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ABSTRACT

John D. Denning: North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ Perceptions of Working Conditions and Concomitant Effects on Job Satisfaction and Retention
(Under the direction of Dr. Kathleen M. Brown)

Building on the literature dealing with teacher retention, job satisfaction, and working conditions, this study utilized an adaptation of Brownell and Smith’s Teacher Career Decision-Making model (1993) to test the relationships between NC Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions and their concomitant effects on job satisfaction and retention.

A one-time survey administered in the Spring of 2008 asked Fellows to rate levels of satisfaction and agreement about perceptions of time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development. Inferences were then made about Fellows’ overall job satisfaction based on responses to 18 general satisfaction indicators, as well as likely decisions to stay or leave the teaching profession.

The study’s response rate of 24% of all 1,814 potential Fellows teaching within years 1-6 and yielded a highly representative sample. Procedures used to analyze the data included basic descriptive statistics, an exploratory factor analysis, MANOVA and ANOVA tests for significant differences, and logistic regression. Comparisons to other NC teachers were based on past administrations of the North Carolina Working Conditions Initiative Survey Instrument. Other examined differences among Fellows teaching in years 1-4 and then 5 or more, as well as other groupings such
as gender, race, years of experience, campus affiliation, and field of study. Those who have already left teaching were also surveyed.

Confirming findings from the literature, Fellows’ responses indicated that, as perceptions of some working conditions perceptions improved, so did levels of general job satisfaction. Fellows were found to be less satisfied when compared to their peers across the state and across all working conditions constructs. Fellows who had already completed their four-year teaching commitment were more satisfied than their peers who had not. While improvements in perceptions of some working conditions correlated to improvements in general job satisfaction scores, the same improvements provided mixed results on retention decisions. Leadership-empowerment and general satisfaction emerged as a negative predictor for retention. Close to 50% of Fellows demonstrated interest in continuing as teachers, despite these counter-intuitive findings. Interpretations and explanations of these results were discussed in the context of the current policy environment along with recommendations for future research.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Introduction

This research study describes North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions and their concomitant effects on job satisfaction and retention. Focusing on the experiences of teachers who are highly recruited and then extensively trained to go into the teaching profession, this study utilized survey data to make inferences about their perceptions of working conditions as an indicator of job satisfaction as teachers. The analysis of rankings and perceptions of various working conditions led to conclusions about teachers’ overall levels of job satisfaction with work-life experiences and provided insight into the dilemma of teacher retention.

Retaining teachers is a major challenge for state and national policymakers alike. Moving beyond policies that merely attract and develop teachers is not enough if teachers find themselves in workplace settings that ultimately fail to yield on the investment of time and energy spent to recruit and train them. In recent years, a new national consensus has emerged around the idea that teachers are indeed the cornerstone of any sound system of quality education (Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; MetLife, 2005; National Council on Teacher Quality [NCTQ], 2007; Public Agenda, 2004; Rice, 2003; Recruiting New Teachers, 2001; Sanders & Rivers, 1996; The Teaching Commission, 2005; Wayne & Youngs, 2003). Given the focus of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and its sweeping policy levers to mandate improvements in student achievement, it seems
accurate that hopes for such goals will not occur without quality teachers at the helm of classrooms.

Solving the ongoing challenges of schools today will require a sustained supply of teachers who possess local and contextual knowledge that comes only from a sustained presence within the school’s community, culture, and surroundings. Considering the amount of time and energy required to induct and support new teachers, one cannot underestimate the value of a school faculty that encompasses a large amount of historical and professional knowledge that can only come with years of experience. Consequently, to examine more fully the issues present within schools and the environments in which teachers find their work, there is a need for an analysis of the real-world issues confronting teachers’ perceptions of their classrooms as workplaces. The impact of such perceptions, and their relationship to measures of overall job satisfaction, can shed light on influences on the decisions of teachers to stay or leave the classroom.

