD Students (%)	0.10	0.09	0.07	1.11	0.270
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 8.45, p < .001, R^2 = .149,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 8.25, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.05	-0.68	0.499
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.16	-2.06	0.041
LD Students (%)	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.97	0.331
Faculty Experience (%)	0.12	0.07	0.16	1.84	0.067
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.10	0.07	0.13	1.39	0.166
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 16.72, p < .001, R^2 = .294,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 49.59, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	-0.02	0.03	-0.03	-0.54	0.587
Minority Students (%)	-0.05	0.02	-0.15	-2.08	0.038
LD Students (%)	-0.03	0.08	-0.02	-0.40	0.687
Faculty Experience (%)	0.10	0.06	0.13	1.72	0.087
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.11	0.06	0.16	1.80	0.074
All Leadership Dimensions	18.20	2.58	0.39	7.04	0.000

Table 15

Hierarchical Regression Summary of Overall Implementation Scores on Teachers' Overall Satisfaction with Their Schools (N = 248)

Source on Satisfaction	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Student Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(3, 244) = 10.15, p < .001, R^2 = .111$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.21	-3.15	0.002
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.17	-2.58	0.010
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.31	0.022
Block 2: Student Demographics + Faculty Demographics					
Model Fit: $F(5, 242) = 6.31, p < .001, R^2 = .115,$					
F Change (2, 242) = 6.01, $p = .549$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.20	-2.98	0.003
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-2.47	0.014
LD Students (%)	0.01	0.00	0.14	2.30	0.022
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.09	1.09	0.276
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.08	-0.82	0.412
Block 3: Student + Faculty Demographics + Leadership Dimension					
Model Fit: $F(6, 241) = 28.27, p < .001, R^2 = .413,$					
F Change (1, 241) = 122.30, $p < .001$					
F/R Lunch Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.19	-3.33	0.001
Minority Students (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.17	-2.75	0.006
LD Students (%)	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.49	0.628
Faculty Experience (%)	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.87	0.385
Faculty Tenure (%)	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.58	0.565
All Leadership Dimensions	0.65	0.06	0.56	11.06	0.000

Chapter Five

Discussion, Summary, and Conclusion

This is the final chapter of the dissertation entitled *The Investigation of the Relationships between Teacher Job Satisfaction and Retention and Green's Four-Dimensional Model of Educational Leadership*. The outcomes of interest in this study, teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention, are topics in ongoing national discussion and educational research. With a national teacher turnover rate of approximately 16%, insight into the factors that lead to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and the connection between job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and teacher retention is fundamental to maintaining a quality teaching force in the nation's public schools.

Green (2010) proposes a model of educational leadership that identifies four qualities or dimensions of principal leadership. A central tenet of Green's model is that teachers do not leave schools or students but leave principals. With this belief, Green's model delves into specific behaviors and characteristics of a school leader that can be developed with intentional practice. The identified behaviors and characteristics for leaders ultimately empower teachers. "The leadership style of principals must focus on people, not production. It is our position that if the focus is truly on people, production will be a natural occurrence" (Green, 2010, p. 127). Leithwood et al. (2004) echo with, "Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school" (p. 5).

The purpose of the study was to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of their schools' implementation of Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, their level of satisfaction with their schools as "a good place to

work and learn,” and their intent to remain professionally employed in their schools. Moreover, local education associations have critical interest in the research because of the potential impacts on student academic growth and the educational and economic costs stemming from teacher turnover.

Predominant literature on teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention relies on teacher survey data using instruments such *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Tennessee*. As such, non-experimental, perceptual data is subject to significant limitations (timing, motivation for response, personal experiences) that cannot be captured in a survey. Nonetheless, survey data is an approach to quantify or measure influences or conditions that affect teachers’ job satisfaction and, ultimately, may influence teacher retention.

Mirroring other studies that look at teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention, this study is restricted to 16,991 secondary level teachers in 248 schools in Tennessee. New to this study is the use of perceptual data as it relates to a specific theoretical framework and model, Green’s (2010) Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership.

