

Teacher Turnover: A Look into Teacher Job Satisfaction

Natalie Lytle

Every year a portion of teachers leave the teaching profession in search of a different career path, which creates the phenomena of the “revolving door” of teachers in schools. Many policy initiatives have focused on trying to attract and retain highly effective teachers to remain in schools across the nation. In 1998, President Clinton signed the Higher Education Amendments to distribute qualified teachers across the United States equally (Ingersoll, 2001). In 2009, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act included the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant that tried to increase the amount of effective teachers and administrators within high need schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Nonetheless in 2013, teacher turnover and retention is still a problem and could continually affect student achievement, especially in high need schools (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007; U.S. Department of Education, 2004 as cited by Stronge, 2007).

A teacher leaving the profession is not a new issue within the education system. Fewer teachers enter the profession each year versus the many teachers leaving the profession each year (Quartz, 2008). Teachers have left the profession in the past, but the number of teachers leaving has increased. The NCES reported that the average annual teacher turnover rate is 17 percent, which increases to 20 percent in urban school districts and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future estimated that many of the teachers leaving the profession are new teachers (Kopkowski, 2008). In 1996, the NCES determined that teacher turnover constituted five percent of public school teachers. The teacher turnover rate was lower in 1996 than it currently is today. In 2012, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that the average job turnover rate is 37 percent, which has decreased from 43 percent in 2008. One can dispute that teacher turnover rates are still lower than the national average; however, teacher turnover is increasing

rather than decreasing like the national average.

Recently, an article in *The Washington Post* claimed teacher job satisfaction plummeted to an all-time low in 25 years (Strauss, 2013). The report indicated that teachers feel more stress, which ultimately decreased morale and job satisfaction (Strauss, 2013). If data collection occurred on which teachers leave and why they are leaving the teaching profession, then supports can be provided to ensure that quality teachers remain in the education field.

Reasons for Teacher Turnover

Teachers leaving the profession is an ongoing problem, and why teachers leave is significant in solving the problem of teacher turnover. Teacher turnover includes teacher attrition and migration. Over 75 percent of the teachers who left the profession considered staying with the resolving of his/her main issue (Jacob et al., 2012). There are also a significant number of teachers, who leave their first teaching assignment after two years (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2009).

Numerous factors influence the movement of teachers within and out of the profession. Ingersoll and Smith (2003) surveyed teachers leaving the profession and found that 19 percent of teachers left for school staffing actions, 42 percent of teachers left for family or personal reasons, 39 percent of teachers left to pursue other jobs, and 29 percent of teachers left for job dissatisfaction. The 42 percent of teachers leaving for personal reasons is consistent with other research study findings that show a portion of teachers leave due to personal reasons (ECS, 2005; Kersaint, Lewis, Potter, & Meisels, 2007; Jacob et al., 2012).

Other research studies have concluded various factors influencing a teacher’s decisions to stay within a teaching position. Beside personal

reasons, more explanations given during teacher exits surveys include frustrations with student discipline issues, lack of administrative support, low salaries, and lack of respect and influence in the profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Buckley, Schneider, & Shange, 2004; Johnson et al., 2005; Kopkowski, 2008; Gonzalez, Brown, and Slate, 2008). Parent and community involvement and facility conditions, which affect teacher work habits and lead to teachers feeling discouraged about teaching, are also other factors noted within exit surveys (Buckley et al., 2004; Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005). An unfavorable teaching assignment is another possible reason why a teacher might leave a school (Boe, Cook, & Sunderland, 2008). Besides the obvious factors listed as to why teachers leave, the influence of rewards impact teachers, which include intrinsic rewards, such as internal motivation and student achievement (Johnson et al., 2005; Perrachione, Peterson, & Rosser, 2008). More recently, teacher turnover correlates to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) mandates (Kopkowski, 2008). No Child Left Behind places more stress on teachers to produce better student achievement. There are many reasons attributed to teacher turnover, but ultimately a majority of the reasons listed account for dissatisfaction with a teaching position.

Stayers, Movers, and Leavers

Multiple researchers studied teacher turnover and retention data and analyzed the data in different groups. Teachers fall into three groups when assessing teacher turnover and retention. The NCES analyzed the results of the Teacher Follow-up Survey from the Schools and Staffing Survey and found three groups of teachers called stayers, movers, and leavers (Whitenor et al., 1997). In the 1994-1995 school year, 85 percent of teachers were classified as stayers, seven percent of teachers were classified as leavers, and eight percent of teachers were classified as movers.