Current retention research has suggested that, of all teachers entering classrooms in the US, about one third of them leave the profession after three years, and almost half leave after five (Center for Teaching Quality [CTQ], 2005; Ingersoll, 2005, 2006; National Education Association [NEA], 2006). While some studies have provided a national estimate for turnover from all businesses with 1,000 employees or more to be

---

15.7% (Tourkin, 2007), data from the 2004 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) estimated that the rate of national teacher turnover trends is close to 17%.

These statistics highlight the difficulties facing school districts as they strive to retain teachers within their ranks. At what point is the multitude of efforts to recruit new teachers similar to that of a group of local firefighters pouring buckets of water on a raging fire in which, for every flame that is extinguished in one portion of the house, three more flames emerge in the next room? What are the factors that influence decisions to stay or leave the teaching profession? What conditions are at work in our schools that promote dissatisfaction with the teaching profession and prevent schools from striving toward their lofty goals of academic success for students? To answer these questions, we need to know more about the effects of teachers’ working conditions on their decisions to remain within the teaching profession.

This study investigated the working conditions of teachers in North Carolina by examining the perceptions of a group of individuals specifically recruited into teaching in North Carolina, the North Carolina Teaching Fellows. Using this lens, this study aimed to test the relationships between teachers’ working conditions and the resulting effects on job satisfaction and decisions to remain in teaching.

Background of the Study

Policy concerns about the shortage of qualified teachers have become more and more of a relevant policy issue since the late 1980s. Research has shown a variety of connections between teacher quality and improvements in student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Goldhaber & Brewer, 1999). Sanders’ value-added research (1996) found that students who had effective teachers for three years in a row showed significant
increases in their percentile rankings on state exams. Similarly, and regardless of other factors such as socioeconomic status, students from the same percentile ranks who had ineffective teachers showed significant decreases in exam scores. Rivkin, Hanusheck, and Kain (1998) examined a large data set of student outcomes across 3,000 schools and concluded that teacher quality stands as the most important predictor for student success.

Despite the emergence of this policy context, the troublesome nature of retaining teachers has continued to grow. A growing student population and trends showing an aging teacher population contribute to the teacher retention dilemma (Hussar, 1999). However, a significant amount of teacher turnover actually occurs when teachers leave one school to go to another or leave teaching altogether (Ingersoll, 2002, 2005). Distinguishing between “school-leavers” and “school-movers,” Ingersoll reported that more teachers left school due to dissatisfaction or to get a better job than for retirement or family reasons.

The issue of teacher retention is especially troubling for those schools thought of as hard to staff. Several studies have reported that minority, disadvantaged, and academically struggling students are more likely to be in hard-to-staff schools and less likely to have experienced, effective teachers (Clotfelter et al., 2004; Hirsch et al., 1998; Ingersoll, 2002; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). Thus, the children with the greatest need for effective teachers are less likely to get them.

Why is teacher retention such a dilemma? A number of national research efforts have taken on this question and revealed a great deal about the myriad reasons causing teachers to leave the profession (Berry, Rasberry, & Williams, 2007; Boe et al., 1994; Boe et al., 1996; Boe et al., 1998; Fetler, 1997; Ingersoll, 2002; Moore, Johnson, & Birkeland,
2003; North Carolina Public School Forum [NCPSF], 1996; Perie, 1997; Shann, 1998; Shen, 1997; 2003; Woods & Weasmer, 2002). Consistently, the list of causes has included several factors associated with teachers’ perceptions of their working conditions: salary and compensation concerns, classroom assignments and workloads, support and induction for new teachers, support for professional development, school safety, levels of autonomy and decision-making, a lack of secretarial services, and low levels of parental support and student readiness for learning.

This study has extended the scope of these earlier examinations of teachers’ perceptions of workplace factors by analyzing the connection between job satisfaction in a group of highly qualified recruits, North Carolina Teaching Fellows, and the impact of working conditions on their decisions to remain in teaching.