Of increasing importance in current research (Boyd et al., 2009; Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2012; Eliophotou-Menon & Ioannou, 2016; Carroll & Fulton, 2004; Green & Munoz, 2016; Horng, 2009; Johnson et al., 2011; Kukla-Avevedo, 2009; Miller, 2013; Simon & Johnson, 2013; Slaalvik & Slaalvik, 2017; Thibodeaux et al., 2015) is the role of the building principal as it relates to teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention. Reginald L. Green, developer and author of *The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership*, posits that school level leadership in the 21st century is fundamental to an organizational structure that promotes teacher job satisfaction and ultimately, teacher

retention. The study identified twenty questions from the 2013 *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Tennessee* survey aligning five questions with each of Green's four dimensions of leadership. Three student demographic variables [% free/reduced lunch (F/R), % minority, % learning disabled (LD)] and two faculty demographic variables [years of experience, years (tenure) in the assigned school] were used to investigate two desired outcomes: overall satisfaction and teacher retention as they relate to Green's four dimensions individually and as a whole. After merging all of these data with covariates pertinent to student and faculty characteristics, five sets of two hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to determine the effect of model implementation on these outcomes: teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention.

The following research questions were central to the study:

1. Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding Self and Others" - the first dimension of Green's model of educational leadership - the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?
2. Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their schools have implemented practices related to "Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life" - the second dimension of Green's model of educational leadership - the percent of such teachers intending to remain

employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

3. Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Building Bridges through Relationships" - the third dimension of Green's model of educational leadership - the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

4. Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of how well their school has implemented practices related to "Engaging in Leadership Best Practices" - the fourth dimension of Green's model of educational leadership - the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

5. Controlling for student and faculty characteristics, what is the strength of relationship between teachers' perceptions of their schools' overall implementation of Green's model of educational leadership, the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there, and the mean level of satisfaction they express with the school?

Discussion of the Findings

This study examines the relationships between of the mean level of satisfaction teachers express with the school as a "good place to work and learn" and the percent of such teachers intending to remain employed there and the perceived implementation of Green's Four-Dimensional Model of Educational Leadership.

The strong aggregate regression results for Green's four dimensions on overall job satisfaction and on teachers' intentions to remain in their schools reinforces the data presented with each of the individual dimensional regression. The strong correlations in the aggregate are also demonstrated by each of the individual dimensions for satisfaction and, though not as robust, for retention. The strength of aggregate model performance expressed for the two outcome variables offers a convincing explanation of the impact of implementation of Green's leadership dimensions as perceived by teachers. Notably, though dimensional correlations are positive for both variables, the model effect on overall job satisfaction is almost twice the effect of the model on retention. This same pattern exists for each of the four dimensions.

There are interesting findings in the differential impact of the four dimensions especially on job satisfaction. The percent effect on satisfaction is strongest for Dimension Two demonstrating more variability in the proportion of variance and the weakest percent effect for Dimension Four. The strong performance for Dimension Two on satisfaction suggests that teachers find that organizational leadership characteristics and behaviors are drivers of institutional characteristics (structure, climate, culture and interactions of people) and as such, create a work environment that makes the school "a good place to work and learn."

The percent effect on retention for Dimensions One - Three is roughly the same with Dimension Four again having the lowest percent effect. The lower correlations across all the regressions for retention may indicate that while a teacher may express strong overall job satisfaction, there are extenuating factors - life circumstances, career phases and generational challenges - that can affect retention.

Dimension Four is the poorest performer for both overall satisfaction and retention. This dimension may be seen as the bailiwick of teachers with teachers holding leaders responsible for an inclusive environment for decision-making. Decisions made that directly affect classroom instruction are best made with voice from those expected to implement the practice.

The strong results for the overall impact of Green's theoretical framework suggests that teachers value and support concepts integral to the framework. It is the totality of the model that demonstrates a statistically significant, but more importantly, a practically significant, influence on principal leadership as it relates to teacher satisfaction and retention. From the aggregate regression results, the strength of the correlation for overall job satisfaction suggests that Green's theoretical model has the potential to inform school-based administrators who are serving or aspire to serve to a greater awareness of leadership characteristics, and therefore, may influence teacher job satisfaction. Similarly, Green's framework appears to support teacher retention by creating working relationships that make a school a "good place to work and learn" and thus, increase teacher retention. Translating awareness into action will be the true test of the model.

