

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2019

Principals as Promoters of Teacher Retention: A Study of the Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership

Ethan Andrew Randall

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

Recommended Citation

Randall, Ethan Andrew, "Principals as Promoters of Teacher Retention: A Study of the Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership" (2019). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2727.
<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/2727>

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 khhgerty@memphis.edu.

PRINCIPALS AS PROMOTERS OF TEACHER RETENTION: A STUDY OF
THE FOUR DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP

by

Ethan Andrew Randall

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirement for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Major: Leadership and Policy Studies

The University of Memphis

August 2019

Acknowledgements

The completion of this work seems surreal yet I am proud to say that I finished the race set before me. I cannot remember setting this as a goal nor did I ever imagine myself being called “doctor.” Regardless, I am humbled and appreciative for the journey and its obstacles. My hope remains to be a positive influence on those around me.

To my wife, Torie Ann Randall, I must give the utmost praise and thanks as she endured this marathon along my side and was my number one cheerleader. In addition to that, she ensured our sons, Russell and Rawlings, were attended to and to the best degree possible, understood why I may not have always been the most present “daddy.”

To my dissertation committee of Dr. Reginald Leon Green, Dr. Charisse Atibagos Gulosino, Dr. James B. Mitchell, Jr., and Dr. Derrick Robinson, thank you for your guidance, support and patience.

To Gamma Cohort, University of Memphis- Main Campus, the journey was quite the ride. Congrats to those of you finishing ahead of me and I offer my support and encouragement to those of you still working toward the prize.

To the faculty of Elmore Park Middle School, I thank you for encouraging me and tolerating me throughout the process.

To my 5th grade teacher and now colleague, Dane McKelvy, thank you for proofreading the manuscript.

Abstract

Teacher attrition is disruptive to the functioning of schools. Student disadvantage is exacerbated in schools serving larger populations of lower socioeconomic status and/or non-white students because these schools suffer from higher rates of teacher attrition. The subsequent recruitment, selection, and development cycle of new teachers contributes to the problem by constraining economic resources of schools and districts. Combined, the effects of teacher attrition inhibit schools from becoming effective promoters of student achievement. Previous research on teacher retention identified school leadership as an important and salient factor in promoting teacher retention. While it is known that school leaders matter, the literature lacks specificity regarding principal behaviors that promote teacher retention. This study of The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership sought to add to the existing literature on teacher attrition by identifying specific principal behaviors that increase the likelihood of teachers choosing to stay at their schools. Results from the analysis produced statistically significant negative correlations that demonstrated that as teachers more favorably rated their principals on the twenty items aligned to Green's model, they also indicated the desire to remain at their current school. Additionally when controlling for additional variables, the regression blocks provided statistically significant evidence that the implementation of behaviors associated with Green's model accounts for 15.0% of the variance in a teacher's career intentions. These findings suggest that teachers interested in staying at their current school seek to engage in collegial relationships with both their principal and colleagues. Green's model guides principals to key behaviors that promote these desired characteristics.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page	
1	Introduction	1
	Background of the Study	1
	Statement of the Problem	7
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Research Questions	8
	Definition of Terms	9
	Significance of the Study	10
	Theoretical Framework	10
	Assumptions	14
	Limitations of the Study	14
	Organization of the Study	14
2	Review of the Literature	16
	Dimension 1: Understanding Self and Others	17
	Dimension 2: Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life	21
	Dimension 3: Building Bridges Through Relationships	26
	Dimension 4: Engaging in Leadership Best Practices	31
	Summary	35
3	Methodology	36
	Research Design	37
	Demographic Characteristics of Sample at the Individual Level	38
	Instrumentation	40
	Variables	43
	Data Analysis	44
	Summary	45
4	Results	46
	Study Design	46
	Sample Participants and Demographics	48
	Quantitative Findings	50
	Research Question One	52
	Research Question Two	60
	Research Question Three	62
	Research Question Four	64
	Summary	65
5	Discussion and Implications	67
	Summary of Study	67
	Discussion of Findings	70
	Dimension Comparisons	71
	Green's Model in the Aggregate	76

Teacher Characteristics	77
Implications for Practice	79
Implications for Further Study	80
Implications for Policy	82
Conclusion	83
References	85
List of Tables	vi

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample at the Individual Level (N = 223)	38
2. Inter-rater Reliability Means and Standard Deviations at the Item and Dimension level (N = 9)	41
3. Demographic Characteristics of State Career Intentions (N = 223)	48
4. Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension One of Green's Model of Educational Leadership	53
5. Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension Two of Green's Model of Educational Leadership	54
6. Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension Three of Green's Model of Educational Leadership	55
7. Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension Four of Green's Model of Educational Leadership	57
8. Hierarchal Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question One Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Educational Model of School Leadership	58
9. Hierarchal Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question Two Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Educational Model of School Leadership	61
10. Hierarchal Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question Three Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Educational Model of School Leadership	63
11. Hierarchal Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question Four Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Educational Model of School Leadership	65

Chapter One

Introduction

There is a new focus on teacher attrition and the extent to which principal behavior influences teacher attrition. The 2012-2013 Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS) (Goldring, Taie, & Riddles, 2014) reported that public schools were only able to retain 84% of their teachers from the previous year. Schools in urban areas with student bodies that are largely minority and serve communities with fewer socioeconomic opportunities are particularly plagued by teacher attrition (Burkhauser, 2016; Holme, Jabbar, Germain, & Dinning, 2017; Ingersoll, 2001). Economically speaking, teacher turnover is problematic because of the operational costs it adds to school districts and ultimately taxpayers (Borman & Dowling 2008; Burkhauser, 2016; Callahan, 2016; Ingersoll, 2003; Ost & Schiman, 2015). Even though the literature has provided evidence that identifies teacher attrition as a result of poor administrative support, researchers have failed to identify or define specific leadership behaviors that promote both student achievement and stability of staffing. This gap in the literature makes the case for developing an understanding of how principal behavior impacts the career decisions of teachers.

Background of the Study

Teacher Attrition

Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlsstrom (2004) noted that principals rank second only to teachers when measuring their impact on student achievement. Therefore, teacher attrition research has sought to develop an understanding of the challenges leaders face while seeking to create an organizational climate of educational success. Initial research attempted to describe the problem of teacher attrition through a variety of

analyses that examined personal characteristics of teachers and overall school characteristics. Both of these categories of descriptors proved predictive of teachers' career decisions. Later research shifted the focus away from the characteristics of teachers and schools and began to examine the effectiveness of different types of leadership in solving the problems school leaders face on a daily basis.

Teacher characteristics. The results of multiple studies have identified that teachers under the age of 30 and over the age of 50 are likely to either move schools or leave the profession altogether (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Goldring et al., 2014; Ingersoll, 2001). These findings are somewhat intuitive because it is logical to see attrition increase as teachers near retirement age, but researchers had to investigate why so many early career teachers choose to exit the profession. Teacher preparation and orientation strategies, or the lack thereof, were found to contribute to teachers' career decisions (Callahan, 2016; Podolsky, Kini, Bishop, & Darling-Hammond, 2017; Ost & Schiman; 2015). In addition to preparation and mentoring, Ost and Schiman (2015) found that changing early career teachers' job assignments significantly contributed to attrition. Sadly, some studies indicated that early career teachers are also assigned to more difficult teaching assignments with more challenging students at lower performing schools (Struyven & Vanthournout, 2014).

School characteristics. Existing literature demonstrates high teacher turnover rates and its negative impact on student learning, especially in low performing schools that serve large percentages of minorities and students receiving free or reduced lunch (Bednar & Gicheva, 2016; Burkhauser, 2016; Ladd, 2009; Torres, 2016). Holme et al. (2017) further examined the phenomenon of teacher turnover at high-poverty, high-

minority, and low-performing schools and found these schools suffer from chronic, cumulative, and episodic turnover. Simply put, more teachers leave and leave more frequently at schools serving high numbers of students of color and/or in poverty. Thus creating instability within the educational environment. Schools with low performance are also less attractive to teachers (Falch & Rønning, 2007). Therefore, not only are teachers leaving these schools at high rates but principals of these schools also have fewer applicants interested in seeking open positions. As researchers began to develop a better understanding of how these school contextual factors were interacting with teacher career decisions, attention shifted to the inner workings of how schools function.

Working Conditions. This general term involves many factors that describe elements of an individual school's identity. For example, many surveys assess teacher perceptions of their autonomy in decision-making, inclusion in school planning, student discipline, and use of instructional time. Teachers who rate elements of their school in a positive manner are found to stay in their schools at much higher rates than those who poorly rate their school (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Burkhauser, 2016; Goldring et al., 2014; Gulosino, C., Franceschini III, L., & Hardman, P., 2016; Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Shen-Wei Yee, D., 2016; Pratt & Booker, 2014; Torres, 2016). Furthermore, the 2012-2013 TFS noted that 52.8% of teachers who left the profession in 2013 believe they have found better working conditions in their new jobs (Goldring et. al 2014). These findings have caused the heavy responsibility for solving the problem of teacher attrition to rest squarely on the shoulders of principals. Papay, Bacher-Hicks, Page, and Marinell (2017) noted that "by and large, teachers prefer to teach in schools that have strong school cultures, effective leadership, and supportive colleagues."

Leadership Behavior

The aforementioned research has framed the problem of teacher attrition through the lenses of personal characteristics and contextual factors but left the role of school leadership within teacher attrition largely unaddressed. Leithwood et al. (2004) identifies the churning of staff as one of seven major challenges facing school principals due to the fact that turnover results in high numbers of inexperienced teachers and the subsequent differences of their professional capacities to collectively improve schools at the individual teacher level. School principals are charged with a wide array of leadership tasks that fall within both the managerial and leadership domains. Budgeting, staffing, and allocation of other resources are structural demands that require the attention of the principal and depend on quality decision-making in order to positively impact the school. While attending to these managerial functions, principals are also taxed with promoting improved instruction for all students. In addition to these two areas, the day-to-day work of principals requires them to engage with stakeholders and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all parties. The complexity of the principal's role calls for the identification of effective leadership styles and behaviors.

Leadership. A leader by definition is one who commands or directs an organization. Carroll and Levy (2008) characterize leadership as intangible while sharing that those in a position of leadership are typically provided greater access to self-esteem, well-being, significance and affirmation. Furthermore, their work separated these positive emotions from the reality of engaging in leadership behaviors by suggesting that the work of leaders is difficult to sustain. The challenge of leaders is also supported in Kuhnert & Lewis' (1987) statement that a leader's "influence cascades throughout the organization."

Schreuder, Groothoff, Jongsma, van Zweeden, van der Klink, and Roelen (2013) added that leadership is a “shared social dynamic determined by situations rather than individual traits.” In contrast to the definition of a manager that will be outlined below, a leader is easily distinguishable as the visionary of an organization.

Management. Functionally speaking, a manager bears the responsibility of administering all or part of an organization. Their day to day work is typically considered supervisory and labeled as a lower level of leadership (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). The traditional bureaucratic structures of organizations manifest the semantic complexities of differentiating between a leader and a manager while the literature supports managers being considered leaders. Along the same line of thinking is Carroll and Levy’s (2008) claim, “managers need to be adept, agile and reflexive in their capacity to move between management and leadership modes.” This description calls on an individual to do more than oversee and therefore managers should be considered to be a leader for the sake of the discussion at hand. These semantic articulations appear to be more closely related to whether or not an individual’s style is aligned with tasks or relationships.

Educational leadership. Within education, striking a balance of managerial and leadership behaviors is essential for achieving short-term accountability goals related to student achievement as well as developing and maintaining a cohesive staff for sustaining long-term organization goals. Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) identified instructional leadership as being three to four times more influential than just transformational leadership. Five dimensions of instructional leadership are posited within their study:

1. Establishing goals and expectations
2. Resourcing strategically

3. Planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum
4. Promoting and participating in teacher learning and development
5. Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment

More specifically, “the closer the educational leaders get to the core business of teaching and learning, the more likely they are to have a positive impact on students’ outcomes” (Robinson et al., 2008). Additionally, the dimensions suggest leader engagement in both the task and relationship realms.

Similarly, Hattie (2017) established three manners in which principals affect student performance. First, the position of principal itself was found to have an effect size of 0.32. The principal’s attention to school climate was also found to have an effect size of 0.32 while the principal’s attention to collective teacher efficacy generated an effect size of 1.57. These factors combined with the aforementioned dimensions support the need for leaders to be skilled in a variety of behaviors. A leader’s ability to collaborate, communicate, motivate, and organize clearly impact organizational success, but it is still not clear which behaviors are important in addressing the problem of teacher attrition.

In the context of teacher attrition, effective leadership behaviors should be contemplated for both student success and continuity of staffing. Rice (2014) found that effective teachers cited lack of support from the principal as a significant factor causing them to leave schools. Similarly, Podolsky et al. (2017) stated, “The quality of support from administrators is often the main factor that teachers identify as their reason for staying in or leaving the profession.” Also, Ingersoll (2001) identified administrative support as lowering turnover rates. The preponderance of evidence elucidates that teacher perception of their principal matters, therefore, further study of supportive leadership behaviors is necessary.

Statement of the Problem

Teacher attrition is disruptive to the functioning of schools. Boyd, Grossman, Ing, Lankford, Loeb, and Wyckoff (2011) frame the problem of teacher attrition as a disadvantage for students. Student disadvantage is exacerbated in schools serving larger populations of lower socioeconomic status and/or non-white students because these schools suffer from higher rates of teacher attrition (Bednar & Gicheva, 2016; Burkhauser, 2016; Torres, 2016). The subsequent recruitment, selection, and development cycle of new teachers contributes to the problem by constraining economic resources of schools and districts (Borman & Dowling 2008; Burkhauser, 2016; Callahan, 2016; Ingersoll, 2003; Ost & Schiman, 2015). Combined, the effects of teacher attrition inhibit schools from becoming effective promoters of student achievement.