Ten years later, two studies assessed teacher retention based on categories similar to the NCES. Kersaint et al. (2007) surveyed Texas teachers to look at teacher retention and the factors involved, which concluded with analyzing two groups of

teachers, leavers and stayers. The teachers considered in the leaver category left due to family issues, the lack of administrative support, finances, paperwork, and the lack of joy in teaching (Kersaint et al., 2007). Another study completed by Olson and Anderson (2007) was a qualitative study looking at teacher retention and reasons teachers leave. Teachers fell into three categories of stayers, uncertain, and leavers, which are similar to the NCES Teacher Follow-up Survey (Olson & Anderson, 2007). The stayers confirmed that they would stay in the field of education as teachers, but referenced a chance that they will leave their current school due to problems with administration and parents (Olson & Anderson, 2007). The uncertain thought about changing positions to be an administrator or leaving to have a family due to the challenges of excelling at parenting and teaching concurrently (Olson & Anderson, 2007). The leavers had commonalities in being a veteran teacher, occupying different roles in a school besides teaching, and had a desire to continue their education (Olson & Anderson, 2007). The leavers stood around seven percent of the rural and urban teachers in 1999-2000 to 2000-2001 school years, which is similar to the results of the 1994-1995 Schools and Staffing Survey (Johnson et al., 2005). These studies show basic groups of teacher within the field of education, and the possibility to what distinguishes why the teachers may stay or leave.

Importance of Teacher Retention

Teacher turnover is an ongoing problem, which can lead student achievement being affected. If ineffective teachers replace effective teachers, then student achievement suffers. On the other hand, if an effective teacher replaces an ineffective teacher, then student achievement may increase (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2011). Teacher turnover and retention rates affect student achievement (Barnes et al., 2007; U.S. Department of Education, 2004 as cited by Stronge, 2007; Ronfeldt et al., 2011).

Ingersoll (2004) stated that high-poverty rural and high-poverty urban school districts end up with less qualified teachers. Lankford, Loeb, and Wyckoff (2002) completed an analysis of data from

schools within the state of New York and found that nonwhite, poor, and low performing students had less qualified teachers. On the other hand, in many rural school districts, there may be one single high school and if that high school loses a teacher not only is the teacher gone, but the department has disappeared (Beesley, Atwill, Blair, & Barley, 2010). Students within rural school districts may miss opportunities in specific courses due to teachers leaving and not being able to replace that subject area. The schools districts that have less qualified teachers teaching the low-performing students will continually fail to meet academic achievement standards set forth by the states (Ronfeldt et al., 2011).

Rural and urban school districts, especially the school districts considered high-poverty, are losing highly qualified teachers. Jacob, Vidyarthi, and Carroll (2012) recently studied four different, urban school districts that employed over 90,000 teachers and looked at the retention of the “irreplaceable” teachers. “Irreplaceable” teachers would include teachers who have been successful at increasing student achievement, as well as influencing the lives of students. Jacob et al. (2012) found that many of the teachers classified as “irreplaceable” did not believe that the school districts made any efforts to retain teachers. Within the urban school districts studied, up to 17 percent of “irreplaceable” teachers left (Jacob et al., 2012). Marinell and Cocoa (2013) studied the urban school district of New York City looking at the middle school teachers over ten years and found that 27 percent of new teachers leave in the first year, 55 percent of beginning teachers leave within three years, and 66 percent of beginning teachers leave within five years (pp. iv-v). With the numerous teachers leaving the profession, how can a rural or urban school district retain “irreplaceable” teachers?

Other researchers suggest that teacher turnover could increase student achievement if the ineffective teachers are leaving the profession (Boyd et al., 2009). Boyd et al. (2009) suggests that teachers may need to be “counseled out” of the profession or that ineffective teachers need to leave to work at another school that may be a better fit (p. 21). There is little research on whether effective or

ineffective teachers are staying within the classroom (Boyd et al., 2009).

Factors Influencing Teacher Job Satisfaction

The NCES data found that when asked teachers indicated that 42 percent of teachers leave the profession due to job dissatisfaction and specifically due to low salaries, lack of support, student motivation and discipline (Perie & Baker, 1996; Ingersoll, 2001; Tickle 2008). A recent report showed that Americans were willing to take a pay cut in order to keep up his/her job satisfaction (Davis, 2013). Teacher salaries will fluctuate, but administrative support, administrative behaviors, and trust within a school are free of cost factors found to affect teacher job satisfaction.