Commonalities in Five Demographic Variables across the Research Questions

First, the ten hierarchical regressions included three student demographic variables. Examining these variables, two have statistical significance. Percent of minority students have statistically significant negative influence on overall satisfaction across all the dimensions and the aggregate and, with the exception of Dimension Two, statistically significant negative influence on teacher retention. Likewise, percent of

free/reduced lunch students had statistically significant negative influence on overall satisfaction for across the dimensions and the aggregate but no statistically significant impact on teacher retention across all the dimensions and the aggregate.

With all dimensions and the aggregate resulting in similar findings, the elephant in the room scenario that students of poverty and of color (and often student populations are both) drive teachers from schools must be addressed. Research by Grissom, Viano, and Selin (2015), Horng (2009), and Johnson et al., (2011) argue that it is the less than adequate working conditions in a school (to include a lack of principal leadership) that drive teacher turnover rather the student demographics. Boyd et al. (2009) state, "...it is difficult to change the student demographics of a school" but find "school contextual factors such as administrative support are more policy-amenable" and suggests "improving school administration may be effective at reducing teacher turnover" (p. 15). This study did not look at confounding factors that might impact job satisfaction and potentially, teacher retention: physical features of the work place such as school plant conditions or psychological features such as test accountability or educational features such as workload.

Second, the two faculty variables of experience and tenure were included in the regressions. Neither the percent of faculty experience of more than ten years nor the percent of faculty tenure of more than six years had statistical significance. Personal teaching efficacy, the feeling that one is teaching students well, according to Perrachione et al., (2008) comes into play when teachers have greater than five years of experience. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017) and Saari and Judge (2004) offer that job satisfaction correlates to job performance in complex professional jobs such as teaching. Teachers

may not have associated their own intrinsic motivations with constructs in the 2013 *TELL Tennessee* survey, and therefore, may have contributed to these results.

Impact of Dimension One

The observed positive findings on Dimension One are consistent with research that emphasizes that before a leader can establish expectations for staff, the leader must understand his/her personal values and beliefs and how those values and beliefs influence his/her behavior. Without this understanding, school leaders cannot understand how individuals they work with and serve may interpret their actions and respond to their expectations. In their research findings, Thibodeaux et al., (2015) found that “principal leadership plays a critical role in the retention of teachers, and it suggests that administrators should be aware of how their leadership style and behaviors impact the teachers they lead” (p. 246). Boyd et al. (2011) note in their literature review that there exists a “positive correlation between school leadership (specifically, school administrators knowing staff members’ problems) and teacher autonomy (specifically, teachers influence over school policy)” (p. 309) and is related to job satisfaction and teacher retention.

Impact of Dimension Two

A school leader’s grasp of organizational complexity is determined by his/her ability to establish and to build his/her school’s vision and mission, to practice shared leadership, to create a positive culture and climate, to foster individual efficacy and collaborative effort and to manage the physical environment. These encompassing features addressed in Green’s model are a school’s working conditions. Ladd (2009) defines working conditions as “The physical features of the work place, the organizational structure, and the sociological, political, psychological and educational features of the work

environment” (p. 6). Working conditions leading to job satisfaction are central to Green’s Dimension Two.

The outcomes for this dimension capture the respondents’ overall satisfaction with their schools’ working conditions as defined by Ladd (2009) and job satisfaction as defined by Locke (1968). From their research, Green and Munoz (2016) conclude “The findings indicate that overall job satisfaction correlates significantly with preparedness, school leadership, independence, time, and benefits” (p. 116). The work of Boyd et al. (2009) points to the impact of working conditions and administrative support in teachers’ decisions to stay or leave. By far, the greatest influence on career decisions points to administrative support.