Purpose of the Study

Research is beginning to emerge that suggests principal behavior is a key lever of successful school reform. Both Boyd et al. (2011) and Kraft et al. (2016) investigated the relationship between school working conditions and teacher career decisions. Interestingly, both sets of research identified school leadership as an important and salient factor in promoting teacher retention. Findings such as these are valuable in promoting the success of schools through the identification of key leadership behaviors and their corresponding impacts, yet the question of what must be done to improve school leadership is still largely unanswered.

A review of research from the Wallace Foundation suggests the promotion of a principal pipeline to prepare future school leaders could improve the outcomes for schools by defining clear standards, specifying preservice training, engaging in selective hiring and placement, and offering ongoing support and evaluation (Turnbull, B. J.,

Anderson, L. M., Riley, D. L., MacFarlane, J. R., & Aladjem, D. K., 2016). The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership is a discipline-specific leadership framework (Green, 2010). Green's framework is informed by multiple theories, school leadership standards, and research-based best practices that align with the principal pipeline initiative work described within the Wallace Foundation research.

The purpose of the study is to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of their school leader exhibiting behaviors informed by Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions. Additionally, the researcher will seek to control for (1) personal demographics, (2) professional demographics, and (3) content training in order to provide school leaders with specific information as it relates to these factors and the four dimensions.

Research Questions

Utilizing teacher responses to eight descriptive characteristics questions and twenty questions or statements aligned with Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, an analysis will be conducted with the following four research questions:

- 1) *What is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*
- 2) *Controlling for personal demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

- 3) *Controlling for professional demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*
- 4) *Controlling for content training of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

Definition of Terms

Career intention: A professional decision to remain in a school and/or district, transfer to another school and/or district, or leave the teaching profession entirely.

Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership- an educational leadership framework articulated by Dr. Reginald Leon Green

High School- A school serving students enrolled in grades nine through twelve

Leaver: A teacher who leaves the profession of education entirely without the intention of returning at a later time.

Leader/Principal behavior – The actions of the school leader in carrying out his or her daily functions and responsibilities.

Mover: A teacher who remains in the education profession but moves to another school or district.

Public Schools- Schools that operate primarily on public funding and generally have open enrollment

Teacher: A school-based individual who holds a valid teaching license and is employed full-time at a public school for the purpose of providing instruction.

Teacher Attrition: Phenomenon of teachers who leave the education profession for other employment.

Teacher Mobility: Phenomenon of teachers leaving one school for another school

Teacher Turnover: Phenomenon of schools and/or districts having to annually replace teachers due to teacher attrition and teacher mobility

Stayer: A teacher who remains in a school and/or in teaching.

Student achievement- Student performance as measured by standardized tests

Working conditions- A variety of elements of a school's culture and climate that are measured on perception surveys

Significance of the Study

This study is significant to the field of education in that it furthers the already robust body of research relating to teacher attrition. Specifically, this research study seeks to identify leader behaviors that promote not just a positive culture and climate, but one that encourages teachers to stay at their schools. An additional benefit of the study is the development of a better understanding of the relationship between principal leadership behavior and teachers' career intentions in order to aid school districts, universities, or other teacher preparation programs in strengthening their systems of support throughout the teacher and administrator pipelines.

Theoretical Framework

The proliferation of literature on leadership and the fact that schools continue to struggle meeting academic accountability mandates was the impetus for developing a framework for school leaders. In his 2010 work, The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership: A Framework for Leading 21st Century Schools, Dr. Reginald Leon Green detailed a conceptual framework that is informed by multiple theories, national school leadership standards, and research-based best practices. According to this framework, all

four of the dimensions should be working simultaneously if effective leadership is to be achieved. The four dimensions are characterized in the figure below:

<p>Understanding Self & Others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading with an understanding of self and others • Values, beliefs, strengths, and other personal aspects • Develops a foundation for leadership • Rooted in Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Theory and Herzberg’s 2-Factor Motivational Hygiene Theory 	<p>Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are multifaceted and complex open social systems • Structure of the school, its culture, climate and interaction of people • Leaders must focus on achieving outcomes while attending to diversity, fair processes, ethics, and removal of fear and intimidation
<p>Building Bridges through Relationships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish and nurture relationships between and among stakeholders • Considers how followers feel and how they respond to leadership in their commitment to achieving outcomes • Process for building a learning community 	<p>Engaging in Leadership Best Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical for advancing the organization from one level to another • Components include effective communication and quality decision-making

Figure 1. The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership

Green (2010) described his framework as one for school leaders to seek a delicate balance that “is situational, requiring the individual to have knowledge of the inner workings of an open social system and to become skilled in adapting to various environmental influences.” In the school workplace teachers have basic job duties and corresponding relational roles to students, parents, and colleagues. When considering the problem of teacher attrition using this framework, the interactions between the teacher and principal could be the most critical for examination. The 21st century principal is typically responsible for the day-to-day management of school operations and therefore has considerable influence over the content and structure of the school as a workplace microsystem.

Understanding Self and Others. The first dimension calls for a deep understanding of oneself as a leader as well as those under the leader's guidance. Green believes that achieving an understanding of oneself and others to be the foundation for effective leadership. Grounded in motivational theory research, the dimension places an importance on understanding the interaction of values, beliefs, and behavior. The essence of understanding self and others is achieving a balance of compliance and commitment and for school leaders to demonstrate the ability to balance organizational needs with the needs of the individuals with whom the organization interacts. The importance of relationships begins within this dimension and will be seen through discussion of the final three dimensions.

Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life. Within the second dimension describing organizational complexity, Green accounts for the variety of inputs and outputs of a school organization as an open social system. School outcomes are influenced by a number of external factors that are largely outside the locus of control of the leader, and these factors are what makes public schools complex. Despite facing these extraneous factors of the school's social system, effective school leaders are called to attend to the culture, climate, structure, and interaction of people with the organization. Once again, the importance of relationships is highlighted as school leaders strive to seek a balance of organizational and individual needs while working towards a shared vision of excellence.

Building Bridges through Relationships. A school leader's relationships are described within this dimension as a bridge and/or buffer between external and internal factors of the school organization. In a brief review of literature on principal-teacher

relationships, researchers have found that the attitudes of principals and teachers develop an atmosphere for learning that either positively or negatively impacts the effectiveness of a school (Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Edgeron & Kritsonis, 2006; Price, 2012). For these to occur, both principals and teachers need to be satisfied in their roles while perceiving their team as cohesive and committed to the mission of the organization. This dimension emphasizes the need for leaders to be aware of how people are treated for the purpose of promoting each individual's engagement in the pursuit of the school's mission.

Engaging in Leadership Best Practices. This is the final dimension in which Green takes a pragmatic view of what leadership behaviors or proximal processes are most effective within public schools. Effective communication and quality decision-making are the cornerstones of the dimension. The diversity of challenges that public schools face requires leaders to identify the appropriate practices for improving conditions in their unique settings. The best practices characterized within the dimension state that effective school leaders will be able to establish and communicate a shared vision for student success and successfully engage stakeholders in the process for attaining the vision of excellence. As with the other three dimensions, the relationship of the school leader with all stakeholders is critically examined.

Combined, the four dimensions offer school leaders practical strategies for improving schools that are grounded in research-based leadership theory. The problem of teacher attrition requires an examination of proximal processes, both direct and indirect, that occur within public schools through consideration of Green's four-dimensional

model for educational leadership due to a lack of literature that is specific to 21st century school leadership.

Assumptions

Evidence has been found in the research literature that supports the importance of the relationship between leadership behaviors and teacher career intentions. Three assumptions are made in regards to this study: (1) there is a relationship between teacher career intentions and the behavior of the school leader; (2) Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership informs effective school leader behavior for principals, and (3) if principals exhibit behavior informed by Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, the rate of teacher retention will be enhanced.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to high school teachers in five suburban districts in the Southeastern United States who opted to complete the survey. The data analyses are based on teachers' responses to twenty perceptual questions and eight descriptive questions. Because the survey relies on teachers' perceptions, the actual working conditions are not known. Perceptual data is also limited by emotional states of the respondents at a particular point in time.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 includes an introduction to the study. The chapter includes a statement of the problem, significance of the study, the purpose of the study, limitations, assumptions, research questions, definition of terms, and a summary.

Chapter 2 consists of a review of literature as it relates to previous teacher retention research. The chapter is organized into four sections: one for each of the four dimensions of the conceptual framework. Each dimension will be characterized and then supported with the existing literature. The chapter will conclude with a summary and purpose statement as to why this study is relevant to furthering teacher retention research.

Chapter 3 focuses on the methodology used to conduct the study. To analyze the data, the study used a description of participants, instrumentation, research questions, procedures, data collection, data analysis, and limitations.

Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the data and findings of the study. The analysis will include tables and narrative explanations of the results.

Chapter 5 includes the following: (a) the discussion and implications of findings, (b) the relationship of the study to prior research, (c) implications of limitations, (d) recommendations for practice, (e) recommendations for future research, and (f) a conclusion.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Public education needs effective teachers and leaders in order to be successful. Unfortunately, retaining effective teachers continues to inhibit continuous improvement within schools and districts across the United States. Researchers have spent decades studying teacher attrition and uncovered many contributing yet merely descriptive factors such as student body demographics, geographic settings, and socioeconomic status (Burkhauser, 2016; Holme, J.J. et al. 2018; Ingersoll, 2001). Other studies have been able to utilize perceptual data that indicates a relationship between how teachers view their working conditions and their career decisions (Bednar & Gicheva, 2016; Kraft et al., 2016). Sometimes included within the definition of working conditions is the concept of principal leadership and support. The challenge within the existing literature has been the inability to connect the problem of teacher attrition and school leadership as a function of the broader educational system.

“The complex issue of teacher retention requires leaders to go beyond traditional linear approaches, mechanistic thinking, and short-term narrow solutions and to make system level changes” (Minarik, M. M., Thornton, B., & Perreault, G., 2003). A framework undergirded by systems thinking could offer educational reformers a window of opportunity to move away from the traditional approaches of reductionism that breakdown and compartmentalize problems. Kraft et al. (2016) supports an emphasis of systems thinking by reminding policymakers that the work of educators cannot be viewed within a vacuum. *The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership* (Green 2010) is a discipline-specific lens through which the relationship of teacher attrition and school leadership can be conceptualized. A better understanding of teachers as educational consumers and school leadership behaviors will add to the existing research.

The four sections that follow frame the existing literature on the problem of teacher attrition through the lens of the individual dimensions of Green's educational model of leadership. This literature review uses previous research that articulates the contributing factors of teacher attrition while validating the relevance of the conceptual framework for this research study. Each section will open with a brief description of the dimension and then support those characteristics with existing research. This chapter will close with a summary of the literature and a call to action for this research study to add to the existing body of work.

Dimension 1: Understanding Self and Others

The first dimension of Green's educational model of leadership is the foundation of effective leader behavior. Without first building this foundation, leaders run the risk of navigating their role without unity of purpose or commitment from followers. Leaders are charged with two intricately intertwined tasks: understanding themselves and understanding others. Leaders are called to develop a deep understanding of their personal beliefs and values while simultaneously recognizing how their followers' beliefs and values interact and possibly compete. "We know who we are only as a result of relationships—with ourselves and with others." (Minarik et al, 2003).

In articulating *Understanding Self and Others*, Green (2010) directs leader's attention to motivational theory and tools for assessing temperament and personality. Heeding to the underpinnings of these theories, leaders position themselves to increase self-efficacy and the readiness vital to accepting responsibility for the success of an organization. As the foundation of self-understanding is established, leaders then shift focus to understanding those within their care. Organizational effectiveness is a result of

the leader's aptitude at having followers who are both compliant and committed. Successful implementation of this first dimension will create a culture and climate typified by focus and trust. Torres (2016) supports the importance of the first dimension by stating that "trust revolves around an understanding of role obligations and one's expectations for other people" (p. 70).

As a part of understanding others and in an effort to further understand teacher turnover, the perspective of the teacher as an educational consumer should be investigated. Furthermore, much of the literature has worked to identify factors that lead to job dissatisfaction and ultimately push teachers out of the profession. Examining the individual perspective of teachers who stay could provide school leaders and policymakers with valuable, actionable information that could lead to improved job satisfaction and organizational commitment manifesting itself in the form of teacher retention. Specifically, it seems increasingly relevant for educational leaders to develop an understanding of themselves and how their personal leadership behaviors interact with an understanding of the teachers with whom they work.

An important question to answer within the existing literature is whether or not teachers from a variety of backgrounds or working in different contexts desire the same type of supports or incentives in order to be satisfied and remain in their positions. One study in particular found leader behavior and organizational structures that improved working conditions to have the greatest impact on teacher retention regardless of a teacher's certification path or school context (Greenlee & Brown, 2009). Greenlee & Brown's (2009) research sought to debunk four myths: (a) financial incentives entice teachers to stay (b) effective teachers get the job done no matter what (c) incentives that

entice some teachers will entice all (d) individual teachers can fix schools. The evidence from their study over and over again supports the need for principals to avoid one-size-fits all approaches when it comes to solving the problem of teacher attrition. Moreover, leaders should tap into their knowledge of motivational theory while seeking to create a positive culture and conditions that enhance the staff desire's and willingness to focus energy on achieving educational excellence.