Administration Support

Many teachers list job dissatisfaction as a reason they leave the profession with citing the lack of administrative support. Teachers within their first few years of teaching are leaving the profession and require administrative support or mentoring to keep them in the profession. Tickle (2008) deemed administrator support as the top indicator for identifying teacher job satisfaction and predicting if teachers stay within the profession. The level of support an administrator provides a teacher impacts a teacher’s effectiveness and job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross, 1994; Perie & Baker, 1996, Ingersoll, 2001; Ingerman et al., 2003; Baker, 2002; Boyd, 2009; DiPaola, 2012).

Numerous studies have concluded that job satisfaction ties with administration support. Emotional support is the best for administrators to offer in a school setting (Littrell et al., 1994). When working with special education and general education teachers, all types of support, such as appraisal, instrumental, and informational, are not practical in the workplace (Littrell et al., 1994). Administrators need to provide support for teachers, but should consider the form of support needed for each teacher.

Demographic factors, such as race and age, may influence job satisfaction, but those findings were not as significant as administrative support affecting job satisfaction of teachers when using the NCES data (Perie & Baker, 1996). Ingerman et al. (2003) found that the teachers who marked dissatisfaction from his/her job accounted the top three reasons for job dissatisfaction as small salaries, student discipline problems, and limited administrative support. Baker (2005) used a checklist of 12 factors during interviews with northern Texas choral teachers to look at increasing job satisfaction. The three leading factors for teacher job dissatisfaction included community and parent support (60.9 percent), salary (58.6 percent), and administrative support (41.3 percent) (Baker, 2005). Boyd, Grossman, Hamilton, Loeb, and Wyckoff (2009) found that 40 percent of teachers surveyed had dissatisfaction of the administration, and 35 percent of teachers left their job due to the dissatisfaction. All of these research studies show a trend in job satisfaction affected by the administration support within the school.

The lack of administrative support can result in job dissatisfaction, but positive administrative support can lead to teachers staying in the profession. There were 48.6 percent of teachers who stayed in teaching because of positive administrative support (Baker, 2005). This research study is consistent with the findings for job dissatisfaction linking to the lack of administrative support.

Along with administrative support, first year teachers using mentors could increase job satisfaction. First year teachers need support and collaboration, which include mentoring that can eventually lead to increased job satisfaction, commitment, and retention of teachers (Grossman & Davis, 2012; Burke, 2013). The mentoring must be content focused, involve training for mentors, and allow time for meetings (Grossman & Davis, 2012). First year teachers may have different needs than veteran teachers, but the research supports that teachers need to have administrative support to stay in the teaching profession.

Administration and Teacher Relationships

Relationships form within a school between the administration, faculty, and students. Certain student and teacher relationships will increase teacher job satisfaction (Yeldman, van Tartivijk, Brekelmans, & Wubbles, 2013). Teacher job satisfaction can be influenced by the amount of trust between the administrator and teacher. Trust can influence the loyalty of the teacher to the administrator and the schools, but can also lead to mistreatment from the principal.

Trust. Besides administration support, trust in administration can influence teacher job satisfaction. Principal behaviors link in building trust and creating job satisfaction (Wolfe, 2010). The lack of trust is a possible obstruction of providing useful administrative support to teachers. Timms, Graham, and Caltabiano (2006) found that male teachers and primary teachers reported higher morale, trust, and perception of school administrators. Yager, Pederson, Yager, and Noppe (2012) surveyed teachers and found results that showed a lack of trust was a barrier to administration support and only 52 percent of teachers felt trust between teachers and administrators. Both studies confirm that trust in administration could affect the relationship between the administration and teachers, which could impact the support from the administration and the leadership style used by the administrator. Other factors can damage the trust within a school, which can lead to job dissatisfaction. Ronfedlt et al. (2011) found that teacher turnover can affect trust within a faculty.

Loyalty. Another factor involving administration and teachers within a school is the loyalty that the teacher has to the school and the administration. Reiss and Hoy (1998) used questionnaires to survey urban school districts to determine that freedom, less restrictiveness, and also being supportive creates higher loyalty in the faculty of the school. If there is greater institutional integrity, then there will be greater loyalty (Reiss & Hoy, 1998). Greater loyalty that a teacher has toward a school would result in a teacher being more likely to remain at the school and increases the interaction of the administration and teachers.

Principal mistreatment. Principal mistreatment could include various situations, which the relationship of the teacher and a principal influence. Blase and Blase (2006) completed a qualitative analysis of nonverbal and verbal behaviors of administrators through snowball sampling. Through the study, creation of three aggression levels led to data collection showing males had more volatile behaviors, were more likely to have sexual harassment filed against them, and act offensively to employees (Blase & Blase, 2006). Teacher mistreatment could lead to teacher job dissatisfaction.