Again, while teachers appear to be satisfied with their jobs in light of organizational complexity, there is a less likely relationship to remain in their schools. The potential influences of other factors on retention cannot be identified in this study. Anecdotal data from Lauderdale County Schools estimate that 50% of the secondary teachers in the district live outside the district and have a one way commute of 30 - 60 minutes each day. These teachers often accept jobs in the district waiting for jobs to become available in their residing districts. Nor can salary differentials be ruled out.

Impact of Dimension Three

This dimension is best illustrated with a personal narrative from an exit survey of a “mover” and emphasizes the importance of this dimension through a teacher’s words.

This teacher would have participated in the 2013 *TELL Tennessee* survey.

“My suggestion for the Ripley High School is that the principal and central office personnel who directly work with RHS take more time to get to know their employees, give each dept. credit for its successes, and work together as a team with them during both successes and failures instead of making the dept. feel inferior and child-like. My dept. ALWAYS worked well together and took care of

each other, but we were made to feel like chastised children” (Employee exit conference form, July 2014).

Reading such a statement should stimulate a deep reflective response in leadership behavior. To build positive relationships, school leaders, both principal and district supervisory personnel, must take the initiative in developing relationships. Green’s third dimension speaks to “how effective leaders remove fear and intimidation from the workplace, free the human spirit to be creative, and build a capacity for self and others to lead” (p. 130). As in any relationship, trust is a foundational piece for school level relationships (Fullan, 2003; Green, 2010; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Murphy, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). However, trust is a complex idea. Trust is built over time. Trust in a school environment is developed in partnership and involves valuing, respecting, and appreciating individuals in a dynamic process (Green, 2010).

The collective efficacy of a school is built on trust. Collective efficacy is relational. Collective efficacy drives school effectiveness at all levels. Therefore, trust becomes the operational component that underpins relationships in schools. Like Green (2010), Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) relate trust to social processes in schools that include “communication, collaboration, climate, organizational citizenship, and proliferation of rules” (p. 581).

Impact of Dimension Four

The results may indicate that the prerequisite skills for this dimension are the hardest for a leader to acquire and to practice because they are an assimilation of multiple behaviors and characteristics.

Characteristics and skills that are core to Dimensions One through Three funnel into Dimension Four as “leadership practices for educational renewal” (Green, 2010, p. 151).

To institute a best practice for educational renewal, a leader must put into practice the tenets of the other dimensions and demonstrate the ability to facilitate a shared vision, to decide collaboratively how to implement change, to communicate expectations and to manage conflict. Only then can a leader be the change agent necessary to positively impact student learning. Simon and Johnson (2013) and Boyd et al. (2011) emphasize this component as essential because of the faceted role of the school leader. School leaders operating under internal and external forces must have the insight to initiate change when needed, the courage to withstand the winds of change, and the integrity to stay the course.

The next sub-section restates the main research findings in relationship to the literature and the contributions and implications the investigation makes to the theory.

1. A statistically significant relationship exists between each of Green's four dimensions of principal leadership and the overall job satisfaction of the respondents. Similar statistical significance is seen with the aggregate for the model. The principal's leadership actions appear to contribute to teachers' overall job satisfaction. Multiple studies address qualities of the components of Green's model and support is found in literature for the individual dimensional characteristics as detailed by Green (2010). Green's model asserts that effective principals are those that integrate all of the dimensional qualities and do so with cognitive effort and reflective insight.
2. A statistically significant relationship exists between Green's four dimensions of principal leadership and percent of teachers intending to stay in their schools. Similar statistical significance is seen with the aggregate for the model.

Literature demonstrates that factors that contribute to teacher attrition and teacher turnover are often associated with inadequate administrative support and the failure of school leaders to effectively address the needs of the teachers collectively and individually.