The North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program

The North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program was created in 1986 by the North Carolina General Assembly as one way to combat the growing shortage of qualified teachers, and now, twenty-two years later, it remains a high-profile program with many high hopes attached to it. A teacher recruitment program for high school seniors within the state, the program aims to recruit “talented high school graduates to the teaching profession” (NC Gen. Stat. § 115C-363.23A). Each year, the program awards a scholarship of $6,500 per year for a maximum of four years to 500 high school seniors who agree to teach for four years in North Carolina’s public schools. For each year of teaching service, a year of the scholarship/loan is repaid. If the recipient cannot repay the scholarship through service, the loan is repaid to the state with 10% interest.
The Teaching Fellows scholarship is open to “current North Carolina high school seniors and high-qualifying juniors accepted for college admission who are interested in becoming teachers and are legal residents of North Carolina for tuition purposes and will have met the twelve-month in-state residency requirement” (NC Teaching Fellows Commission, retrieved on November 3, 2007).

To be considered, the student submits an application with a copy of his or her high school transcript, a verification of SAT scores, a writing sample, and references. The requirements for the scholarship/loan include having academic standing, demonstrating leadership, and participating in extracurricular activities; in addition, they must undergo an extensive interview process. The interview process begins at each of North Carolina’s 115 local school districts and advances to a regional interview level where all applications are reviewed and scored for performance on all aspects of the selection criteria. Once selected, Fellows are required to maintain a 2.5 GPA or higher in all courses during their junior and senior years, to meet all local campus program requirements, and to participate in all campus and statewide programs, meetings, conferences, and experiences.

Eighteen campuses host a Teaching Fellows program in North Carolina. Thirteen are public institutions, and five are private institutions. During the application and selection process, an aspiring Teaching Fellow is required to gain acceptance and admittance on his or her own merits into any prospective higher education institution that hosts a Teaching Fellows Program. Each campus program is required to provide a program of experiences and opportunities that not only complement each institution’s traditional teacher preparation program but also augment and enrich the teacher preparation experience. Each campus designates a Teaching Fellows Director who is
responsible for the planning and delivery of their Teaching Fellows program. Some of the activities campuses provide include seminars, social activities, opportunities for enhanced field experiences, opportunities for travel, cultural experiences, collaboration with local districts, and diversity and technology education. One of the specific goals of each program is to provide opportunities for leadership development and activities that promote decision-making.

Each summer, Teaching Fellows participate in a scheduled set of activities designed to fit within each year of development and progression through the program. After the freshman year, all Teaching Fellows participate in an event called the Discovery Tour. This seven-day bus tour takes the Teaching Fellows across North Carolina, introducing them to various educational, cultural, and business institutions throughout the state. Rising juniors and seniors participate in conferences aimed at stimulating conversations around the issues of diversity (Junior Conference) and new systems of teaching and learning (Senior Conference). In the summer prior to the junior year, Teaching Fellows participate in an event called a “Junior Enrichment Experience.” This summer experience allows Teaching Fellows to choose from a wide-ranging list of opportunities that are usually a week in length and can include seminars, travel opportunities, internships, or other learning experiences that expose the Fellows to various aspects of cultural and educational institutions. During the summer prior to the senior year, Fellows participate in a “Senior Orientation” experience, which is a weeklong visit to a school system. The experience is designed to be a real-world introduction into the working organization of a school system.
The North Carolina Teaching Fellows Commission governs the Teaching Fellows Program. This group’s 11 members are appointed by the Governor, the Senate President Pro Tempore, the Speaker of the State House of Representatives, and the Chair of the State Board of Education. The Chair of the Commission is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor. The program is administered by the Public School Forum of North Carolina. The General Assembly appropriates approximately $13 million each year to cover the costs of the $6,500 scholarship for 2,000 active Fellows (500 per year), and $810,000 for administrative costs.

The North Carolina Working Conditions Initiative

An early antecedent to this study began with an effort to learn more about data-driven results of teachers’ perceptions of working conditions in North Carolina. In 2001, North Carolina Governor Mike Easley began a Teacher Working Conditions Initiative to examine the issue by creating a statewide survey about North Carolina teachers’ perceptions of working conditions. The North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission, with the support of the State Board of Education, conducted research and focus groups to develop 30 standards for working conditions in five broad categories: time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development. Focus groups including more than 500 teachers validated the categories or "domains." The original survey was made available to every licensed public school educator in North Carolina in 2002 and solicited teacher response on 39 statements regarding working conditions in these five categories.