Administrative Behavior

Besides administration support, administrative behaviors impact job satisfaction of teachers, which ultimately affects a teacher's decision, to stay in the field of education. Two main areas of administrative behaviors thought to increase job satisfaction are teacher empowerment and the leadership styles of the administration.

Empowerment. Empowerment of teachers has contradicting evidence whether it increases teacher job satisfaction. Empowerment links to other variables, such as motivation, professionalism, and stress. The empowerment of teachers may increase overall teacher job satisfaction. One study conducted in Texas found that empowerment of leadership had the greatest impact on job satisfaction (Shead, 2010). If a teacher felt empowered in the school, then job satisfaction increased among the teacher (Shead, 2010).

Other research suggests that empowerment has little effect on job satisfaction when linked to other variables within a study. Davis and Wilson (2000) focused on principal empowerment and motivation versus job satisfaction and found that the principal empowering behavior did not affect job satisfaction or stress of teachers. Another finding included teachers having higher job satisfaction when intrinsically motivated and eventually this decreased stress (Davis & Wilson, 2000). Pearson and Moomaw (2005) found that increasing curriculum autonomy decreased stress and that an increase in job satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism decreased stress. There was very little relationship between with curriculum

autonomy and job satisfaction (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). These studies show that there is a lack agreement on whether the amount of empowerment affects job satisfaction.

Leadership styles. Leadership styles of the administration affect teacher job satisfaction. Bogler (2001) found that teacher's occupation perceptions influence job satisfaction, but there were limits to the research study including defining transactional leadership, which involves leaders providing rewards and punishments. Cerit (2009) focused on servant leadership, where leaders share power, and job satisfaction. There was a positive and meaningful relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Cerit, 2009). Aydin, Sarier, and Uysal (2013) determined that there is a negative correlation between transformational leadership, where leaders work alongside followers, and organizational commitment of teachers, which reflects the loyalty and acceptance of the teachers. Research shows that the reason for the negative correlation is due to a "superficial expression of loyalty and the firsts stage of commitment" (Aydin et al., 2013, p. 809). Transactional leadership has a positive correlation with job satisfaction, and laissez-faire leadership has a negative correlation with job satisfaction (Aydin et al., 2013). Overall, these studies show the impact of teachers from administration leadership styles.

Leadership styles improving job satisfaction include servant and transactional leadership versus transformational and laissez-faire styles. Servant leadership involves sharing power with everyone in the school, which coincides with the empowerment of teachers. Transactional leadership style showed a positive correlation with job satisfaction is intriguing because transactional leadership does not promote growth, but rather much of the same over time. Transformational leadership in a school includes promoting growth and success of the teachers, but in the study mentioned above, administrative transformational leadership was not a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction. The limitations on these studies are the samples being from countries other than the United States and possibly within other countries cultures emphasize different facets of leadership.

Within the United States, research showed that shared leadership and perceptions of the administration influence job satisfaction. Ndoye, Imig, and Parker (2010) looked at the charter school teachers, and research concluded that there is value in shared leadership and a support system for teachers to rely on helps with teachers staying in the profession. Crane and Green (2013) used the 13 core competencies of administrators that affect teacher job satisfaction, which include visionary leadership, unity of purpose, learning community, instructional leadership, curriculum and instruction, professional development, organizational management, assessment, reflection, collaboration, diversity, inquiry, and professionalism. Perceptions and job satisfaction increased with the 13 core competencies, but limits of the study included using a convenience sampling for the population.

Other Reasons Noted for Job Dissatisfaction

Other reasons besides administration support, administration and teacher relationships, and administration behavior, can influence teacher job satisfaction. Favorable working conditions increase teacher job satisfaction (Perie & Baker, 1997). Teacher with higher job satisfaction had greater teacher autonomy or parental and student support that was strong (Perie & Baker, 1997). The study found few factors that influence teacher job satisfaction and specific influences include salary and benefits, class assignments, or coaching positions.

Teacher burnout. Russell, Altmaier, and Van Veizen (1987) surveyed teachers at the end of the year to look at stressful events within the teaching profession. The study deemed inconclusive whether stress and the amount of support influence teacher burn out. Teacher job dissatisfaction could stem from teacher burnout.