To the point of playing on motivational theory, another facet of understanding teachers as consumers within the system of education is that of efficacy, both self and collective. Understanding the impact of teacher belief systems on organizational outcomes is critical for leaders as they seek to develop a school climate characterized by educational success (Kilinç, 2013). The challenge leaders face when assessing collective teacher efficacy is that often teachers within the same school will report very different levels of efficacy (McCoach & Colbert, 2010). Seemingly, this supports the elements of the first dimensions as the evidence points out to the need to understand individual teacher perspectives. McCoach and Colbert (2010) note that “even teachers within the same school may require differential intervention or professional development” (p. 43). Therefore, school principals must make efforts to better align the expectations of the organization and the expectations of the individuals within the school.

An emerging area of interest for educational researchers is the impact of generational differences and alternative pathways such as Teach for America (TFA) on teacher career decisions. Generational studies on *Millennials* (born between 1983 and 1994) and *Gen Zs* (born between 1995 and 1999) have found long-term commitments to an organization to be a thing of the past. For instance, a recent Deloitte Survey (2018)

reported that 43% of *Millennials* planned to change jobs or professions within two years. When asked if they intended to stay longer than five years, just 28% of *Millennials* stated they would. The data is even more bleak for *Gen Zs*. Sixty-one percent of them expect a job or profession change within two years and a mere 12% envision themselves lasting longer than five years. Generational studies such as this make the case for school leaders to take into consideration the changing career perspectives of those individuals entering the teaching profession.

Alternative pathway programs such as TFA recruit individuals to the field of education and typically aid urban districts in staffing schools that suffer from chronic turnover and limited applicant pools. TFA utilizes a two-year commitment structure with financial incentives to lure recent college graduates into the profession. Heineke, Mazza, and Tichnor-Wagner (2014) applied mixed methods to study how the two-year commitment impacted TFA corps members' long-term career decisions. TFA members were categorized as leavers, lingerers, and lasters. Leavers left following the two-year commitment, lingerers stayed at least one year longer but did not identify as making a long-term commitment, and lasters stayed beyond the commitment and articulated a long-term commitment to the profession. The results of the study found that one out of four leavers did so simply because the two-year commitment had run its course. One out of five lingerers also left because the commitment was short-term and only stayed longer than two years while they solidified their future endeavors. Lasters, however, indicated they stayed in the profession because they had become disillusioned with TFA and felt compelled to make a difference within the educational environment. Once again,

conflicting expectations of the organization and the individual play an influential role in career decisions.

The aforementioned research on teacher attrition has identified differences among teachers as individuals as having an impact on their career decisions. Considering the characteristics of the first dimension demand attention to understanding others, it remains evident that the teacher as an individual should be contemplated by educational leaders during the teacher attrition problem-solving process. All individual factors, from teacher preparation to age to personality type to belief systems, should be examined. The necessity of developing an understanding of self and others will continually appear in the sections that follow.

Dimension 2: Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life

School organizational life is a complex interaction of climate, culture, and people. All schools are different, and this is what creates the complexity school leaders must navigate in order to successfully move their organizations towards accomplishing their stated goals. Differences among schools can be found in the varying external and internal environments, the experiences and values stakeholders carry with them, and lastly the purpose and processes in which the school engages. Green (2010) urges school leaders to be cognizant of four areas that reflect their behavior: (a) respect for diversity (b) principles of fair process (c) ethical behavior and (d) removal of fear and intimidation from the schoolhouse. Acknowledgment that schools function as open social systems is critical as school leaders juggle organizational and individual needs while seeking a shared vision of excellence.

The aforementioned characteristics of the second dimension charge school leaders with the task of engaging in systems thinking. “Viewing a teacher solely within the education community is a Newtonian approach, and if the school’s retention strategies reflect this same philosophy, then the principal has failed to take into account the complexity of the individual and the system” (Minarik et al., 2003). Kraft et al. (2016) echo the call for systems thinking by describing the challenge in this way: “teachers do not work in a vacuum; their schools’ organizational contexts can undermine or enhance their ability to succeed with students” (p. 1439). Failure to acknowledge the complexity of the social system in which schools function will limit the quality of school leaders’ problem-solving ability and create a myriad of unconnected solutions to daily challenges. An examination of literature related to working conditions and administrative support is critical to better understanding teacher attrition.

Working Conditions. “When teachers decide whether to continue teaching or to leave, the school environment plays a large role” (Brown & Wynn, 2007). Boldly stated, this proposition is fundamental to understanding teacher attrition. Throughout the research on teacher attrition, the idea of working conditions contributing to teacher attrition is well-stated and identifies a range of areas for consideration (Burkhauser, 2016; Campoli, 2017; Darling-Hammond, 2003; Podolsky et al., 2017; Struyven & Vanthournout, 2014). Additionally, more than half of all leavers in 2012-2013 reported their new work environments to be better than when they were teaching (Goldring et al., 2014). The prominence of data related to teacher perceptions of their workplace culture and climate and its impact on their career decisions sets the stage for researchers to identify leader behavior within these working conditions that influences teacher attrition.

School Contexts. Possibly the most challenging aspect of working conditions is factors largely outside of the school leader's locus of control: school contextual factors (Bednar & Gicheva, 2016; Burkhauser, 2016; Holme, J.J. et al. 2018; Ingersoll, 2001; Ladd, 2009; Torres, 2016). Contexts that have been studied have been geographic location, socioeconomic opportunities, percentage of minority students, student discipline rates, student achievement, and the availability of necessary resources. Many of these characteristics overlap with one another and compound the problem of not only teacher attrition but also the teacher applicant pool as these conditions can make some schools undesirable for a teacher to even consider employment. Due to the ample research and inability of school leaders to substantively change most of these factors, it is important to shift attention to research on working conditions that can possibly be manipulated to improve teacher retention rates.

Beginning Teachers. In attempting to understand why early-stage educators leave the profession at such high rates, research has been conducted to better describe typical work environments. "Novice teachers are often given difficult classes, annoying tasks, and have to prove themselves continuously in order to get recognition for their work and positive assessments in order to receive a permanent position, if available, in the long run" (Struyven & Vanthournout, 2014). Conceivably, assertions such as these are realities for early career teachers across America and create a logical explanation for teacher attrition during the first few years of a teacher's career.

Additionally damning for new teachers, Borman & Dowling (2008) note that the education profession has yet to develop a "systematic way to induct beginners gradually into a highly complex job" (p. 397). Of the beginning teachers who left after their first

year, approximately 18% did not participate in an induction program and almost 19% did not participate in a mentoring program (Ingersoll, 2003). Callahan (2016) contends teacher attrition can be mitigated through the implementation of effective induction programs that increase teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. While citing the economic benefits of robust support systems for new teachers, Podolsky et al. (2017) propose that school districts utilize Federal funds as a part of the Every Student Succeeds Act to create induction programs for beginning teachers. The literature on beginning teacher attrition articulates an area of focus for school leaders and adds to the complexity of the problem.

Workload. Teacher workload is also a strong predictor of teacher turnover yet can be alleviated when teachers perceive working conditions and school leadership to be strong (Goldring et al., 2014; Torres, 2016). Workload is a factor that can be described in a variety of manners. Possibly the most fundamental form of workload is that of instructional planning and teaching assignment. Ost & Schiman (2015) were able to identify the reassignment of teachers within the first six years of experience to new grade levels or content areas to be predictive of teacher turnover. Highly effective teachers stay at their schools when their instructional time is protected, when they are provided ample planning time, and they are not overwhelmed with duties unrelated to instruction (Pratt & Booker, 2014).

Teacher attrition research investigating the quality of working conditions is typically limited by the inability of researchers to identify actual working conditions due to the reliance on perceptual data. However, the imbedded bias within such studies on working conditions supports the reasoning that a psychological contract exists between

teachers and their school as an organization. The concept of the psychological contract could be simply explained as a mismatch of personal expectations that teachers bring into their workplace microsystem. Principals have been identified as a key lever in improving teachers' perceptions of their work environment and ultimately their career intentions (Burkhauser, 2016; Eranil & Özbilen, 2017).

Administrative support. “The quality of support from administrators is often the main factor that teachers identify as their reason for staying in or leaving the profession” (Podlosky et al., 2017). Fleshing out the nuances of the psychological contract between principals and teachers is paramount to defining this notion of administrative support. How teachers view their principals influences their job satisfaction, and when job satisfaction goes unaddressed by the principal, attrition rates rise. Ingersoll (2001) cites that 52% movers and leavers did so due to job dissatisfaction. When these statistics were further analyzed, 38% of movers and 30% leavers attributed their dissatisfaction to poor administrative support. Borman and Dowling (2008) propose that less bureaucracy within schools and districts would create conditions in which principals could offer genuine support that may improve retention.

Conceptually, administrative support is a broad topic that can be viewed as being composed of individual constructs. A few examples of constructs that have been found to promote positive teacher perceptions are shared decision-making, collaboration, modeling high expectations, working to reduce teacher isolation, visibility, and having an open door (Brown & Wynn, 2007). Torres (2016) conversely proposes that school leaders should not treat administrative support as a series of individual parts, but instead promote trust as a unifying theory. The importance of trust for strengthening relationships will be

further discussed in the forthcoming section on the third dimension. Regardless of how the concept of support is viewed, there are multiple teacher attrition studies that have found that more supportive environments are more likely to retain teachers (Bednar & Gicheva, 2016; Brown & Wynn, 2007; Campoli, 2017; Eranil & Özbilen, 2017).

The abundance of literature supporting leader behavior as described in the second dimension should not be underestimated, yet engaging in systems thinking requires leaders to consider the interactions of all factors. One factor that permeated many of the findings on teacher attrition was the quality of teacher—principal relationship. As with working conditions, individual perceptions drive the understanding of this dynamic. The third dimension and its corresponding research highlights the necessity for leaders to attend to relationships in and among the school, but particularly relevant for understanding the teacher—principal relationship.

Dimension 3: Building Bridges through Relationships

The third dimension narrows the focus of the leader to the importance of the relationships within and among the school’s social system. “Not only do many principals fail to address key issues within the school system internally, but they also fail to promote the development of relationships in the external community” (Minarik et al., 2003). Green (2010) concurs and goes on to state that “organizational effectiveness is enhanced by the combined skills, strengths, and unique attributes that exist as a result of the building of solid relationships” (p. 132). Generally, leaders should be giving consideration to how people are treated and the observed levels of commitment in achieving goals. Many types of relationships exist within an organization, yet a few are of

particular interest within this dimension: (a) principal—teacher (b) teacher—teacher (c) teacher—student and (d) school—community.

The principal-teacher relationship is important to consider as the problem of teacher attrition is addressed. As previously mentioned during the discussion of working conditions, this relationship can be characterized as the principal and teacher engaging in a psychological contract. “For this relationship to be effective, teachers have to perceive that their leader is competent, honest, committed, possesses integrity, and will lead using processes that are fair, affording dignity and respect to all followers” (Green, 2010). Green (2010) and Torres (2016) further argue the quality of teachers’ perceptions of their leaders is highly predictive of their overall job satisfaction. Quality relationships can result in high levels of trust and consequently, long-term commitment.

Trust. Throughout the current review of literature, the concept of trust has emerged as important for examination. Sinek (2009) makes a clear argument that “trust is a feeling, not a rational experience” (p.84). Trust is furthered described as a balance of why, how, and what. *Why* is best explained as a belief that an individual holds while *how* is the set of actions a person engages in while trying to achieve the *why*. The results of the *how* is described as the *what*. Communicating and demonstrating that you share the same values and beliefs is the pathway to earning trust (Sinek, 2009). Once again, the call for understanding one’s self and others from the first dimension permeates the other dimensions of Green’s model of educational leadership. While Sinek described trust from a conceptual standpoint, it is also important to understand trust within the context of the school environment.

In *Trust Matters*, Tschannen-Moran (2014) promote trust as a leverage point for leadership in successful schools. Trust is described as a paradox in that it acts as both glue and lubricant. A trusting school has teachers who are bound together while it simultaneously has systems in place that facilitate effective communication and confidence in one another. Principals are identified as the promoters of a school culture that “emphasizes cooperation and caring rather than competition and favoritism (p. 151). A recent study on supportive principals and teacher turnover reported that a teacher with a higher staff bond was two times more likely to stay than teachers with lower staff bonds (Campoli, 2017).

A recent qualitative study on teacher turnover in No Excuse Charter Schools found that school leadership and trust are two strong predictors of teacher turnover (Torres, 2016). The teacher interviews conducted revealed that teacher trust was broken through implicit high expectations and failure of the leader to appropriately recognize the efforts of teachers. At times, what teachers believed to be extra efforts were deemed as the status quo. While teachers stated an appreciation for their leadership’s high expectations, the lack of clarity around what was expected coupled with some unrealistic aspects of expectations led to turnover as principal—teacher and teacher—teacher bonds began breaking down. The evidence from this study supports school leaders attending to relationships as a means for promoting teacher retention and that as trusting relationships are developed, principals should observe greater levels of commitment.

Organizational commitment behaviors. The evidence within studies on trust implies that teachers are more likely to commit to organizations in which high levels of trust exist. Like trust, commitment can be viewed in a variety of manners. Some may say

that commitment is a tangible action that is easily observable through checklist types of assessment. Others might suggest that commitment is a mixture of direct actions coupled with intrinsic motivation to be a part of something greater than one's self. Luckily, there is existing literature on the organizational commitment behaviors (OCB) and their impact on teacher job satisfaction and teacher retention.

OCB might best be defined as behaviors that individuals engage in that are above and beyond expectations. Studies have shown that organizational effectiveness is promoted where OCB is observed (Sesen & Basim, 2012; Somech, 2016). Both studies suggest organizations with observable OCB are able to better facilitate their core work, individuals within the organization are more coordinated, and that a climate exists in which individuals are bound together due to socio-emotional support. Going above and beyond the call of duty is likely to be promoted by leaders, but the question set forth in both OCB studies reviewed sought to investigate the return on investment of leaders making such demands of their teams.