The survey was administered for a second time in 2004 in an online format and with even more questions than the initial instrument. Upon receiving the survey results, a
statistical factor analysis was conducted not only to ensure that the survey was well
constructed but also to create domain averages that included questions that explained the
working conditions area described. In 2006, statewide administration of the survey
occurred for a third time. More than 75,000 surveys were submitted, and a 65% response
rate was achieved. An area of concern has been the question of what policymakers and
practitioners should do with the data beyond the mere collection of these perceptions. Led
by the Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ) and supported by a major grant from the
BellSouth Foundation, there have been efforts to promote conversations in local school
buildings about the implications of school-level results. The CTQ has created a toolkit
that enables building-level principals to take the school-level reports and perform their
own analysis and interpretation.

There is a growing interest in this work in other states as well. Other states and
some local districts have created similar efforts to collect and analyze similar kinds of
questions. In addition to North Carolina, South Carolina, and Kansas, individual districts
in Arizona, Nevada, Ohio, and Virginia have all undertaken an effort to better
comprehend the meaning behind teachers’ perceptions of their workplaces. Although
questions differ to a small degree on each state's survey, a series of core questions allows
all states and districts to begin analyzing their data with the aid of the toolkit.

Problem Statement and Research Design

Building on the literature dealing with teacher retention, job satisfaction and
working conditions, this study utilized an adaptation of Brownell and Smith’s conceptual
framework of a Teacher Career Decision-Making model (1993) to test the relationships
between North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions and their concomitant effects on job satisfaction and retention.

This study focused on the experiences of Fellows who are currently teaching within a four-year commitment to the state, as well as those who have elected to teach beyond the required four-year commitment. Teaching Fellows who have elected to leave the classroom within the last six years were also surveyed.

Respondents to the survey were asked to rate their levels of satisfaction and/or agreement about perceptions of time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development as constructs of working conditions within a school setting. Inferences were then made about respondents’ perceptions of working conditions as an indicator of job satisfaction.

Specific Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study: Generally, what are the perceptions of Teaching Fellows with regard to their working conditions? Specifically, what are the perceptions of Teaching Fellows regarding their school-level leadership as an influencing factor on their working conditions? How do the resources of time and facilities impact their perceptions of working conditions in their school? How do Teaching Fellows perceive the quality and effectiveness of professional development opportunities provided to them? To what degree does a teacher’s sense of empowerment and involvement in decision-making impact his or her perception of workplace conditions? Generally, what do Teaching Fellows’ perceptions tell us about their levels of job satisfaction? Specifically, how do these factors of working conditions influence their overall levels of job satisfaction? Of these factors, which matters the most in promoting
job satisfaction for teachers? Do some factors have a negative relationship to job satisfaction? Generally, what impact do working conditions and job satisfaction have on the retention of Teaching Fellows? Specifically, what conclusions can be made about the relationship between Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions and the retention of Fellows as teachers? Of the Teaching Fellows who have left the classroom, to what degree did their working conditions impact their decision to quit teaching? Of the Fellows teaching beyond their four-year commitment, why have they chosen to stay in the classroom, and what factors of working conditions have affected their decision to remain in the profession?

*Figure 1. Simple graph of working conditions’ impact on retention (Denning, 2008).*

Over a period of time, the various factors of the school’s environment, culture, norms, and parameters as an organizational workplace will have an impact on the individual teacher’s sense of job satisfaction that then has an impact on his or her decision to remain or leave teaching. There are other factors that influence a decision to remain or
leave teaching, hence the disproportionate size of the “decision box” to the “job satisfaction box.” *Time* is a variable as well. Over a period of time, the effects of working conditions have a lingering effect on the level of job satisfaction.

The study employed a quantitative analysis of survey responses to NC Teaching Fellows’ responses to questions regarding their perceptions of various constructs of working conditions. As with similar question sets from the NC Working Conditions Survey, participants responded to the variables of *time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment,* and *professional development* and rated each according to their level of satisfaction. Respondents also indicated their current level of satisfaction with their current school setting as well as with the teaching profession in general.