Salary and benefits. Salary and benefits have mixed results when discussing teacher job satisfaction. Perie and Baker (1997) found the relationship between job satisfaction and income and benefits that the teacher receives is weak. In contrast, multiple studies found that salary was one of the number one reason teachers left the profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Buckley, Schneider, & Shange, 2004; Baker, 2005; Johnson

et al, 2005; Kopkowski, 2008; Gonzalez, Brown, and Slate, 2008).

Other teacher assignments and duties.

Administrators not only lead the school, but make a crucial decision each summer in determining what subjects teachers will teach. Teachers who teach STEM subjects, such as science and math, tend to have a higher job satisfaction (Bishay, 1996). Teachers who have more job responsibilities or participate in coaching or advising organizations in a school have a higher job satisfaction (Bishay, 1996). More involvement within the school could lead to empowerment in the teacher, which could eventually lead to a higher job satisfaction.

Demographics of Teachers who Leave and Stay

Job dissatisfaction attributes to the reason teachers leave the profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Along with the many reasons why teachers are leaving the profession, the teachers' gender, age, years' experience, academic ability, race and location of school that a teacher works in could impact teacher turnover rates. Researchers investigate job satisfaction versus the many demographics, such as gender and age, which categorize teachers.

Gender

Conflicting research findings do not provide proof that one gender over the other has consistently higher job satisfaction. Currently, a majority of teachers working within the United States are female (Feistritzer, 2011). When looking at gender, some researchers concluded females tended to have a higher job satisfaction (Perie & Baker, 1997; Bolin, 2008; Shead, 2010; Turner, 2012). On the contrary, Bishay (1996) conducted a study that concluded women had lower job satisfaction. Even more, other researchers found that job satisfaction and gender showed no connection (Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Perrachione, 2008; Eddins, 2012). However, Ma and MacMillan (1999) stated that a possibility in the research that determined females have a higher job satisfaction is probably due to females selecting teaching as a career choice.

Age

The younger a teacher is the higher the job satisfaction, but this does not coincide with the number of younger teachers who are leaving the profession. In 2011, the National Center for Education Information (NCEI) concluded that teacher ages proportion out equally within the categories, with 21 percent being less than 29 years old, 27 percent being 30 to 39 years old, 22 percent being 40 to 49 years old, and 31 percent being 51 and older (Feistritzer, 2011). The shift that occurred from 2005 until 2011 is the large increase in teachers under the age of 30 and the decline of teachers who are over the age of 50 (Feistritzer, 2011). Statistically, teachers who are less than 30 years old and over 50 years old were more likely to be the majority in teacher turnover, which includes a 171 percent increase when looking at the categories for younger teachers leaving over middle-aged teachers leaving (Ingersoll, 2001; Kopkowski, 2008). If a teacher begins his/her career at age 22 then works for 30 years, he/she would be over 50 years old, and eventually retirement could account for the teacher turnover within the last age group.

The link to job satisfaction and age varies. Shead (2010) found an inverse relationship of age to teacher job satisfaction. Bishay (1996) conducted a study that concluded job satisfaction increased with age. Other researchers found that job satisfaction showed no connection with age (Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Eddins, 2012).

Years Teaching

According to the NCEI (2011), there is not much variation between the categories in the number of years teaching. There was 26 percent of teachers have taught one to five years, 16 percent of teachers have taught six to nine years, 16 percent of teachers have taught ten to 14 years, 23 percent of teachers have taught 15 to 24 years, and 17 percent of teachers have taught 25 years and more (Feistritzer, 2011). The number of years teaching did not show statistical significance in determining job satisfaction (Ma & MacMillan, 1999; Turner, 2007).

Academic Ability

Cochran-Smith, Cannady, McEachern, Piazza, Power, and Ryan (2011) compiled numerous research articles to determine if teacher certification, educational background, entryway into teaching, teacher preparation programs, and teachers' life histories impacted teacher retention. Academic ability of the teacher did not predict teacher retention, but teacher characteristics and workplace conditions influenced retention (Cochran-Smith et al., 2011). Individuals who enter the teaching profession through alternative ways, such as Teacher for America, have higher retention rates after one year, but after two years university-prepared teachers have higher retention rates (Cochran-Smith et al., 2011).

Interestingly, teachers made retention decisions based on expectations versus experiences in multiple categories, such as mentoring opportunities, principal support, collaboration with colleagues, appropriateness and difficulty of teaching assignments/responsibilities, and opportunities for professional development and leadership roles (Cochran-Smith et al., 2011).