Somech (2016) conducted a study to understand what stressors are associated with OCB and what factors might moderate those stressors. The theoretical underpinnings connect back to dimension one and its reliance on motivational theory. Three stressors were identified as contributing to teacher strain within individuals who demonstrated OCB: (a) role ambiguity (b) role overload and (c) role conflict. Somech's (2016) findings differentiate between commitment to an individual and commitment to an organization. Commitment to individuals was more positive and no significant link to teacher strain was found. Commitment to the organization was found to be a source of stress, likely because of perceived pressure from leadership.

The second study reviewed also distinguished between OCB at the individual and organizational level. OCB at the individual level are categorized as reflecting altruism or conscientiousness while OCB at the organizational level are classified as courtesy, civic virtue, or sportsmanship. Sesen and Basim (2012) researched the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB and found statistically positive relationships among all variables. The implications of their findings support the notion that school leaders must attend to the school climate in order to increase job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and OCB. If the conditions of such a climate are present, OCB are likely to directly benefit students through extra efforts on the part of the teachers.

The combination of the two studies discussed above coupled with Torres' (2016) work on relational trust appear to be complimentary of one another. All three works promote an environment grounded in teachers trusting their leadership with the eventual outcome of highly committed individuals who are bound together. Principals should promote OCB while also creating an environment that develops a sense of control and ownership among teachers (Somech, 2016). If principals place undue importance on OCB, then they run the risk of causing more stress and job burnout (Sesen & Basim, 2012). "Principals must be savvy about the potential pitfalls and work toward building trusting relationships with and between teachers if they hope to create more sustainable schools" (Torres, 2016).

A summation of the importance of the third dimension can found in the following quote from Simon Sinek's (2009) book *Start with Why*:

People who love going to work are more productive and more creative. They go home happier and have happier families. They treat their colleagues and clients

and customers better. Inspired employees make for stronger companies and stronger economies.

This quote provides a pragmatic perspective about the importance of the third dimension.

In short, relationships promote effectiveness. A connected web of employees within the organization will be able to realize visions of excellence (Minarek et al., 2003). A remaining challenge for leaders to take into account is the process of identifying and enacting the most effective practices for building effective schools.

Dimension 4: Engaging in Leadership Best Practices

The proverbial *last but not least* might be an appropriate opening for a description of the final dimension of Engaging in Leadership Best Practices. The three aforementioned dimensions merge to develop a pragmatic framework for effective school leaders as they pursue educational excellence. Green (2010) articulates 13 core competencies that inform leader behavior and aid them in engaging in best practices:

1. Visionary Leadership
2. Unity of Purpose
3. Learning Community
4. Instructional Leadership
5. Curriculum and Instruction
6. Professional Development
7. Organizational Management
8. Assessment
9. Reflection
10. Collaboration
11. Diversity
12. Inquiry
13. Professionalism

Within this framework, effective instructional leaders are called to be drivers of change, effective communicators, quality decision-makers, and managers of conflict. The unique challenge of this dimensions lies within the leader's ability to identify the appropriate situations in which to utilize best practices. Crane and Green (2013) studied

the 13 core competencies and were able to support previous research on effective leadership, stating that “school leaders possess skills used to forge collaborative relationships with their teachers” (p. 49). An additional study of the 13 core competencies conducted by Ross and Cozzens (2016), reported “that the competencies were connected such that they directly influenced the school’s climate” (p. 171). The essence of the final dimensions is the identification and implementation of those skills.

Instructional leadership. “Effective leaders facilitate the application of current knowledge in learning and human development. They are able to use data to make instructional program decisions that meet the needs of all students” (Green, 2010). While not necessarily a universal belief, the notion that the primary function of schools is to promote student achievement is widely agreed upon among educators. The question that is often most debated is what factors best promote student achievement. Leithwood et al. (2004) put it most succinctly: “It turns out that leadership not only matters; it is second only to teaching among school-related factors in its impact on student learning.” In light of this evidence, it is no wonder *Instructional Leadership* is one of the 13 Core Competencies of effective school leaders.

Robinson et al. (2008) utilized meta-analysis as they worked to close the gap on research supporting the impact of leadership on student outcomes. The study compared styles of leadership (Transformational, Instructional, and other) and their subsequent impact on student outcomes. The reported mean effect sizes were strongest with Instructional Leadership. In fact, the mean effect size of Instructional Leadership was found to be almost four times higher than that of Transformational Leadership. The authors do give caution to running with their analysis in and of itself, but go on to urge

leaders to be involved in teaching and learning activities in order to develop a deep understanding of how teachers are working to improve outcomes.

Connecting the problem of teacher attrition with the value of Instructional Leadership is important for establishing the legitimacy of the fourth dimension. Drawing on the research surrounding the necessity of administrative support, multiple studies have noted teachers stay at schools where principals are able to provide support in the areas of curriculum, professional learning, and other avenues connecting to teaching and learning (Greenlee & Brown, 2009; Ingersoll, 2001; Kraft et al., 2016; Kiliç, 2013; Rice, 2014). Collectively, the research describes effective schools being filled with connected educators engaged in communities of learning under the leadership of their principal.

Communication. School leaders engage in communication as a part of their daily responsibilities. The gamut of communication involves speaking and listening, writing emails and reports, promoting the school through media outlets, and even implicit behaviors that send messages. How and what expectations are communicated plays a pivotal role in organizational effectiveness. “Consequently, the manner in which expectations are communicated or understood by staff disrupted the social fabric that is essential to creating schools where teachers are more likely to stay” (Torres, 2016). Becoming an effective communicator is therefore important to maintain organizational cohesion.

A key facet of effective communication is the ability of the leader to influence stakeholders in and among the organization. Visionary Leadership, another of Green’s (2010) 13 Core Competencies, speaks to the need for values to be communicated and when done well, stakeholders are influenced and inspired. The previous discussion on

trust demonstrated the potential value to the organization as a whole and Tschannen-Moran (2014) propose that both the quantity and quality of communication is important in establishing trust. Returning to the discussion on teacher attrition, research focused on evaluating the impact of working conditions has repeatedly mentioned the principal's levels of communication as an indicator of teacher job satisfaction (Burkhauser, 2016; Crane & Green, 2013; Rice, 2014; Ross & Cozzens, 2016).

In their study of push and hold factors, Rice (2014) suggested that principals ensure there are “channels of communication” (p. 323) present in order to retain staff. As a means to create open lines of communication with teachers, the need for feedback mechanisms to be in place for principals is supported throughout other research discussions (Burkhauser, 2016; Campoli, 2017; Torres, 2016b). One practical example provided by Torres (2016b) of such mechanisms to employ is “including staff in conversations about improving working conditions” (p. 905). This appears logical and supported by other research such as Ingersoll's (2001) in which he found 31% of movers and leavers attributed their dissatisfaction to lack of faculty influence. Another form of communication that could prove valuable is feedback to teachers (Pratt & Booker, 2014). Interestingly, feedback to teachers is another form of Instructional Leadership.

The fourth dimension highlights the overall challenge of today's school leaders. The skills associated with successful leadership are complex and demand that the person attend to both managerial and leadership attributes. The complexity implicit in this dimension further advances the idea that systems thinking is essential to promoting educational centers of excellence. Should school leaders be able to combine the behaviors

described within the four dimensions, a stable staff of effective teachers could be established in order to achieve the organization's vision of educational excellence.

Summary

The nagging issue of teacher attrition is worth investigating in order to provide educational reformers with more nuanced rationales for both the problems and solutions that have been previously proposed. "Teacher retention cannot be understood as a function of the individual components because there are synergistic effects across the whole system" (Minarik et al., 2003). Green's model of educational leadership offers researchers the opportunity to conceptualize problems within the broader social system of education. The possible benefits of further study regarding the impact of school leadership behaviors on teacher attrition are important to success of public education. Specifically, this study seeks to identify which, if any, leadership behaviors across the four dimensions of Green's model of educational leadership demonstrate the propensity to reduce teacher attrition. Teacher perceptions of their school leaders' behavior will be utilized in an effort to understand how teachers are educational consumers and subsequently make decisions related to their career intentions.

Chapter Three

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of their school leader exhibiting behaviors informed by Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions. Additionally, the researcher controlled for (1) personal demographics, (2) professional demographics, and (3) content training in order to provide school leaders with specific information as it relates to these factors and the four dimensions. Utilizing teacher responses to eight descriptive characteristics questions and twenty questions or statements aligned with Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership multiple statistical analyses were conducted with the following four research questions guiding the work:

- 1) *What is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*
- 2) *Controlling for personal demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*
- 3) *Controlling for professional demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

- 4) *Controlling for content training of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

The present chapter continues with an explanation of the general methodology employed in this study—specifically, Pearson correlational analysis and hierarchal multiple regression of survey data. The research design is described in regards to the sample and population, context, instrumentation, variables, and hypothesis. The final section provides a discussion of the statistical analyses employed and a closing summary.

Research Design

Quantitative methods were used to measure the relationship between teachers' perception of their principal's behavior, as informed by Green's model of educational leadership, and the teachers' stated career decision. Furthermore, personal and professional demographics were collected to further analyze the relationships between leader behavior and teacher career decisions. Following the survey data collection, the analyses were run using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to answer each of the four research questions.

Sample & Research Population. The population of interest for this research study was high school teachers currently teaching in five high schools found in the Southeastern United States. The surveyed high schools were chosen using convenience sampling based upon their geographic location being in proximity to the researcher and holding similar compositions with one another. Additionally, convenience sampling was employed in an effort to capture a larger number of responses and subsequently better

represent the population of high school teachers. The survey instrument included personal and professional demographic questions that were used as covariates in the analyses. Prior to the administration of the survey, the researcher obtained approval to conduct research from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Memphis and from each of the governing school districts in which the high schools operate. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics of the sample population.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample at the Individual Level (N = 223)

Characteristic	<i>f</i>	%
Gender		
Male	80	35.9
Female	142	63.7
Unspecified	1	0.4
Racial Classification		
White	204	91.5
Black/African-American	11	4.9
Hispanic	1	0.4
Asian	1	0.4
Multi-Racial	2	0.9
Other	3	1.3
Unspecified	1	0.4
Age		
22-30	22	9.9
31-40	63	28.3
41 and older	137	61.4
Unspecified	1	0.4
Years of Experience		
First Year	3	1.3
2-5 Years	26	11.7
6-10 Years	48	21.5
11 or more	146	65.5
Years of School		
First Year	13	5.8
2-5 Years	100	44.8
6-10 Years	32	14.3
11 or more	77	34.5
Unspecified	1	0.4

Table 1 Continued

Content Area		
English	39	17.5
Mathematics	31	13.9
Science	26	11.7
Social Studies/Humanities	36	16.1
Special Education	23	10.3
Fine Arts	15	6.7
CTE	34	15.2
Other	19	8.5
Pre-Service Training		
Traditional	171	76.7
Alternative Licensure	52	23.7

Research Context. Previous studies have been conducted using Green’s model of educational leadership and its relationship with other factors such as student achievement and teacher job satisfaction. In an unpublished dissertation, Farris (2018) studied the relationship between teacher job satisfaction, teacher retention, and Green’s model. This study compared in design yet differed in two significant ways. First, the data was collected through the administration of a survey to current high school teachers while Farris (2018) conducted an analysis of secondary data. Secondly, the present study only sought to measure the relationship between teacher perception of leader behavior and teacher career decisions rather than including teacher job satisfaction.

Data Collection. Data was electronically collected using *Qualtrics*, a web-based survey collection software. The survey measured the extent to which teachers perceive their principal engaging in behaviors aligned to the four dimensions of Green’s educational model of leadership and teacher career decisions. Additionally, respondents were asked to provide descriptive information regarding their personal and professional demographics.

Instrumentation. A three-part questionnaire will be used to collect teacher responses. Part one consisted solely of consent to participate in the study. Part two included eight demographic questions: (1) gender (2) age (3) race/ethnicity (4) years of experience (5) years at current school (6) content area (7) type of pre-service teacher training (8) career intentions. The responses to the first seven questions served as covariates for the analyses while the responses to question eight served as the outcome or dependent variable. The final section of the questionnaire consisted of twenty items aligned with Green's model of educational leadership and serve as the independent variable. The following sections discuss the validity and reliability of the twenty items.

Validity and Reliability. The twenty items included on part two of the questionnaire were self-selected by Green himself. Previous studies have utilized the same twenty items and their validity and reliability were reported within their methodology. Farris (2018) reported "a review of these statistics indicates that each scale exhibits a level of reliability far above minimum levels of acceptability ($\alpha \geq .70$) (p. 50). To further assess the reliability of the twenty items, the researcher conducted an inter-rater reliability survey.

Inter-Rater Reliability. To assess the reliability of the survey questions intended to gauge teacher perception of their leader's behavior as informed by Green's model of educational leadership, the researcher employed peer debriefing by surveying four doctoral candidates, two professors, and three practicing school administrators. The twenty questions selected by Green as measuring characteristics of the four dimensions were entered into the survey and respondents were asked to rate the quality of each question or statement on a three-point likert type scale: (1) bad (2) neutral (3) great. The

peer debriefing means and standard deviations are reported for each dimension as a whole and also by individual question within Table 2.