3. Although weak, a negative statistically significant relationship exists across all four leadership dimensions and the aggregate of the dimensions for the percent of free and reduced lunch students and percent of minority students and respondents' scores for overall satisfaction. However, there is no statistical significance present for the percent of free and reduced lunch students and the respondents' intentions of remaining in their schools. The percent of minority students has a weak but statistically significant relationship with Dimensions one, three, four, and the aggregate. The notable exception is in Leadership Dimension Two where percent of minority students has no statistical significance. These findings stay in contrast to research studies that indicate it is a more subtle influence of factors found in schools with high poverty and high minority students. These studies suggest that it is not the students teachers are leaving, but the contextual factors often associated with high poverty, high minority schools including ineffective leadership.
4. The two longevity teacher covariates of more than ten years of experience and more than six years of tenure have no statistically significant relationship with either overall job satisfaction or teachers' intentions of remaining in their school. Many studies have focused on the attrition and mobility in the early years of teachers' (five years or less). While not a finding in this study, good

principal leadership is reported as the key-contributing factor to ongoing commitment, job satisfaction and retention.

Summary

Before summarizing, I reiterate the context of my interests in teacher retention. Lauderdale County Schools (TN) is a small rural, high poverty, high minority school district. Teacher turnover is an annual dilemma for the district especially for secondary level teachers. For 2014-2015, Lauderdale County Schools had 45 new hires with an estimated teacher turnover economic cost of \$415, 500 (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) *Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator*). The five-year average inclusive of the 45 new hires averaged 42.2 hires/year for a staggering \$2,000,000. Reported another way, the district had replaced three-fourths of its staff over the five-year interval. A high poverty rural school district such as Lauderdale County cannot withstand the economic and educational costs of such teacher turnover. Couple turnover with critical teacher shortages especially at the secondary level, the challenges of providing a quality education for students with the greatest disadvantages are enormous.

In my second year as district supervisor, responsible in part for teacher hiring at the secondary level, the turnover numbers distressed me. I began the University of Memphis's Educational Leadership program in August 2014. Green's Four Dimensional Model of Educational Leadership was introduced in classwork. By June 1, 2017, seventeen percent of the district's high school staff had retired, were not rehired, moved to other educational or non-educational positions, or moved to other districts. Whatever the reason for leaving, a vacancy is created. Two of these positions, one special education

and one mathematic, remain unfilled. This researcher understands the impact of teacher mobility and attrition on district and individual school resources. Additionally, both the district's high schools experienced principal turnover, three principals over three years. As with Ingersoll (2001) and subsequent researchers, this researcher seeks to understand factors that influence teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention, especially the impact of school leadership, that are critical to student academic and social-emotional learning. I speculated that Green's model might address factors and influencers associated with teacher retention. In the research, the role of job satisfaction emerged as a corollary to teacher retention. In defining job satisfaction, the role of principal leadership was emphasized in multiple studies.

First, the current study yielded statistically significant results to support a strong relationship between Green's Four Dimensional Model of Educational Leadership and teacher job satisfaction, and was strong enough to counter the statistically significant negative influences of the percent of minority students and the percent of free/reduced lunch students on teacher job satisfaction. If teachers were asked to select from a list of leadership behaviors and characteristics, this study indicates that they would identify such behaviors and characteristics as presented in the four dimensions central to this study especially those associated with Dimension Two: trust, affirmation, efficacy and communication.

Second, there is statistically significant but moderate correlation between Green's Four Dimensional Model of Educational Leadership and teachers' intention to remain in their schools, the stayers. The moderate correlation appears to promote the principles of effective leadership as informed by Green's framework. There is an interesting

dichotomy between overall job satisfaction and teachers' intentions to remain in the current assignments. It would be reasonable to view job satisfaction as a predictor of retention. However, because the strength of the relationship is not as strong, it does call into question if other factors that cannot be evaluated with the survey data in this study are confounding variables (economic security, commute times, education-related job advancement and personal life situations) that do not necessarily indicate less job satisfaction but may influence teachers' intentions of staying.

Leithwood et al., (2004) state "The total (direct and indirect) effects of leadership on student learning account for about a quarter of total school effects" (p. 5). Current and emerging leaders must recognize the importance of leadership characteristics in developing the learning and teaching environment that will maximize student academic achievement and growth. There is a moral imperative that a leader invests in evaluating his/her own values and beliefs, understands the complexity of organizational life in the open society of public education, builds relationships with the teachers, parents and communities that he/she serves, and engages in an ongoing search for best practices. These are the four pillars of principal leadership that constitute Green's theoretical framework.