Race. A majority of teachers within the United States are currently white, but individuals from different races are beginning to enter the teaching field at a more pronounced rate (Feistritzer, 2011). Race was another demographic category analyzed against job satisfaction. A majority of the participants within the research studies mentioned contained white females, which is similar to the current population of teachers. Two studies produced conflicting results of race and job satisfaction. Billingsley and Cross (1996) found that non-white teachers have a lower job satisfaction than whites, but the study included a sample population of only 13.5 percent of non-white individuals. Perie and Baker (1997) found that Hispanic teachers had higher job satisfaction over other races and Native American had the lowest job satisfaction out of all the races (Perie & Baker, 1997).

School Setting

The amount of teachers working within the different school settings, rural, town, city and

suburb, statistically range from 31 percent of teacher working in the city to 19 percent of teachers working in a town (Feistritzer, 2011). The NCES reported that teacher turnover rate was higher than the overall average in urban school districts, and these statistics provide an insight to teacher turnover with reference to the location of a school district. The NCES (Whitenor, Lynch, & Fondelier, 1997) reported that rural and urban school teachers staying and leaving the profession equaled in the 1994-1995 school year. One study found that teachers working in urban schools, such as New York City, are more likely to leave, but there is little significant difference in suburban and urban setting for teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 2001; Kopkowski, 2008).

Along with location of the school district, the socioeconomic status of the community could affect teacher turnover and retention. Teacher turnover in rural high-poverty school districts was 16.4 percent, and in urban high-poverty school districts it was 22 percent in the 2000-2001 school year (Ingersoll, 2004). The teacher turnover rate for high-poverty urban school districts is still closer to the national average, and the teacher turnover rate for high-poverty urban school districts is higher than the national urban school district average. Ingersoll (2004) researched teacher retention in high-poverty urban and rural school districts and found many similarities to the various aspects of teacher turnover and retention, such as less experienced teachers working within the schools. Over time, teacher turnover and retention in schools districts has changed by location of the school district.

School settings and job satisfaction coincide with teacher turnover research. Baker (2005) linked suburban schools to have better job satisfaction in teachers, and teachers who had been in the school for one to four years had a better job satisfaction; nevertheless the limit of the study are the participants being all choral teachers. Ma and MacMillan (1999) found that workplace did not affect job satisfaction of Canadian teachers.

Depending on the location of the school district, teachers determine job satisfaction based on different factors that they encounter within the

location. Rural teachers are likely to remain at the rural school districts if he/she feels a sense of community linked to the school (Collins, 1999; Goodpaster, Adedokun, & Weaver, 2012). Besides feeling connected to the community, school and professional factors impact rural teacher retention (Goodpaster et al., 2012). Reasons stated why teachers leave positions within rural school districts include lower income, geographic and social isolation, difficult working conditions, and NCLB requirements for highly qualified teachers (Hammer, Hughes, McClure, Reeves, & Salgado, 2005; Monk, 2007). The decisions for teachers in urban settings to stay or leave may be due to working conditions and school environment and not student influences (Johnson et al., 2012 as cited by Hammerness & Matsko, 2012).

Conclusion

Teacher turnover is growing rapidly towards the average job turnover listed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Teacher turnover ultimately affects student achievement, by placing effective or ineffective teachers within the classroom. Teacher job satisfaction can influence a teacher's decision to stay or leave the profession. Through numerous research studies, job satisfaction of teachers links to administration support, relationships with administrators, and administrative behaviors. There are other reasons noted that influence teacher job satisfaction, such as demographics of a teacher, salary, and personal reasons. Disparities in the research show that demographics of the teachers do not provide a general trend in determining teacher job satisfaction. The underlying problem with the research studies presented is the focus on mainly using surveys with Likert scales to determine job satisfaction. More qualitative research on the topics of teacher retention, especially pertaining to job satisfaction, needs to be completed. In order for the education system in the United States to stop being stagnant in the education world a ranking, a focus needs to be placed on teacher job satisfaction to in turn help student achievement.