Capturing these data from a subset of teachers who have specifically been recruited to teach in North Carolina classrooms allowed for comparisons to all other NC teachers and yielded analyses on the potential variances in perceptions of job satisfaction and/or their intent to remain in the classroom. Efforts to sample a full representation of all potential Fellows teaching in years one through six were utilized to draw conclusions about the variance of perceptions between those who are new to the profession, those who have decided to teach beyond the state’s four-year commitment, and those who have already decided to leave the profession, either before or after their four-year obligation to the Fellowship Program. Exploratory factor analysis and logistical regressions were deployed to provide a more robust assessment of the relationships among these factors.

**Significance of This Study/Rationale of This Study**

While there has been some growth in the number of studies in this area in recent years, most research efforts have focused on the general descriptors of working conditions
as a factor of job satisfaction. This study sought to examine further the effects of working conditions and job satisfaction for their combined effects on teachers’ intentions to continue teaching. By asking respondents to offer their views on current working conditions within their schools as well as asking direct questions related to their intentions of staying at the school, to move to another school, and/or to leave the profession altogether, this study is intended to provide a more salient set of insights into the concomitant effects of working conditions and job satisfaction.

This study also is unique because of its sampling strategy. The focus on a group of highly recruited individuals such as the North Carolina Teaching Fellows was intended to provide insight into the impact of such programs that attempt both to provide more teachers into the teacher supply ranks and to attract qualified applicants to the profession.

This study is especially relevant for the policy environment. Escalating public expenditures for teacher recruitment and other efforts to improve overall teacher quality are causing school districts, schools of education, and policymakers alike to grapple with the dilemma of sustaining a viable and high quality teaching force (Barnes & Crowe, 2007; Benjamin, 2007; Berry, Rasberry, & Williams, 2007; CTQ, 2007; Education Week, 2007; Rice, 2003).

Significant attention—along with many resources—has been given to the focused improvement of education within the North Carolina educational policy arena. In light of such investments, policymakers need to be aware of the realities of the teaching profession, a teacher’s sense of job satisfaction, and the working conditions that can lead teachers either to commit themselves to the profession or to leave the classroom. Additionally, practitioners need not only a greater sense of why their colleagues may be
leaving the classroom but also an awareness of both the subtle and obvious dimensions of their workplaces and the subsequent effects of such environments on their craft, student learning, teacher-administrator relationships, and school morale.

While in the past many efforts have sought answers to these ongoing dilemmas, little has been done to uncover more fully a robust understanding of the statistical analyses of various survey data. As suggested by Guba (1999), this research “fits” for an examination between policy and practice. A better understanding of the factors associated with teacher working conditions as influences on job satisfaction can inform both policy and practice. Further, by delving into the documented perceptions of teacher working, such research can only add to the body of knowledge for policymakers hoping to work within the teacher retention area.

Limitations of This Study

This study did not seek to understand the total array of issues that may or may not affect teachers’ levels of job satisfaction. External motivators such as salary, social status, and other geographic or economic influences were not accounted for. Internal motivators such as personal drive, determination, perseverance, resiliency, and other factors were also not explicitly measured. This study examined the specific matters of the workplace environment and how the varied perceptions of these resources, contexts, and matters influence a teacher’s level of job satisfaction.

This study did not sample teachers from across the continuum of teaching experience. As it was limited to Fellows within their first six years of teaching, more analysis across the full distribution of teaching experience and from other sectors of recruited-teacher populations is needed.
The study was designed to be non-experimental, and, as such, it did not fully attempt to gain access to all of the Teaching Fellows who have left the classroom. Efforts were limited to reaching out to Teaching Fellows with the information contained within the Employment Verification Form. Teaching Fellows who have left the classroom were potentially accessible via this conduit, but their response rates were anticipated to be small.