Table 2
*Inter-rater Reliability Means and Standard Deviations at the Item
 and Dimension level (N = 9)*

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. The faculty and leadership have a shared vision.	2.78	0.63
2. Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.	2.67	0.47
3. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.	2.56	0.68
4. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.	2.78	0.41
5. Provided supports (i.e., instructional coaching, PLCs, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.	2.11	0.31
Dimension 1	2.57	0.25
1. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.	2.22	0.91
2. Teachers have adequate space to work productively.	2.67	0.67
3. The physical environment of classrooms in this school supports teaching and learning.	2.78	0.63
4. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect.	2.78	0.42
5. Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.	2.89	0.31

Table 2 Continued

Dimension 2	2.67	0.23
1. This school maintains clear, two-way communication with parents/guardians and the community.	2.56	0.83
2. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.	2.78	0.41
3. Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles.	2.78	0.41
4. Professional development provides teachers with strategies to involve families and other community members as active partners.	2.67	0.67
5. Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.	2.67	0.67
Dimension 3	2.69	0.08
1. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials.	2.78	0.63
2. The school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning.	2.33	0.82
3. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.	2.67	0.67
4. The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.	2.56	0.68
5. Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.	2.77	0.63
Dimension 4	2.62	0.17
All Dimensions	2.63	0.20

Based upon these results, three items held a mean score less than 2.50.

Consideration was then given to how the questions were constructed in the aggregate.

The twenty questions were not designed to stand alone, but rather function as a part of a scale measuring the totality of each dimension. Given the previously stated reliability levels and the scale construction of the questions, it was determined to utilize all twenty questions despite the inter-rater reliability scores.

Variables

In order to answer all four research questions at hand, it was necessary to delineate independent, dependent, and covariables for this research study. In general terms, the present study sought to identify leader behaviors that influence teacher career decisions. Leader behavior as measured by teacher perception on the twenty items in part three of the questionnaire served as the independent variable and teacher career decisions served as the dependent variable. Covariates were also examined to deepen the understanding of the relationship. The following sections further described the variables of this study in more detail.

Independent Variable. Responses to twenty survey questions corresponding to the four dimensions of Green's model of educational leadership served as the independent variable for this research study. Each dimension was assessed with five individual questions. In an effort to answer the first research question, the analyses measured the relationships of individual questions, individual dimensions, and the model as a whole. At the individual level, specific leader behavior was analyzed while entire dimensions were also judged for strength within categories of leader behavior. Lastly, the entire model in the aggregate was measured for its impact on teacher career decisions.

Dependent Variable. Stated teacher career intentions served as the variable of interest for this study and was categorized in three ways: (1) stayers (2) movers (3) leavers. These three levels of teacher career decisions represent the predominant manner in which previous research has sought to describe teacher attrition. In addition to examining the range of teacher responses, these levels allowed for a deeper analysis of relationship with the perceived leader behavior.

Covariates. The first research question intended to measure the overall relationship between leader behavior and teacher career decision. The remaining three questions set forth to develop an understanding of various teacher characteristics and whether or not these characteristics influence teacher career decisions. The inclusion of covariates enabled the researcher to control for factors such as age, experience, and content area. Lastly, the covariables support suggestions for future studies on the topic of teacher attrition.

Data Analysis

For each of the four research questions, correlational and hierarchical multiple regression analyses were employed to determine what kind of relationships existed, if any, and how much variation in teacher career decisions is explained by leader behavior as informed by Green's model of educational leadership while controlling for teacher characteristics. The initial analysis measured the relationship and its significance between Green's model and a teacher's decision to stay, move, or leave within the next academic year. The other analyses attempted to determine the amount of variance between the independent variable and the outcome of teacher career decisions while also explaining the variation within the relationship after controlling for personal demographics

(race/ethnicity, age, and sex), professional demographics (years of experience and years at school), and content training (content area and pre-service training).

Summary

In the pursuit of quantifiable data on leader behaviors that mitigate teacher attrition, this research study sought to investigate the extent to which principal behaviors informed by Green's model of educational leadership are related to teachers' career decisions. A survey asking teachers to state their immediate career intentions, rate their perception of their leader's behavior, and provide both personal and professional demographics was administered to high school teachers employed at five high schools in the Southeastern United States. Data was electronically collected and a correlational analysis in conjunction with a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify whether or not the variables and covariates interact in a statistically significant manner. Findings of the present study are reported in Chapter 4.

Chapter Four

Results

The present study sought to identify any existing relationships between teacher career decisions and their perceptions of their school leader's behavior as informed by Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership. Additionally, the researcher controlled for previously researched variables known to explain patterns of teacher retention and attrition. Little previous literature exists in which the problem of teacher attrition is connected to school leadership behaviors. The results from this research have the potential to add to the existing literature by developing a better understanding of teachers as educational consumers and school leadership behaviors that significantly contribute to teachers' career decisions. The structure of the current chapter is divided into three sections: (a) Study Design, (b) Sample Participants and Demographics, and (c) Quantitative Findings and Answers to Research Questions.

Study Design

In order to identify any existing relationships between teacher career decisions and their perceptions of their school leader's behavior, the following four research questions guided the data collection and analysis:

- 1) *What is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*
- 2) *Controlling for personal demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's*

implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?

3) *Controlling for professional demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

4) *Controlling for content training of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

Convenience sampling was employed and data were collected using an electronic survey on the *Qualtrics* platform. Five school districts were identified as possible locations to conduct research based upon locality to the researcher and similarity of composition. Namely, each district is classified as suburban and operates one high school within their district. The researcher solicited these five school districts for permission to send out the electronic survey to all high school teachers within their districts. Approval was granted by all five districts; subsequently, the corresponding principals were contacted with the details for when and how the survey should be delivered.

The questionnaire consisted of three parts: (1) participation consent, (2) demographic questions, and (3) twenty questions assessing teacher perception of their school leader's behaviors as informed by Green's four dimensional model of educational leadership. Responses to the demographic questions served as covariates, but most importantly, the dependent variable was also included in this section: *Within the next academic year, do you intend to (a) remain at your school, (b) move to another school, or*

(c) *leave the profession*. The twenty perceptual questions served as the primary independent variables and assessed leader behavior informed by Green’s model of educational leadership with five questions assigned to measure each of the four dimensions.

Sample Participants and Demographics

The five school districts granting permission to conduct research are composed of five high schools. It should be noted that one district operates one high school on two campuses with each campus having its own principal. Therefore, five high schools were surveyed, yet perceptions were gathered in regards to six principals. Following data collection, all responses were reviewed to ensure that consent was given, respondents stated their career intentions, and perceptions of leader behavior were provided. In all, 223 responses met the aforementioned criteria. Table 3 provides the demographic characteristics after sorting the responses by career intentions.

Table 3
Demographic Characteristics of Stated Career Intentions (N = 223)

Characteristic	Stayer (n = 208)	Mover (n = 13)	Leaver (n = 2)
Gender			
Male	73	6	1
Female	135	7	
Unspecified			1
Racial Classification			
White	190	13	1
Black/African-American	11		
Hispanic	1		
Asian	1		
Multi-Racial	2		
Other	2		1
Unspecified	1		

Table 3 Continued

Age			
22-30	20	2	
31-40	58	5	
41 and older	130	6	1
Unspecified			1
Years of Experience			
First Year	2	1	
2-5 Years	24	2	
6-10 Years	41	6	1
11 or more	141	4	1
Years of School			
First Year	10	3	
2-5 Years	94	6	
6-10 Years	27	4	
11 or more	76		1
Unspecified	1		1
Content Area			
English	38	1	
Mathematics	28	3	
Science	25		
Social	32	3	1
Studies/Humanities	21	2	1
Special Education	15		
Fine Arts	32	2	
CTE	17	2	
Other			
Pre-Service Training			
Traditional	161	10	
Alternative Licensure	47	3	2

As shown in Table 3, 93.3% of the sample population indicated a desire to remain at their current school within the next academic year. To a much lesser degree, just 5.8% of teachers surveyed intend to move to another school, and less than 1% plan to leave the profession altogether. On the surface, the sample's race or ethnicity demonstrated disproportionality toward the response of *white*. The suburban nature of the surveyed districts makes this ratio reflective of the actual demographics of the districts. Another response worth highlighting is that while 141 of *stayers* indicated they had been working

in the teaching profession for 11 or more years, just under half (46.1%) stated they also had been at their current school for 11 or more years. Furthermore, just 50% of the *stayers* indicated they had been at their current school for more than 5 years.

Quantitative Findings and Answers to Research Questions

In pursuit of answers to the four research questions, several statistical tests were run to determine whether a relationship existed between teachers' stated career intentions and the perception of their principal's leadership behaviors as informed by Green's model of educational leadership. The paragraphs immediately following describe the statistical tests employed along with the cursory findings. The remaining sections of this chapter are divided into the results for each research question and will culminate with a summary of findings.

First, a correlational analysis was run to identify what relationships existed between the twenty questions at the individual item level, dimension scale level, and the model as a whole. Eighteen of the twenty individual items were significantly negatively related to career intentions. These scores will be further addressed in the subsequent section pertaining to research question one. Furthermore, all leadership dimensions are significantly related to the career intentions and do so in the expected direction as follows:

- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension One scores increase ($r = -.26, p < .01$);
- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension Two scores increase ($r = -.22, p < .01$);

- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension Three scores increase ($r = -.18, p < .01$);
- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension Four scores increase ($r = -.23, p < .01$); and unsurprisingly,
- as teachers state their intention to stay the aggregate scores on Green's leadership model increase ($r = -.26, p < .01$).

Following the identification of a significant negative correlation, a hierarchal multiple regression was conducted to identify the amount of variance each dimension contributes to the teachers' stated career intentions. Additional regression blocks were run to control for other independent variables for which data were gathered. In addition to having both a continuous dependent and more than two continuous independent variables, the following assumptions were met: (a) independence of observations, (b) linearity, (c) multicollinearity, (d) unusual cases, (e) influential points, and (f) normal distribution. Some cases were flagged as unusual, yet after further inspection, they were actually responses indicating a desire to move or leave, and therefore their responses were not deemed to be outliers considering the distribution of stayers, movers, and leavers noted in Table 3. The final regression block including all variables statistically significantly predicted career intentions, $F(2, 210) = 3.081, p < .001, \text{adj. } R^2 = .105$.

For all tables and data, both preceding and following, it should be noted that some correlation and coefficient values will be negative. This was expected for several variables due to the construction of the scales associated with the responses to questions. The outcome variable of teacher career intentions was measured as follows: stay at current school = 1, move to another school = 2, and leave the profession altogether = 3.

Each of the twenty perceptual were measured on a one to five Likert-type scale with lower scores representing negative perceptions and conversely higher scores representing more positive perceptions. Therefore, the negative correlations between the individual items and dimension scores were expected and indicated that the more positively teachers perceived the behavior of the principal, the more likely they were to indicate a desire stay at their current school. The nature of regression coefficients for to covariates will be discussed prior to the data tables for each of the research questions.

Results Pertinent to Research Question One: What is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?

The initial analysis conducted was correlational in order to establish the type of relationship and significance level between stated career intentions and teacher perception of their leader's behavior. The results produced negative Pearson correlations (r) that were statistically significant ($p < .05$) for eighteen of the twenty perceptual questions. The range of significant Pearson correlations was weak ($r = -0.13$) to moderate ($r = -0.31$). Unsurprisingly, when the analysis was conducted at the dimension level, all four dimensions and the aggregate of the entire model produced negative Pearson correlations that were all statistically significant ($p < .05$). Tables 4-7 provide the descriptive statistics and correlations for each of the twenty perceptual items and the dimensions, as a whole.

As shown in Table 4 below, Dimension One of Green's model demonstrated the strongest Pearson correlation ($r = -0.26, p < .001$) for the individual dimensions and was equal to that of the aggregate model. Due to the relative strength of this dimension it is

interesting that only four of the five perceptual questions produced significant, negative correlations with stated career intentions. Additionally, the individual item “*The faculty and leadership have a shared vision*” produced the strongest Pearson correlation ($r = -0.31, p < .001$). The mean scores of the individual items and entire dimension were relatively the highest of all dimensions.

Table 4

Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension One of Green’s Model of Educational Leadership

Item and Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i> =
1. The faculty and leadership have a shared vision.	4.39	0.71	-.31	.000
2. Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.	4.58	0.56	-.21	.001
3. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.	4.37	0.75	-.23	.000
4. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.	4.61	0.64	-.10	.066
5. Provided supports (i.e., instructional coaching, PLCs, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.	4.17	0.84	-.21	.001
Dimension One	4.45	0.61	-.26	.000

Table 5 provides the descriptive and correlational results of the second dimension. The Pearson correlations for each of the five perceptual items and entire dimension were significantly related to stated career intentions. The individual item of “*There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect*” produced the second strongest correlation of the twenty perceptual questions. This dimension also contains the third strongest individual item correlation, “*Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices*” ($r = -0.24, p < .001$). Despite these individual item strengths and the significance of all items, the correlational strength of Dimension Two as a whole is only stronger than Dimension Three. Additionally, the mean score for the individual item “*Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students*” ($M = 3.71, SD = 1.10$) was interestingly the second lowest scoring item of all twenty perceptual items.

Table 5

Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension Two of Green’s Model of Educational Leadership

Item and Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i> =
1. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.	3.71	1.10	-.18	.004
2. Teachers have adequate space to work productively.	4.24	0.92	-.17	.006
3. The physical environment of classrooms in this school supports teaching and learning.	4.35	0.82	-.16	.007

Table 5 Continued

4. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect.	4.35	0.86	-.28	.000
5. Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.	4.42	0.75	-.24	.000
Dimension Two	4.26	0.73	-.22	.001

Overall, Dimension Three produced the weakest relative correlation ($r = -0.18, p < .05$) within Green’s model. As shown in Table 6, just four of the five individual items were significantly correlated with stated career intentions. All Pearson correlations were weak to moderate and thus contributed to the relative weakness of this dimension as a whole. The individual item with the strongest correlation within Dimension Three was *“Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices”* ($r = -0.20, p < .05$). Also within this dimension was the lowest scoring of all twenty perceptual items, *“Professional development provides teachers with strategies to involve families and other community members as active partners”* ($M = 3.60, SD = 1.11$).