The findings of this study lay the groundwork for current and aspiring leaders to improve teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention as they improve their skills as leaders. This researcher feels that Green's theory and model of principal leadership is the framework to significantly impact both teacher job satisfaction and retention in today's challenging educational environment.

Conclusion

This study revealed that the relationships between teachers' perceptions of their schools' implementation of Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, their level of satisfaction with their schools as "a good place to work and learn" and their intent to remain professionally employed in their schools was statistically significant. More importantly, the statistical significance supports a strong practical application of Green's Four Dimensional Model of Educational Leadership.

Literature has focused on research of why teachers migrate or leave the profession. Most of the research findings center on the broad scope of working conditions including such factors as dissatisfaction with accountability, lack of respect, lack of professional support, poor school leadership, low pay, percent of minority and socio-economically disadvantaged students, teacher-teacher rapport, and dissatisfaction with teaching (Boyd et al., 2009; Carroll & Fulton, 2004; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017; Fuller et al., 2013; Miller, 2011). Recommendations to mitigate turnover include improving teacher preparation programs, new teacher mentoring and coaching, personalized professional development and, more recently, school leadership development (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Boyd et al. (2009) recognizes that many factors cannot be controlled at the school level (pay schedules, accountability policy, student demographics) where teacher turnover has its most direct effect. What is amendable to change is school level leadership development. Only recently has the research looked to specific leadership behaviors associated with teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention. The results of this study indicate that the systematic dimensional approach developed by Green

addresses building level leadership behaviors that create an effective school community with the intentional work of increasing job satisfaction and teacher retention.

The potential of Green's dimensions for the school level practitioner is exponential. Each of the four dimensions provides the building level practitioner actionable steps and evaluative strategies in a journey toward excellence. Dimension One, *Understanding Self and Others*, encourages a strong foundation by self-identifying values, beliefs and strengths and how these are understood by the leader and perceived by the stakeholders. Dimension Two, *Understanding the Complexities of Organizational Life*, expands to the breadth of organizational structure, culture and climate and the social interactions within the school community seeking "(1) respect for diversity; (2) principles of fair process; (3) ethical behavior; and (4) removal of fear and intimidation from the schoolhouse" (Green, 2010, p. 64). Dimension Three, *Building Bridges Through Relationships*, emphasizes the role of the principal in fostering collegial relationships between all stakeholders and building learning communities inclusive of all constituents. Dimension Four, *Utilizing Leadership Practices for Educational Renewal*, is the culminating point of leadership, the move to excellence. If a school leader wishes to be a catalyst for change, he must arrive at this dimension. The leader recognizes the enormity of the leadership tasks and willingly seeks to share the leadership with others in the organization.

The strong correlation between Green's Four Dimensions of Educational Leadership and teacher job satisfaction demonstrated in this study supports the implementation of Green's Theoretical framework as a robust instrument in the development of 21st century school leaders. The correlation between Green's Four

Dimensions of Educational Leadership and teacher retention, while not as strong as with job satisfaction, also signals the value of leadership behaviors as a determinant of teacher retention.

Recommendations for Further Study

The current study focused on the relationship between Green's Four Dimensional Model of Educational Leadership and overall job satisfaction and teachers' intention of remaining employed in their current school using responses from the 2013 *Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Tennessee* survey. The following suggestions for future research are made to better understand the variables of this study:

- 1) Replicate the study with a more diverse sample from other states to increase the generalizability to the results of this study.
- 2) Conduct a qualitative study with a focus group to ascertain teachers' perception of leadership incorporating data collection based on interviewing, observation and document analysis that may reveal specific leader behaviors impacting migration/attrition that cannot be captured in survey data.
- 3) Compare and analyze the perceived impact of Green's Four Dimensions of Educational Leadership and other programming for leadership development such as The Governor's Academy of School Leaders (GASL), a joint venture between TDOE, Vanderbilt University's Peabody College, the governor's office and local school districts; The University of Memphis's Center for Urban School Leaders (CUSL) sponsored Memphis Leadership Fellows Program; and/or on the national level, the National Institute of School Leadership (NISL).