Inasmuch as this was not an explicit retention study, the findings, however, do illuminate the factors that are associated with those who have chosen to remain in the classroom beyond a given required period. It also provides insight into factors that could be enhanced, altered, or improved upon as a means of improving job satisfaction. Because of the observations gleaned via this one-time survey administration, the most generalized conclusions that can be drawn are those that deal with those surveyed and their current perceptions. Further research is needed to explicate more fully other recruited groups and teachers in general for reasons contributing to their leaving the profession.

Definitions of Key Terms Used In This Study

There are several key terms utilized within this study. There are two latent variables measured in this study: job satisfaction and teacher retention. Both variables are calculated via the observations of manifest variables for time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development.

---

2 Future references to these terms will be italicized when they are specifically referring to the variables of time, leadership, and so forth, within this study. Likewise, when referenced as a variable, facilities and resources will be referred to as facilities and resources. When referencing the group of all variables together, perceptions of working conditions will be used.
Job satisfaction is a subjective measure of contentment with one’s job. There are a variety of factors that can influence a person's level of job satisfaction. For the purposes of this study, levels of job satisfaction were measured as a co-joined variable of the answers to rankings on working conditions constructs and questions from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) instrument.

For the purposes of this study, the instrument measured perceptions of working conditions related to five factors affecting a teacher’s workplace. These factors are time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development. Together, these factors were identified and measured against the degree of satisfaction that respondents have with each manifest variable. Those respondents who had already elected to leave teaching were asked to rank their perceptions of workplace factors in the last school in which they were employed. Time was assessed via questions that asked respondents if they felt as if they have time to collaborate with colleagues, the amount of time that they spend on instructional versus administrative duties, and how much time is required for teachers to work outside of their required contractual obligations. Leadership was evaluated with questions about communication, shared vision, access to other resources, and other functions of instructional leadership. Effectiveness ratings for these measures were generated from respondents’ views of satisfaction with each item. The perceptions of how respondents feel about their access to instructional materials, technology, office supplies, space to work, and the cleanliness and safety of their work environments was determined through a set of questions measuring the construct of facilities and resources. The construct of teacher empowerment was evaluated by respondents’ answers to questions about the nature of decision-making and opportunities
for teachers to be supported and involved in programmatic issues within a school. This
construct examined the degree to which a teacher feels as if there are opportunities for
growth or advancement as well. Lastly, the construct of professional development was
examined via questions that asked teachers about their access to professional development
and the degree to which they rated the quality of professional development offerings and
relevancy to their teaching role.

Teacher retention is the variable that was studied via respondents’ answers to the
questions about their intentions to remain in teaching in the following academic year and
their future career plans. As teacher retention is discussed, three categories of teachers
will be described: Teacher-stayers are teachers who stay in teaching from one year to the
next. Teacher-movers are teachers who are counted as a part of employee turnover but
only because they leave one school to teach at another. Teacher-leavers are teachers
counted as a part of employee turnover because they leave the teaching profession
altogether.

Data for this research came from a survey that combined questions from the North
Carolina Working Conditions Initiative (NCWCI), the Schools and Staffing Survey
(SASS), and the Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFUS). NCWCI is the statewide initiative
started by Governor Mike Easley to document and analyze teacher working conditions in
North Carolina. SASS is the only nationally representative study of U.S. schools and
teachers. TFUS is the follow-up survey administered to participants who have already
participated in an earlier administration of SASS. The National Center for Education
Statistics, which is an arm of the U.S. Department of Education, administers both the
SASS and the TFUS.
The Employment Verification Form (EVF) is the documentation that the Public School Forum of North Carolina and the NC Teaching Fellows Program use to validate Teaching Fellows who are employed and, in essence, are repaying the state for their fellowship award through service.

Organization of This Dissertation

The remainder of this dissertation is organized into four remaining chapters.

Chapter 2 continues with a review of the current literature findings on issues related to the development of schools as an organizational workplace, working conditions, job satisfaction, and teacher retention. After each section of relevant literature findings, a summary of the elements used to build the conceptual framework for this study is presented. Chapter 3 provides further details of the methodology and process by which this study was conducted. This chapter contains descriptions of the statistical analyses that were performed and the rationale for selecting each analytical tool. Chapter 4 yields the results and findings of the research questions. Chapter 5 provides analysis and conclusions based on the summary of findings and offers suggestions for practitioners and policymakers. Chapter 5 concludes with suggestions for further continued research around the issues of working conditions and their impact on job satisfaction and, ultimately, on teacher retention.