Table 6

Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension Three of Green's Model of Educational Leadership

Item and Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i> =
1. This school maintains clear, two-way communication with parents/guardians and the community.	4.39	0.78	-.07	.143
2. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.	4.47	0.82	-.17	.007
3. Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles.	4.42	0.83	-.15	.014
4. Professional development provides teachers with strategies to involve families and other community members as active partners.	3.60	1.11	-.18	.004
5. Professional development provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.	4.04	0.95	-.20	.001
Dimension Three	4.20	0.77	-.18	.003

The descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations associated with Dimension Four and the aggregate of Green's model can be found in Table 7. All individual items and the dimension aggregate were negatively significantly correlated as was Green's model in its entirety. The combined strength of the items makes Dimension Four the

second strongest correlated dimension of Green’s model ($r = -.023, p < .001$). Individual item correlations did not rank high compared to other items within the model, yet the mean score of this dimension is second only to Dimension One ($M = 4.27, SD = 0.76$).

Table 7

Zero Order Correlations Observed between Stated Career Intentions and Item and Scale Scores Pertinent to Dimension Four of Green’s Model of Educational Leadership

Item and Scale	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i> =
1. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials.	4.37	0.79	-.20	.002
2. The school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning.	4.38	0.81	-.18	.004
3. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.	4.30	0.85	-.13	.029
4. The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.	4.05	1.03	-.20	.001
5. Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school’s improvement plan.	4.09	.93	-.19	.002
Dimension Four	4.27	0.76	-0.23	0.00
All Dimensions	4.29	0.70	-0.26	0.00

Once the significant negative correlation was found to exist between stated career intentions and teacher perception of leadership behavior, a hierarchal multiple regression analysis was conducted for the purpose of determining the extent teachers' perception of leadership behavior predicted their stated career intentions. Table 8 below contains the data for the initial five blocks of the analysis. The first block was run with only Dimension One, and the remaining dimensions were added one at time in the subsequent blocks until the fifth block was ultimately run to include all dimensions and the entire model. All blocks were found to be statistically significant and the fifth block of the analysis indicated that Green's model accounts for 8.0% of variance in teacher's stated career intentions ($F(1, 217) = 3.785, p = .003, R^2 = .080$).

Block One produced results that identified Dimension One as a significant predictor of stated career intentions ($\beta = -.262, t = -4.04, p < .001$). Dimension One remained a significant, individual predictor through the first three blocks. The inclusion of all four dimensions and the aggregate model eliminated any single significant predictors. The variance found in the first block states that leadership behaviors within Dimension One account for 6.9% of a teacher's stated career intentions. ($F(1, 221) = 16.347, p < .001, R^2 = .069$). As the additional dimensions were added to the blocks, the variance did not significantly change.

Table 8
*Hierarchical Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question One Concerning
 Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Educational Model of School
 Leadership*

Source	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Dimension One Model Fit: $F(1, 221) = 16.347, p < .001, R^2 = .069$					
Dimension One	-.128	.032	-.262	-4.043	< .001
Block 2: Dimension One + Dimension Two Model Fit: $F(1, 220) = 8.861, p < .001, R^2 = .075,$ F Change (1, 220) = 1.349, $p = .247$					
Dimension One	-.100	.040	-.206	-2.529	.012
Dimension Two	-.039	.033	-.094	-1.161	.247
Block 3: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three Model Fit: $F(1, 219) = 5.886, p = .001, R^2 = .075,$ F Change (1, 219) = 0.014, $p = .904$					
Dimension One	-.102	.043	-.210	-2.379	.018
Dimension Two	-.041	.037	-.099	-1.098	.273
Dimension Three	.004	.035	.011	.120	.904
Block 4: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three + Dimension Four Model Fit: $F(1, 218) = 4.582, p = .001, R^2 = .078,$ F Change (1, 218) = 0.696, $p = .405$					
Dimension One	-.089	0.46	-.182	-1.933	.055
Dimension Two	-.033	.038	-.081	-.878	.381
Dimension Three	.019	.040	.051	.490	.624
Dimension Four	-.036	.043	-.092	-.834	.405
Block 5: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three + Dimension Four + All Dimensions					

Table 8 Continued

Model Fit: $F(1, 217) = 3.785, p = .003, R^2 = .080,$
 F Change (1, 217) = 0.627, $p = .429$

Dimension One	-.073	.050	-.151	-1.475	.142
Dimension Two	-.016	.044	-.040	-.371	.711
Dimension Three	.033	.043	.087	.766	.444
Dimension Four	-.022	.047	-.056	-.475	.635
All Dimensions	-.058	.073	-.135	-.792	.429

In sum, research question one was answered with both the correlational and regression results. The negative correlations demonstrated that as teachers more favorably rated their principals on the twenty items aligned to Green’s model, they also indicated the desire to remain at their current school. Regression blocks one through five found in Table 8 provide significant statistical evidence that Green’s model accounts for 8.0% of the variance in a teacher’s stated career intentions. The following sections will provide further analysis of the influence Green’s model has on teacher career decisions while controlling for extraneous factors.

Results Pertinent to Research Question Two: Controlling for personal demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators’ perceptions of their school leader’s implementation of Green’s model of educational leadership and teachers’ stated career intentions?

In order to answer the second research question, the hierarchal multiple regression continued with a sixth block including personal demographics which consisted of three covariates: (a) gender, (b) age, and (c) race/ethnicity. As shown in Table 9, the model continued to demonstrate statistical significance when personal demographics were added to the regression model and these covariates contributed an additional 2.0% of variance

($F(3, 214) = 2.985, p = .003, R^2 = .10$). However, the increase in variance of the model was not found to be statistically significant (F Change (3, 214) = 1.60, $p = .190$).

Furthermore, none of the variables individually demonstrated significance as predicting teacher career intentions, yet the inclusion of personal demographic covariates increased the influence of Green’s model on teacher career intentions to a total of 10.0%.

In regards to interpreting the values of the covariate coefficients, it is important to discuss how responses were converted to numerical values. Age was measured from youngest to oldest: 22-30 = 1, 31-40 = 2, and 41 and older = 3. Gender was binary: male = 1 and female = 2. Race/ethnicity was represented as follows: White = 1, Black/African-American = 2, Hispanic = 3, Asian = 4, Native American = 5, Multi-Racial = 6, and Other = 7. As previously mentioned, teacher career decision was measured in degrees of likelihood to stay (1) to leave (3). Any negative coefficients should be interpreted with these scales in mind.

Table 9

Hierarchical Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question Two Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green’s Model of Educational Leadership

Source	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 6: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three + Dimension Four + All Dimensions + Personal Demographics Model Fit: $F(3, 214) = 2.985, p = .003, R^2 = .10,$ F Change (3, 214) = 1.60, $p = .190$					
Dimension One	-.086	.050	-.176	-1.719	.087
Dimension Two	-.016	.044	-.039	-.367	.714
Dimension Three	.036	.043	.095	.841	.401

Table 9 Continued

Dimension Four	-.015	.047	-.039	-.324	.746
All Dimensions	-.062	.073	-.144	-.844	.399
Gender	-.008	.040	-.013	-.192	.848
Age	.024	.029	.054	.811	.419
Race/Ethnicity	.038	.020	.125	1.906	.058

Results Pertinent To Research Question Three: Controlling for professional demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?

The research question at hand sought to further explain the outcome of teacher career intentions while controlling for total years of teaching experience and years teaching at their current school in addition to the previous variables. Table 10 displays the results of the seventh block of the hierarchal multiple regression analysis. It also demonstrated statistical significance and added 4.0% of variance to the model ($F(2, 212) = 3.531, p < .001, R^2 = 0.14$). The robust increase in variance was found to be statistically significant ($F \text{ Change } (2, 212) = 5.24, p = .006$).

Within this model, years of experience ($\beta = -.225, t = -2.550, p = .011$), age ($\beta = -.208, t = -2.582, p = .011$), and race/ethnicity ($\beta = .128, t = 1.978, p = .049$) all were statistically significant predictors of teacher career intentions. This is unsurprising due to the correlations between these individual variables. Age is significantly yet weakly correlated to race/ethnicity ($r = .14, p < .05$) while years of experience ($r = .59, p < .001$) is correlated to age to a much stronger degree. Additionally, race ($r = .12, p < .05$) and

years of experience ($r = -.13, p < .05$) are weakly correlated to the outcome of teacher career intentions.

In regards to interpreting the values of the covariate coefficients, it is important to discuss how responses were converted to numerical values. Years of experience was measured from one to four as follows: First year = 1, 2-5 years = 2, 6-10 years = 3, and 11 or more years = 4. Likewise, years of experience at their current school was measured on the same scale. As previously mentioned, teacher career decision was measured in degrees of likelihood to stay (1) to leave (3). Any negative coefficients should be interpreted with these scales in mind.

Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question Three Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Model of Educational Leadership

Source	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 7: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three + Dimension Four + All Dimensions + Personal Demographics + Professional Demographics Model Fit: $F(2, 212) = 3.531, p < .001, R^2 = 0.14,$ F Change (2, 212) = 5.24, $p = .006$					
Dimension One	-.093	.049	-.191	-1.889	.060
Dimension Two	-.005	.043	-.011	-.108	.914
Dimension Three	.036	.043	.093	.839	.402
Dimension Four	-.005	.046	-.013	-.107	.915
All Dimensions	-.080	.072	-.187	-1.114	.267
Gender	-.001	.039	-.001	-.021	.983
Age	.092	.036	.208	2.582	.011
Race/Ethnicity	.038	.019	.128	1.978	.049
Years of Experience	-.089	.035	-.225	-2.550	.011
Years at Current School	-.015	.023	-.052	-.668	.505

Results Pertinent to Research Four: Controlling for content training of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?

The final research question was answered by employing an additional regression block consisting of all variables. As indicated in Table 11, 15% of teacher career intentions can be explained by Green's model while controlling for personal demographics, professional demographics, and content training ($F(2, 210) = 3.081, p < .001, R^2 = 0.15$). The variance increase of 1.0% from block seven to block eight was insignificant (F Change (2, 210) = 0.856, $p = .427$). As in the previous regression block, the covariates of age ($\beta = .200, t = 2.428, p = .016$), race/ethnicity ($\beta = .130, t = 2.011, p = .046$), and years of experience ($\beta = -.212, t = -2.361, p = .019$) continue to serve as significant predictors of teacher career intentions due to their correlations with one another.

In regards to interpreting the values of the covariate coefficients, it is important to discuss how responses were converted to numerical values. Content area taught was represented as follows: English = 1, Mathematics = 2, Science = 3, S.S./Humanities = 4, Special Education = 5, Fine Arts = 6, and CTE = 7. The type of teacher preparation was binary: traditional = 1 and alternative licensure = 2. As previously mentioned, teacher career decision was measured in degrees of likelihood to stay (1) to leave (3). Any negative coefficients should be interpreted with these scales in mind.

Table 11

Hierarchical Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question Four Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Model of Educational Leadership

Source	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 8: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three + Dimension Four + All Dimensions + Personal Demographics + Professional Demographics + Content Training Model Fit: $F(2, 210) = 3.081, p < .001, R^2 = 0.15,$ F Change (2, 210) = 0.856, $p = .427$					
Dimension One	-.095	.049	-.195	-1.918	.057
Dimension Two	-.010	.043	-.024	-.225	.822
Dimension Three	.035	.043	.092	.828	.408
Dimension Four	-.006	.046	-.015	-.126	.900
All Dimensions	-.073	.072	-.171	-1.013	.312
Gender	.002	.039	.003	.054	.957
Age	.088	.036	.200	2.428	.016
Race/Ethnicity	.039	.019	.130	2.011	.046
Years of Experience	-.084	.035	-.212	-2.361	.019
Years at Current School	-.013	.023	-.044	-.569	.570
Content Taught	-.001	.009	-.005	-.080	.936
Pre-service Training	.060	.046	.086	1.307	.193

Summary

The study at hand set forth four research questions aimed at identifying and explaining the relationship between teacher career decisions and teacher perceptions of their leaders' behavior as informed by Green's four dimensional model of educational leadership. Through the employment of a correlational analysis, the data revealed that as teachers stated their intention to stay at their current school, they also more positively

rated their principal as engaging in behaviors aligned to Green's model. A hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to further explain the established relationship between Green's model and teacher career decisions. The initial block with only the dimensions included showed that Green's model represented 8.0% of the variance in teacher career intentions. The subsequent regression blocks included additional variables. With respect to the covariates, those categorized as professional demographics most strengthened the regression blocks. In all, Green's model accounts for 15% of the variance in the outcome variable of teacher career intentions while controlling for personal demographics, professional demographics, and content training.

Chapter Five

Discussion and Implications

The final chapter of the dissertation brings together reviewed literature and the present data to discuss the relevance of its findings in terms of the broader educational community. A summary of the study is immediately following with the remaining sections of the chapter being organized as follows: (a) discussion of findings, (b) limitations of the study, (c) implications for practice, (d) further study, and (e) policy, while closing with a conclusion.

Summary of Study

The education profession in the United States continues to suffer from chronic teacher turnover. Decades of research studying teacher attrition have uncovered many contributing yet merely descriptive factors such as student body demographics, geographic settings, and socioeconomic status (Burkhauser, 2016; Holme, J.J. et al. 2018; Ingersoll, 2001). More recent research has suggested principal behavior is a key lever of successful school reform. Both Boyd et al. (2011) and Kraft et al. (2016) determined the relationship between school working conditions and teacher career decisions as significant. Under the category of working conditions, both studies identified school leadership as a pertinent factor when attempting to explain teacher attrition. Despite these powerful findings, the question of how to improve school leadership for promoting both effectiveness and teacher retention remains unanswered due to a lack of specificity regarding leader behavior.