References

- Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2013). The effects of school principals' leadership style on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educational sciences: Theory and practice*. 13(2). 806-811.
- Aiken, M. & Hage, J. (1966). Organizational alienation: A comparative analysis. *American Sociological Review*. 31. 497-507.
- Baker, V. (2005). The relationship between job satisfaction and the perception of administrative support among early career secondary choral music educators.
- Barnes, G., Crowe, E., and Schaefer, B. (2007) The cost of teacher turnover in five school districts: A pilot study. National commission on teaching and America's future. Retrieved from <http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/NCTAF-Cost-of-Teacher-Turnover-2007-full-report.pdf>
- Beesley, A., Atwill, K., Blair, P., and Barley, Z. (2010). Strategies for recruitment and retention of secondary teachers in central U.S. rural schools. *The Rural Educator*. 31(2). 1-9.
- Billingsley, B. & Cross, L. (1992). Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in teaching: A comparison of general and special education. *The Journal of Special Education*. 25(4). 453-471.
- Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study employing the experience sampling method. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences*. 3. 147-154.
- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2006). Teachers' perspectives on principal mistreatment. *Teacher Education Quarterly*. 123-142.
- Boe, E., Cook, L., & Sunderland, R. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfer, and school migration. *Exceptional Children*. 75(1). 7-31.
- Bogler, Ronit. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Education Administration Quarterly*. 37(5). 662-683.
- Bolin, F. (2007). A study of teacher job satisfaction and factors that influence it. *Chinese Education and Society*. 40(5). 47-64.
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). *The Influence of School Administrators on Teacher Retention Decisions*. Calder Urban Institute: Washington D.C.
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Who leaves? Teacher attrition and student achievement. *National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research*. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1001270_teacher_attrition.pdf
- Buckley, J., Schneider, M., and Shang, Y. (2004). The Effects of School Facility Quality on Teacher Retention in Urban School Districts. National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities: Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.231.5373&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2012). *Economic news release: Table 16. Annual total separation rates (1) by industry and region, not seasonally adjusted*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/jolts.t16.htm>.
- Burke, P., Schuck, S., Aubusson, P., Buchanan, J., Louviere, J., & Prescott, A. (2013). Why do early career teachers choose to remain in the profession? The use of best-worst scaling to quantify key factors. *International Journal of Education*. 1-10.
- Catalyst. (2012). *Catalyst Quick Take: Turnover and Retention*. New York: Catalyst. Retrieved from <http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/turnover-and-retention>
- Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviours of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management*

- Administration and Leadership*. 37(5). 600-623.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Cannady, M., McEachern, K., Piazza, P., Power, C., and Ryan, A. (2011). Teachers' education, teaching practice, and retention: A cross-genre review of recent research. *Journal of Education*. 191(2). 19-31.
- Collins, T. (1999). Attracting and retaining teachers in rural areas. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from <http://bern.library.nenu.edu.cn/upload/soft/0-article/+026/26140.pdf>
- Crane, D. & Green, R. (2013). Exploring leader behavior informed by the thirteen core competencies and their influence on teacher job satisfaction. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*. 26(1&2). 33-54.
- Cui-Callahan, N. (2012). An examination of job satisfaction among urban high school teachers. *ProQuest*.
- Davis, A. (2013). Job satisfaction beats salary. *Employee Benefit News*. Retrieved from <http://ebn.benefitnews.com/news/job-satisfaction-beats-salary-2734305-1.html>
- Davis, J. & Wilson, S. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction. *The Clearing House*. 73(6). 349-353.
- Department of Professional Employees. (2010). Fact sheet 2010.
- DiPaola, M. (2012). *Contemporary challenges confronting school leaders*. Information Age Publishing.
- Eddins, G. (2012). The influence of principal gender, teachers' years of experience and retention on teacher perceptions of principal leadership style, qualities, and job satisfaction. *ProQuest*.
- Feistritzer, C. (2011). Profile of teachers in the U.S. 2011. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/media/pot2011final-blog.pdf>
- Goodpaster, K., Abedokun, O., and Weaver, G. (2012). Teacher's perceptions of rural STEM teaching: Implications for rural teacher retention. *Rural Educator*. pp. 9-22.
- Gonzalez, L., Brown, M., and Slate, J. (2008). Teachers who left the teaching profession: A qualitative understanding. *The Qualitative Report*. 13(1). 1-11.
- Grossman, P. & Davis, E. (2012). Mentoring that fits. *Educational Leadership*. 54-57.
- Hammer, P., Hughes, G., McClure, C., Reeves, C., and Salgado, D. (2005). Rural teacher recruitment and retention practices: A review of the research literature, national survey of rural superintendents, and case student of programs in Virginia. *EDVANTIA: Charleston, West Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED489143.pdf>
- Hammerness, K. and Matsko, K. (2012). When context has context: A case study of new teacher induction in the University of Chicago's urban teacher education program. *Urban Education*. 48(4). pp. 557-584. DOI: 10.1177/0042085912456848
- Ingersoll, R. & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*. 60(8). 30-33.
- Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Education Research Association*. 38(3). 499-534.
- Jacob, A., Vidyarthi, E., and Carroll, K. (2012). The Irreplaceables: Understanding the Real Crisis in America's Urban Schools. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED533959.pdf>
- Johnson, S., Berg, J., and Donaldson, M. (2005). *Who stays in teacher and why: A review of literature on teacher retention*. NRTA Educator Support Network. Retrieved from http://assets.aarp.org/www.aarp.org/_articles/NRTA/Harvard_report.pdf