References

- Allensworth, E., Poinciak, S. & Mazzeo, C. (2004). The schools teachers leave: Teacher mobility in Chicago Public Schools. Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute. Retrieved from http://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/CCSR_Teacher_Mobility.pdf
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2016, October). *Measures of effective teaching project*. Document retrieved from <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/united-states/Pages/measures-of-effective-teaching-fact-sheet.aspx>
- Boyd, D. J., Grossman, P. L., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. H. (2009). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. Retrieved from the Urban Institute website: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1001287_calderworkingpaper25.pdf
- Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., Rivkin, S. G., & Urban Institute, N. (. (2012). Estimating the Effect of Leaders on Public Sector Productivity: The Case of School Principals. Working Paper 66.
- Carroll, T. & Fulton, K. (2004). True cost of teacher turnover. <http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Tom-Carroll-Kathleen-Fulton-True-Cost-of-Teacher-Turnover-graphic-Threshold-Spring-2004.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.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Collins, T. (1999). Attracting and Retaining Teachers in Rural Areas. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED438152.pdf>

- Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Education.
- Donald, B., Pam, G., Marsha, I., Hamilton, L., Susanna, L., & James, W. (2011). The Influence of School Administrators on Teacher Retention Decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, (2), 303.
- Eliophotou-Menon, M. & Ioannou, A. (2016). The link between transformational leadership and teachers' job satisfaction, commitment, motivation to learn, and trust in the leader. *Academy Of Educational Leadership Journal*, 20(3), 12-22.
- Flynt, S. W. & Morton, R. C. (2009). Teacher shortage in America: Pressing concerns. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal*. 19(3). Retrieved from <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Flynt,%20Samuel%20Teacher%20Shortage%20in%20America.pdf>
- Friedman, T. L. & Mandelbaum, M. (2011). *That use to be us*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Froese-Germain, B. (2014, July). Work-Life Balance and the Canadian Teaching Profession. *Canadian Teachers' Federation*.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Fuller, B., Waite, A., Miller, P., & Iribarra, D. T. (2013, December). Explaining teacher turnover-School cohesion and intrinsic motivation. Retrieved from http://gse.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/users/bruce-fuller/LAUSD-Berkeley%20ReedSchoolClimate_TeacherEngagementAssessment_%20TechnicalReport_Dec2013.pdf

- Golding, R., Taie, S., & Riddles, M. (2014). Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results From the 2012-13 Teacher Follow-up Survey. Prepared for the National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2/2014077.pdf>
- Gottfried, M. A., & Straubhaar, R. (2015). The perceived role of the Teach For America program on teachers' long-term career aspirations. *Educational Studies, 41*(5), 481-498. doi:10.1080/03055698.2015.1044248
- Green, A. M., & Muñoz, M. A. (2016). Predictors of New Teacher Satisfaction in Urban Schools. *Journal Of School Leadership, 26*(1), 92-123.
- Green, R. L. (2013). *Practicing the art of leadership*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Green, R. L. (2010). *The four dimensions of principal leadership*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Grissom, J. A., Viano, S. L., & Selin, J. L. (2016). Understanding Employee Turnover in the Public Sector: Insights from Research on Teacher Mobility. *Public Administration Review, 76*(2), 241-251.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: transforming teaching in every school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Johnson, S. M., Berg, J. H., & Donaldson, M. L. (2005). Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention. Cambridge, MA: The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from http://assets.aarp.org/articles/NRTA/Harvard_report.pdf