Leithwood et al. (2004) noted that principals rank second only to teachers when measuring their impact on student achievement and the churning of staff as one of seven

major challenges facing school principals. Combined, this information signals the need to further identify and understand positive leadership behaviors. The tasks of 21st century school principals fall under a wide array of classifications but ultimately boil down to that of manager versus leader. This duality might best be explained by Carroll and Levy (2008), “managers need to be adept, agile and reflexive in their capacity to move between management and leadership modes.” Specific to the education sector, Robinson et al. (2008) articulated five dimensions of instructional leadership that strike a balance between managing and leading:

6. Establishing goals and expectations
7. Resourcing strategically
8. Planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum
9. Promoting and participating in teacher learning and development
10. Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment

In continued pursuit of answering the question of how school leaders impact teacher retention, multiple studies identified administrative support or the lack thereof as being critical to their career decisions (Ingersoll, 2001; Podolsky et al. 2017; Rice, 2014). Policy work seeking to improve school leadership is being led by the Wallace Foundation to promote a principal pipeline defined by clear standards, preservice training, selective hiring and placement, and ongoing support and evaluation (Turnbull et al. 2016). The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership is a discipline-specific leadership framework informed by multiple theories, school leadership standards, and research-based best practices that align with the principal pipeline initiative work of Wallace Foundation (Green, 2010). The repeated suggestion of an interaction between teacher and principal make for a logical call for the inclusion of systems thinking and is supported in previous

teacher retention work (Kraft et al. 2016, Minarik et al. 2003). Green's model is built upon systems thinking and therefore important to include in this study.

Because public education needs effective teachers and leaders in order to be successful, this study set out to investigate relationships between teachers' perceptions of their school leader exhibiting behaviors informed by Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions. Because of known contributing factors mentioned in the research above, the researcher controlled for (1) personal demographics, (2) professional demographics, and (3) content training in order to provide school leaders with specific information as it relates to these factors and the four dimensions. Utilizing teacher responses to eight descriptive characteristics questions and twenty questions aligned with Green's model, an analysis was conducted according to the following four research questions:

- 1) *What is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*
- 2) *Controlling for personal demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*
- 3) *Controlling for professional demographics of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

- 4) *Controlling for content training of teachers, what is the strength of relationship between educators' perceptions of their school leader's implementation of Green's model of educational leadership and teachers' stated career intentions?*

At the outset of the current study, the findings were known to be limited by surveying only high school teachers in five public, suburban school districts and relying on teacher perception of leader behavior. The research conducted confirmed these limitations while suggesting the following additional limitations:

1. By surveying just five suburban high schools, the sample population was homogenous in nature according to race/ethnicity because 93.1% of respondents reported themselves as *white*.
2. The study designed relied on self-reported career intentions and measures of teacher perception which introduced bias into the results but also did not reflect actual career decisions or leader behavior.
3. Despite several demographic characteristics gathered on the questionnaire, no questions were asked to differentiate between levels of teacher effectiveness in order to compare them to career intentions.
4. While teacher tenure was gathered by the questionnaire, it lacked a measure of principal tenure.

Discussion of Findings

This study examined relationships between teacher career decisions and their perceptions of their school leader's behavior through both correlational and hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Descriptively, 93.3% of respondents reported their intention to stay at their current school while 5.8% planned to move schools with just 0.9%

believed to be leaving the profession altogether. According to the 2012-2013 TFS data, national rates of stayers is 84.3%, movers is 8.1%, and leavers is 7.7% (Goldring et al. 2014). This data varies from the findings of this study in terms of stayers and leavers, but closer for mobility rates. Even when the data set was examined for suburban school rates of teacher retention, the reported rates of this study are misaligned and support the previously noted limitation of only surveying five suburban high schools. A larger, more diverse sample population would be needed to properly compare the means of these findings.

Broad results of the analyses indicate that perceived implementation of Green's model is significantly correlated in a negative direction with stated career intentions ($r = -.26, p < .05$). Also, the aggregate of the model accounts for 8.0% of variance in teacher career decisions, and this variance increases to 15.0% when the covariates are introduced. These positive findings warrant further inspection with respect to the outlined research questions. The following discussion will include a comparison of the four dimensions and Green's model as a whole while also examining the relevance of individual items.

Dimension Comparisons

Looking across the dimensions of Green's model, relative strengths are observed in the Pearson correlations and regression blocks one through four. The dimensional strengths are represented by the following bullet points outlining correlation direction and value while Table 8 contains the regression results:

- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension One scores increase ($r = -.26, p < .01$);

- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension Two scores increase ($r = -.22, p < .01$);
- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension Three scores increase ($r = -.18, p < .01$); and
- as teachers state their intention to stay leadership Dimension Four scores increase ($r = -.23, p < .01$)

Table 8
Hierarchical Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question One Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Educational Model of School Leadership

Source	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 1: Dimension One Model Fit: $F(1, 221) = 16.347, p < .001, R^2 = .069$					
Dimension One	-.128	.032	-.262	-4.043	< .001
Block 2: Dimension One + Dimension Two Model Fit: $F(1, 220) = 8.861, p < .001, R^2 = .075,$ F Change (1, 220) = 1.349, $p = .247$					
Dimension One	-.100	.040	-.206	-2.529	.012
Dimension Two	-.039	.033	-.094	-1.161	.247
Block 3: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three Model Fit: $F(1, 219) = 5.886, p = .001, R^2 = .075,$ F Change (1, 219) = 0.014, $p = .904$					
Dimension One	-.102	.043	-.210	-2.379	.018
Dimension Two	-.041	.037	-.099	-1.098	.273
Dimension Three	.004	.035	.011	.120	.904

Table 8 Continued

Block 4: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three + Dimension Four
 Model Fit: $F(1, 218) = 4.582, p = .001, R^2 = .078,$
 F Change (1, 218) = 0.696, $p = .405$

Dimension One	-.089	0.46	-.182	-1.933	.055
Dimension Two	-.033	.038	-.081	-.878	.381
Dimension Three	.019	.040	.051	.490	.624
Dimension Four	-.036	.043	-.092	-.834	.405

Based upon the results of this study, a comparison across dimensions finds Dimension One, *Understanding Self and Others*, to be the most powerful for understanding teacher career decisions within Green’s model. The first regression block in which only Dimension One was included produced a variance of 6.9%. The additional three blocks added just 0.09% of variability to the model. Dimension One also held significance as an individual predictor in blocks one through three. Coupled with its above noted correlational significance and strength, the predictive power of the behaviors associated with Dimension One proves important for discussion.

Faculty and leadership sharing an organizational vision produced the strongest correlation of this study ($r = -.31, p < .001$). In further review of the individual item correlations, teachers appear to value and support concepts as outlined by four of the five perceptual questions associated with Dimension One. These four items further suggest that principal and teacher relationships play a role in teacher career decisions due to the fact that the only insignificant correlation was found in the statement: *Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice*. Of the five, this statement reflects less interaction occurring between the principal and teacher while the other four items allude to required interaction.

Dimension One's relative strength and its corresponding individual items are supported throughout the literature. Because the first dimension calls for leaders to recognize the interaction of their personal beliefs and values with those of their followers, there must be clear communication among parties. Torres (2016) purports that "an understanding of role obligations and one's expectations for other people" (p. 70) promotes teacher retention. The perceptual items associated with dimension one reflect both a reliance on communication of expectations and an interaction of people. Additionally supportive of these findings is the work of Greenlee & Brown (2009) in which one-size-fits all approaches were discouraged because schools employ teachers from a variety of backgrounds across multiple contexts. Furthermore, the results back the idea of administrative support being the main factor in a teacher's career decision as previously noted by Podolsky et al. (2017). Supports provided by principals in conjunction with clear communication enables leaders to aid teachers in not just being compliant to an organization, but more importantly, committed to its cause.

Considering the correlations of the remaining three dimensions, a discussion of their value to mitigating teacher attrition is valuable. Additionally, all individual items in Dimensions Two and Four held significant correlational strength while four of the five items within Dimension Three were significant. However, the final three dimensions did not prove to be significant as individual predictors as the regression models progressed. The importance of the dimensions as a whole will be further explained in the subsequent section involving the aggregate model, but the more strongly correlated individual items within each dimension will first be discussed.

Within Dimension Two, the perceptual item referencing an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect held the second strongest correlational value ($r = -.28, p < .001$). The description of the second dimension, *Understanding the Complexity of Organizational Life*, is typified by the complex interaction of climate, culture, and people and broadly details the perceptual question on trust and respect; therefore it is unsurprising that this item held such a strong relative correlation. Additionally supportive of Dimension Two is the third most strongly correlated item in which teachers rated the presence of professional learning communities in their schools ($r = -.24, p < .001$). The work of Brown & Wynn (2007) supports the findings for items within Dimension Two and the correlation of the entire dimension. Shared decision-making, collaboration, working to reduce teacher isolation, visibility, and having an open door are all strategies found to promote positive teacher perceptions. Pratt & Booker (2014) also found teachers tend to be *stayers* when instructional time is protected, ample planning time is provided, and they are sheltered from unrelated duties. It should be noted that despite this alignment with previous literature, Dimension Two was not strong, relatively speaking, in the explanation of teacher career decisions.

The weakest data of the four dimensions is found within Dimension Three. Dimension Three, *Building Bridges Through Relationships*, as a whole was significantly correlated ($r = -.20, p < .05$), yet just four of the five perceptual items were found to be significant and none of the items were remarkable according to their correlational value. According to the mean scores, teachers also rated this dimension lowest of them all ($M = 4.20, SD = 0.95$). Interestingly, the most strongly correlated item in this dimension referenced an interaction of colleagues very similar to the more strongly correlated items

in Dimension Two. These limited findings could have resulted from the focus of this study being on the teacher as an educational consumer in relation to the behavior of the principal. Characterized by the building of relationships, Dimension Three places a heavy emphasis on the inclusion of external stakeholders. The relationship between career intentions and teacher perception may not have been as strong because school leaders may not be as effective at forging relationships with members of the school community. The literature supports this proposition. Minarik et al. (2003) notes that principals often fail to promote relationships with the external community.

The final dimension's correlation was second highest of the four ($r = -.23, p < .001$) and all individual items were found to be statistically significant on their own. The overall strength of this dimension is interesting due to the lack of individual item strength. This could be explained, once again, by the amount of interaction between individuals suggested by the statements on the five perceptual items within Dimension Four. All five items reference either direct interaction with a colleague or teachers being provided something by their school leaders. The combined strength of Dimension Four, *Engaging in Leadership Best Practices*, is explained by the thirteen core competencies posited by Green (2010) and supported by further research by Crane & Green (2013) and Ross & Cozzens (2016). The descriptors of this dimensions are focused on daily implementation of skills such as instructional leadership, curriculum and instruction, and professional development.

Green's Model in the Aggregate

Discussion in respect to Green's model in its entirety is important because it is a framework that is grounded in systems theory. According to this framework, all four of

the dimensions should be working simultaneously if effective leadership is to be achieved. Individual dimensions and individual perceptual items demonstrated strengths, yet the design is intended to be implemented in the aggregate for the greatest effect. The aggregate model's correlational strength was significant, approaching moderate strength ($r = -.26, p < .05$). Variability between Green's model and stated career intentions was 8.0%, reaching a total of 15% when controlling for additional teacher characteristics. Teacher characteristics will be vetted in the following section.

The interdependency of the dimensions becomes more evident when the results are viewed at the framework level. Minarek et al. (2003) supported the analysis of teacher attrition at a system level as opposed to breaking it apart into smaller factors. Even though Dimension One is quantitatively the most powerful factor found within the current study, an evaluation of individual items holding relative correlational strength suggest a webbing of leadership behaviors. As correlations of individual items have been discussed, several themes have emerged including interactions among colleagues, relationships inside and out of the school, involvement in processes, communication between parties, supportive environments, and a climate of support. Combined, the data and research associated with the four dimensions inform school leaders of ways in which to improve school climate while also offering practical strategies that are grounded in research-based leadership theory. The forthcoming section of Implications for Practice will delineate several specifics related to the findings of this study.

Teacher Characteristics

Control variables were included in the study in an effort to more fully understand and explain teacher career decisions. Viewing the teacher as an educational consumer

meant that personal, professional, and content training demographics were collected in order to introduce covariates into the regression blocks. The final block's results can be found in Table 11 and demonstrate that when all variables are introduced, Green's model is strengthened to account for 15.0% of variance in teacher career decisions. As supported in previous teacher retention studies, both age ($\beta = .200, t = 2.428, p = .016$) and years of experience ($\beta = -.212, t = -2.361, p = .019$) serve as significant individual predictors of teacher turnover (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Goldring et al., 2014; Ingersoll, 2001). Of the three categories of teacher characteristics, professional demographics explain the most in terms of teacher career decisions.