- Kersaint, G., Lewis, J., Potter, R. and Meisels, G. (2007). Why teachers leave: Factors that influence retention and resignation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 23. 775-794.
- Kopkowski, C. (2008). Why they leave. *National Education Association*. Retrieved from www.nea.org/home/12630.htm
- Lankford, H., Loeb, S., and Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools: A descriptive analysis. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*. 24(1). 37-62.
- Littrell, P., Billingsley, B., & Cross, L. (1994). The effects of principal support on special and general educators' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*. 15(5). 297-310.
- Ma, X. & MacMillan, R. (1999). Influences on workplace conditions on teachers job satisfaction. *The Journal of Educational Research*. 93(1). 39-47.
- Marinell, W. and Coca, V. (2013). Who stays and who leaves? Findings from a three-part study of teacher turnover in NYC middle schools. *The research alliance for New York City schools*. Retrieved from https://files.nyu.edu/RANYCS/public/media/TTPSynthesis_Report_March2013.pdf
- Monk, D. (2007). Recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers in rural areas. *The future of children*. Retrieved from https://www.futureofchildren.org/futureofchildren/publications/docs/17_01_08.pdf
- Ndoye, A., Imig, S., & Parker, M. (2010). Empowerment, Leadership, and Teachers' Intentions to Stay in or Leave the Profession or Their Schools in North Carolina Charter Schools. *Journal of School Choice*. 4. 174-190.
- Pearson, L. & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Education Research Quarterly*. 29(1). 37-53.
- Perie, M., Baker, D., & Whitener, S. (1997). Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation. *National Center for Educational Statistics*.
- Perrachione, B., Peterson, G., & Rosser, V. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction and Retention. *Professional Educator*. 32(2). 25-41.
- Quartz, K. (2004). Retention report series: A longitudinal study of career urban educators. *UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education, & Access*. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/1mw9h5m1#page-1>
- Reiss, F. & Hoy, W. (1998). Faculty loyalty: An important but neglected concept. *Journal of School Leadership*. 8. 4-25.
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. Retrieved from <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/TchTrnStAch%20AERJ%20R%26R%20not%20blind.pdf>
- Russell, D., Altmaier, E., & Van Velzen, D. (1987). Job-related stress, social support, and burnout among classroom teachers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 72(2). 269-274.
- Shed, L. (2010). An investigation on the relationship between teachers' rating of their principals' leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction in public education. *ProQuest*.
- Smith, P. C. (1974) Motivation, Attitudes, and Job Satisfaction. Retrieved from <http://www.sba.oakland.edu/Faculty/york/Readings434/Readings/Development%20of%20a%20method%20of%20measuring.pdf>
- Strauss, V. (2013). U.S. teachers' job satisfaction craters – report. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/02/21/u-s-teachers-job-satisfaction-craters-report/>

- Stronge, J. (2007). *Qualities of Effective Teaching* (2nd ed.). ASCD: Washington, D.C.
- Tickle, B. (2008). Public School Teachers' Perceptions of Administrative Support and its Mediating Effect on Their Job Satisfaction and Intent to Stay in Teaching. Retrieved from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-09102008-214736/unrestricted/Dissertation-Tickle.pdf>
- Tims, C., Graham, D., & Caltabiano, M. (2006). Gender implications of perceptions of trustworthiness of school administration and teacher burnout/job stress. *Applied Journal of Science*. 41(3). 343-358.
- Turner, H. (2007). Predictors of job satisfaction in urban schools. *ProQuest*
- Veldman, I., van Tartwijk, J., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2013). Job satisfaction and teacher student relationships across the teaching career: Four case studies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 32. 55-65.
- Whitenor, S., Lynch, H., and Fondelier, S. (1997). *Characteristics of stayers, movers, and leavers: Results from the teacher follow-up survey 1994-95*. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97450.pdf>
- Wolfe, C. (2010). Behaviors That Develop Mutual Trust and Its Association with Job Satisfaction. Retrieved from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-03292010-154955/unrestricted/CRWolfe_ETD.pdf
- Yager, S., Pederson, J., Yager, R., & Noppe, R. (2011). Impact of school leadership on teacher's professional growth: Teacher perception of administrative support. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*. 25(1). 12-21.