- Johnson, S. M., Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J.P. (2011). How context matters in high-needs schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. Cambridge, MA: The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/mkraft/files/johnson_kraft_papay_teacher_working_conditions_final.pdf
- Hakim, C. (1982). *Secondary analysis in social research: A guide to data sources and methods with examples*. London: George Allen & UNWIN.
- Hornig, E. L. (2009, September). Teacher tradeoffs: Disentangling teachers' preferences for working conditions and student demographics. *American Educational Research Journal*. 46(3). 690-717.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*. 38(3), 499-534. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3202489>.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1961, February). *Special Message to Congress on Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=8433>
- Koedel, C., Li, J., Springer, M. G., & Tan, L. (2017). The Impact of Performance Ratings on Job Satisfaction for Public School Teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(2), 241-278.
- Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Shen-Wei Yee, D. (2016). School Organizational Contexts, Teacher Turnover, and Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(5), 1411-1449.

- Kukla-Acevedo, S. (2009). Leavers, Movers, and Stayers: The Role of Workplace Conditions in Teacher Mobility Decisions. *Journal of Educational Research*, 102(6), 443.
- Ladd, H. F. (2009). Teachers' Perceptions of Their Working Conditions: How Predictive of Policy-Relevant Outcomes? Working Paper 33. *National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research*.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Executive Summary: Review of Research: How Leadership Influences Student Learning. *Learning from Leadership Project*.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Speech presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, California, August 30-September 3, 1968. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED023138>
- Miller, S. B. (2010). *The revolving door: How leaders push teacher turnover*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1067&context=eps_diss
- Monk, D. H. (2007). Recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers in rural areas. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795884.pdf>
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2013). Policy Brief: The high cost of teacher turnover. Retrieved from http://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/NCTAF_CostTurnover_ExecSummary.pdf

- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. Reston, VA: Author
- New Teacher Center. (2016, May). *Teaching and learning conditions initiative*. Retrieved from <https://newteachercenter.org/approach/teaching-empowering-leading-and-learning-tell/>
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perrachione, B. A., Rosser, V. J. & Petersen, G. J. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *The Professional Educator*. 32(2). Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ862759>
- Popham, W. J. (2011). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2012). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*. 50(10). pp. 4-36.
doi: 10.3102/0002831212463813
- Saari, L. M. & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4). 395-407. doi:10.1002/hrm.20032
- Schmoker, M. (2011). *Focus: Elevating the essentials to radically improve student learning*. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Simon, N. S. & Johnson, S. M. (2013). Teacher turnover in high-poverty schools: What we know and can do. Cambridge, MA: The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

- Skaalvik, E. & Skaalvik, S. (2015). Job Satisfaction, Stress and Coping Strategies in the Teaching Profession-What Do Teachers Say?. *International Education Studies*, 8(3), 181-192.
- Skaalvik, E. & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Still motivated to teach? A study of school context variables, stress and job satisfaction among teachers in senior high school. *Social Psychology Of Education*, 20(1), 15-37.
- Swanlund, A. (2011). *Identifying working conditions that enhance teacher effectiveness: The psychometric evaluation of the teaching working conditions survey*. Chicago: American Institutes for Research.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Applied Social Research Methods (Book 46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- TELL Tennessee. (2013, Spring). *Validity and reliability report*. Document retrieved from https://telltennessee.org/uploads/File/TN13_brief_val_rel.pdf
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2015-2016) Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model Administrator's Rubric. Retrieved from <http://team-tn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/TEAM-Admin-Evaluation-Rubric-20161.pdf>
- Thibodeaux, A. K., Labat, M. B., Lee, D. E., & Labat, C. A. (2015). The effects of leadership and high-stakes testing on teacher retention. *Academy Of Educational Leadership Journal*, 19(1), 227-249.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 547-593. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1170781>

Tucker, P. D. & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*.

Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/104136/chapters/The-](http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/104136/chapters/The-Power-of-an-Effective-Teacher-and-Why-We-Should-Assess-It.aspx)

[Power-of-an-Effective-Teacher-and-Why-We-Should-Assess-It.aspx](http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/104136/chapters/The-Power-of-an-Effective-Teacher-and-Why-We-Should-Assess-It.aspx)

Witcher, A. (1993). Assessing school climate: an important step for enhancing school

quality. *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*,

77(554), 1-5.