Table 11
Hierarchical Regression Outcomes Pertinent to Research Question Four Concerning Stated Career Intentions and Scores on Green's Model of Educational Leadership

Source	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.B.</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> =
Block 8: Dimension One + Dimension Two + Dimension Three + Dimension Four + All Dimensions + Personal Demographics + Professional Demographics + Content Training Model Fit: $F(2, 210) = 3.081, p < .001, R^2 = 0.15,$ F Change (2, 210) = 0.856, $p = .427$					
Dimension One	-.095	.049	-.195	-1.918	.057
Dimension Two	-.010	.043	-.024	-.225	.822
Dimension Three	.035	.043	.092	.828	.408
Dimension Four	-.006	.046	-.015	-.126	.900
All Dimensions	-.073	.072	-.171	-1.013	.312
Gender	.002	.039	.003	.054	.957
Age	.088	.036	.200	2.428	.016
Race/Ethnicity	.039	.019	.130	2.011	.046
Years of Experience	-.084	.035	-.212	-2.361	.019
Years at Current School	-.013	.023	-.044	-.569	.570
Content Taught	-.001	.009	-.005	-.080	.936
Pre-service Training	.060	.046	.086	1.307	.193

Implications for Practice

The aforementioned discussion of findings identifies several areas of focus for current school leaders to improve teacher retention. First and foremost, Green's model provides school leaders with a systems thinking model specific to the school environment. Secondary to the model as a whole are individual leader behaviors as identified by eighteen significantly correlated individual perceptual items used in this study. As both district and school-level leaders contemplate plans for maintaining a cohesive faculty at their individual schools, it would prove important for them to consider the following recommendations for practice:

1. The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership serves as a framework to improve staff continuity. Data from this study support previous findings that teachers who rate elements of their school in a positive manner tend to stay in their schools at much higher rates than those who rate elements of their school in a negative manner (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Burkhauser, 2016; Goldring et al., 2014; Gulosino et al., 2016; Kraft et al., 2016; Pratt & Booker, 2014; Torres, 2016).
2. School leaders should give the establishment of an organizational vision utmost concern. *The faculty and leadership have a shared vision* was the highest correlated perception item. The Tennessee Department of Education's administrator evaluation rubric places an importance on casting a vision and utilizing communication as a tool to achieve the vision (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016). The rubric is supported by a great deal of leadership research and coupled with the evidence from this study, it could

prove powerful more school leaders to consider the value in articulating a shared vision.

3. School leaders should work to remove fear and intimidation from the school environment. *There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect* references the climate of a school and demonstrated the second strongest correlation of the twenty perceptual items. Trust and respect are supported in literature as a leverage point or bond among faculties and tends to lead to greater commitment of staff (Campoli, 2017; Sesen & Basim, 2012; Sinek, 2009; Somech; 2016; Torres, 2016; Tschannen-Moran, 2014)

4. School leaders should engage faculty members in collaborative structures focused on teaching and learning. *Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices* was the third most strongly correlated perceptual item within the study. Effective school leaders should not only ensure collaborative structures are a priority; they should engage as active participants themselves (Greenlee & Brown, 2009; Ingersoll, 2001; Kraft et al., 2016; Kiliç, 2013; Rice, 2014; Robinson et al. 2008).

Direct involvement provides school leaders with a deeper understanding of the work teachers face.

Implications for Further Study

The present study surveyed teachers at five public suburban high schools in order to determine how teachers' career intentions were influenced by teacher perception of their leader's behavior. To better understand the interaction of leader behavior informed by Green's model and teacher career decisions, the following recommendations could

mitigate the aforementioned limitations of the study as well as enhance future teacher retention and leadership research:

1. The homogeneous sample population limited generalizations of the findings. The study design could be expanded to include other school compositions that would provide a more diverse sample of teachers. This could include private or charter schools in addition to other grade bands such as elementary (PK-5) and middle (6-8). Of particular importance, surveying teachers at schools situated in an urban setting is needed due to the documented teacher attrition issues associated in typical urban settings. These additions could bolster the present findings in order to offer greater generalization of the results to all populations of teachers.
2. A qualitative measure could be added to the study design. Individual teacher interviews and focus groups at each of the five high schools could be formed as a second layer of the study. The focus groups would be able delve deeper into the more strongly correlated perceptual items from the survey. For instance, the item *the faculty and leadership have a shared vision* could be fleshed out by focus groups to identify the process or activities in which the teachers and leader engaged in order to achieve that vision. As the specificity of leader behavior increases, so should the generalizability.
3. Differentiating between effective and ineffective teachers could be powerful in further explaining teacher turnover. Previous research has sought to label teacher turnover as either good or bad in terms of teacher effectiveness. Logically, the loss of ineffective teachers is good while the loss of effective

teachers is bad. The relationship between teacher and leader could also better be explained by the introduction of the teacher effectiveness variable.

4. The teacher questionnaire could include a question regarding the tenure, experience, and possibly types of training of the principal. Characteristics of the school leader was an unobserved variable in the present study, yet including it could provide greater insight into understanding teacher retention in conjunction with the teacher as educational consumer. The introduction of this variable would allow researchers to not only describe teachers in terms of their career intentions, but also the leaders with whom they work.
5. A longitudinal study consisting of both qualitative and quantitative measures could be initiated as new cohorts of teachers enter an individual school or as a new principal is assigned. The study could attempt to use the perceptual items associated with Green's model as well as stated teacher career intentions to measure how conditions change over time. The inclusion of interviews and focus groups could help guide the leader in improving the culture and climate. Developing an understanding of how changing conditions influence teacher perceptions and ultimately their career decisions could enhance school leaders' ability to retain teachers.

Implications for Policy

1. Principal preparation programs could be informed and/or enhanced by the inclusion of Green's model. Because it has already been developed using leadership theory and research, this framework could save policymakers a great

deal of time and trouble. Each of the four dimensions offers detailed perspectives as leaders approach a myriad of issues.

2. Should further study be conducted in additional contexts such as the urban setting, issues of equity that arise from chronic turnover could be addressed. Despite school contextual factors residing outside the school leader's locus of control, *The Four Dimensions of Principal Leadership* calls on them to be mindful of diversity. The noted strengths of vision casting, expectations, and communication found in the current study provide the groundwork that could stabilize a workforce and ultimately promote equity in all settings.

Conclusion

A review of literature substantiated the problem of teacher attrition. From concerns related to lenses of economics to equity to climate and culture, the negative effects of annual teacher turnover have been well documented (Bednar & Gicheva, 2016; Borman & Dowling 2008; Boyd et al. 2011; Burkhauser, 2016; Callahan, 2016; Ingersoll, 2003; Torres, 2016; Ost & Schiman, 2015). The purpose of the present study and corresponding research questions was guided by three assumptions: (1) a relationship exists between teacher career intentions and the behavior of the school leader; (2) Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership informs effective school leader behavior for principals, and (3) if principals exhibit behavior informed by Green's four-dimensional model of educational leadership, the rate of teacher retention will be enhanced. The results did in fact identify a statistically significant negative Pearson correlation between teacher career intentions and perceived implementation of leader behavior informed by Green's model. When controlling for teacher characteristics, 15.0%

of variance between the two variables appeared. Therefore, informed by multiple theories, national school leadership standards, and research-based best practices, Green's model has been further identified as a tool for practitioners, researchers, and policymakers in pursuit of improving educational outcomes.

References

- Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2004). Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(3), 406-434.
- Bednar, S., & Gicheva, D. (2016). *Workplace Support and Diversity in the Market for Public School Teachers* (No. 16-5). University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Department of Economics.
- Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of educational research*, 78(3), 367-409.
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(2), 303-333.
- Brown, K. M., & Wynn, S. R. (2007). Teacher retention issues: How some principals are supporting and keeping new teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(6), 664-698.
- Burkhauser, S. (2016). How much do school principals matter when it comes to teacher working conditions? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1-20. doi:10.3102/0162373716668028
- Campoli, A. K. (2017). Supportive principals and black teacher turnover: ESSA as an opportunity to improve retention. *Journal of School Leadership*, 27(5), 675-700.
- Carroll, B. & Levy, L. (2008). Defaulting to management: Leadership defined by what it is not. *Organization Articles*, 15(1), 75-96. doi: 10.1177/13505084070844486
- Callahan, J. (2016). Encouraging retention of new teachers through mentoring strategies. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin: International Journal for Professional Educators*, 83(1), 6-11.
- Crane, D., & Green, R. L. (2012, November). Exploring Leader Behavior Informed by the Thirteen Core Competencies and Their Influence on Teacher Job Satisfaction. In *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal* (Vol. 26).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational leadership*, 60(8), 6-13.
- Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu (Firm). (2018). 2018 Deloitte Millennial Survey: millennials disappointed in business, unprepared for Industry 4.0.

- Edgeron, D. E., & Kritsonis, W. A. (2006). Analysis of the influence of principal teacher relationships on student academic achievement: A national focus. *National Journal for Publishing and Mentoring Doctoral Student Research*, 1(1), 1-5.
- Erani, A. K., & Ozbilen, F. M. (2017). Relationship between School Principals' Ethical Leadership Behaviours and Positive Climate Practices. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6(4), 100.
- Falch, T., & Rønning, M. (2007). The influence of student achievement on teacher turnover. *Education Economics*, 15(2), 177-202.
- Farris, S. L. (2018). *The Investigation of the Relationships Between Teacher Job Satisfaction and Retention and Green's Four-dimensional Model of Educational Leadership* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Memphis).
- Goldring, R., Taie, S., & Riddles, M. (2014). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2012-2013 teacher follow-up survey* (NCES 2014-077). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Green, R. L. (2010). *The four dimensions of principal leadership: A framework for leading 21st century schools*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Greenlee, B., & Brown Jr, J. J. (2009). Retaining Teachers in Challenging Schools. *Education*, 130(1).
- Gulosino, C., Franceschini III, L., & Hardman, P. (2016). The Influence of Balance within the Competing Values Framework and School Academic Success on Teacher Retention. *Journal of Organizational and Educational Leadership*, 2(1), n1.
- Hattie, J. (2017). Hattie's 2017 updated list of factors influencing student achievement. Retrieved from: <http://www.evidencebasedteaching.org.au/hatties-2017-updated-list/>
- Heineke, A. J., Mazza, B. S., & Tichnor-Wagner, A. (2014). After the two-year commitment: A quantitative and qualitative inquiry of teach for America teacher retention and attrition. *Urban Education*, 49(7), 750-782.
- Holme, J. J., Jabbar, H., Germain, E., & Dinning, J. (2018). Rethinking teacher turnover: Longitudinal measures of instability in schools. *Educational Researcher*, 47(1), 62-75.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.

- Ingersoll, R. M. & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30-33.
- Kraft, M. A., Marinell, W. H., & Shen-Wei Yee, D. (2016). School organizational contexts, teacher turnover, and student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(5), 1411-1449. doi: 10.3102/0002831216667478
- Kılınc, A. Ç. (2013). The Relationship between Individual Teacher Academic Optimism and School Climate. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(3).
- Kuhnert, K. W. & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 648-657.
- 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., Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Review of research: How leadership influences student learning.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385- 415. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90027-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2)
- McCoach, D. B., & Colbert, R. D. (2010). Factors underlying the collective teacher efficacy scale and their mediating role in the effect of socioeconomic status on academic achievement at the school level. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 43(1), 31-47.
- Minarik, M. M., Thornton, B., & Perreault, G. (2003). Systems thinking can improve teacher retention. *The Clearing House*, 76(5), 230-234.
- Ost, B. & Schiman, J. C. (2015). Grade-specific experience, grade reassignments, and teacher turnover. *Economics of Education Review*, 46, 112-126.
- Papay, J. P., Bacher-Hicks, A., Page, L. C., & Marinell, W. H. (2017). The challenge of teacher retention in urban schools: Evidence of variation from a cross-site analysis. *Educational Researcher*, 46(8), 434-448.
- Podolsky, A., Kini, T., Bishop, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Sticky schools: How to find and keep teachers in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 98(8), 19-25.
- Pratt, T. & Booker, L. (2014). *Teacher retention in tennessee: Are we keeping our best*

teachers? Policy Brief May 2014. Tennessee Department of Education. Nashville, TN: Office of Research and Policy

- Price, H. E. (2012). Principal–teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(1), 39-85.
- Rice, S. M. (2014). Working to maximise the effectiveness of a staffing mix: what holds more and less effective teachers in a school, and what drives them away? *Educational review*, 66(3), 311-329.
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
- Ross, D. J., & Cozzens, J. A. (2016). The principalship: Essential core competencies for instructional leadership and its impact on school climate. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 4(9), 162-176.
- Schreuder, J. A. H., Groothoff, J. W., Jongsma, D., van Zweeden, N. F., van der Klink, J. J. L., & Roelen, C. A. M. (2013). Leadership effectiveness: A supervisor's approach to manage return to work. *J Occup Rehabil*, 23, 428-437. doi: 10.1007/s10926-012-9409-6
- Sesen, H., & Basim, N. H. (2012). Impact of satisfaction and commitment on teachers' organizational citizenship. *Educational Psychology*, 32(4), 475-491.
- Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with why: How great leaders inspire everyone to take action.* Penguin.
- Somech, A. (2016). The cost of going the extra mile: the relationship between teachers' organizational citizenship behavior, role stressors, and strain with the buffering effect of job autonomy. *Teachers and Teaching*, 22(4), 426-447.
- Struyven, K., & Vanthournout, G. (2014). Teachers' exit decisions: An investigation into the reasons why newly qualified teachers fail to enter the teaching profession or why those who do enter do not continue teaching. *Teaching and teacher education*, 43, 37-45.
- Tennessee Department of Education (2016). Administrator evaluation rubric. Retrieved from: <https://team-tn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/TEAM-Administrator-Rubric.pdf>
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools.* John Wiley & Sons.

- Torres, A. C. (2016). The uncertainty of high expectations: How principals influence relational trust and teacher turnover in no excuses charter schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 26, 61-91.
- Turnbull, B. J., Anderson, L. M., Riley, D. L., MacFarlane, J. R., & Aladjem, D. K. (2016). The Principal Pipeline Initiative in Action. Building a Stronger Principalship: Volume 5. *Policy Studies Associates, Inc.*