In summary, this study sought to better understand the relationships between teacher working conditions and the combined effects of working conditions and job satisfaction with teacher retention. This is an important research area because of its relevance to both policymakers and the public. As policy concerns mount regarding the burgeoning need for a greater teacher supply, getting a better understanding of the
dynamics of teacher retention is important. In North Carolina, efforts to grapple with this problem have led to significant efforts to recruit talented high school seniors into teaching. This study has great relevance, as a number of working-conditions studies have been conducted but none has identified unique groups of recruits. Utilizing a web-based survey instrument that combines questions from NCWCI, SASS, and TFUS, this study sought to test the relationships between the manifest variables of time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development to job satisfaction and teacher retention.

Chapter 2 examines the relevant literature findings on teacher retention, job satisfaction and working conditions and describes the conceptual framework used to develop this study.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Informed by studies of teacher retention and job satisfaction and the subsequent literature regarding working conditions, this study was designed to provide insight into the growing dilemma of teacher supply. Gaining a better understanding of the day-to-day realities of what employment within a school setting is truly like will support and inform the goals of recruiting and retaining qualified teachers. After setting out the limitations and processes guiding this literature review, the remainder of this chapter discusses the relevance and saliency of the literature findings and a conceptual framework for examining the influence of working conditions on teacher retention.

Limitations for Conducting Literature Review

This review of the literature focuses on research in the areas of teacher retention, job satisfaction, and working conditions. While this review of the literature also includes aspects of the organizational development of schools as workplaces, this review does not explore the number of other factors associated with teacher dissatisfaction or other barriers to teacher retention such as salary, personal or family reasons (such as the relocation of a spouse), or family-planning decisions. It is also not an exhaustive review of the numerous recruitment strategies being explored in North Carolina or across the nation.
Approach to Literature Review

In reviewing the literature related to teacher retention, job satisfaction, and working conditions, a number of techniques were utilized to uncover relevant scholarship in these areas. A review of articles from the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) database revealed more than 900 articles when the keywords used in the search were *working conditions, teaching conditions, or teacher working conditions*. Honing in on these articles for those that also include the keyword *retention* reduced the number of articles to just 65. A search in ERIC using the keywords *teachers’ job satisfaction* yielded more than 1,672 entries. Refining this search to include those entries related to *working conditions* reduced this number to 155 entries. The UNC Library Catalog was also searched, yielding similar results with a larger number of studies and texts examining the general concept of working conditions, from many realms including industrial labor relations, personnel management research, and histories of other labor movements. When the search parameters were narrowed to focus on teacher working conditions and teacher job satisfaction alone, many additional entries were found.

The overall depth of much of this literature, however, is tentative in its ability to demonstrate powerful connections between teacher retention, job satisfaction, and the places of teacher work. In addition to traditional library research methodologies, a careful review of many of the endnotes and footnotes of articles and book chapters on these topics was also conducted. *Education Week* and the publications of national teacher quality policy organizations such as the Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ), the Education Commission of the State, the National Governors Association, and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) were searched and reviewed as well. What follows is a summary
of the most significant of these studies and their relevance to this study in regards to retention, job satisfaction, and working conditions.

The Dilemma of Teacher Retention

The current literature on teacher retention research suggests that, of all teachers entering classrooms in the US, about one third of them leave the profession after three years, and almost half leave after five (CTQ, 2005; Ingersoll, 2005, 2006; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2005b; NEA, 2006; Teaching Commission, 2005). The most quoted source of national data regarding teacher turnover in the United States is the National Center for Education Statistics’ Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). Begun in the late 1980s, the instrument, which is administered every three years, comprises four components: a School Questionnaire, a Teacher Questionnaire, a Principal Questionnaire, and a School District Questionnaire (NCES, 2004). Findings from SASS analyses have provided much insight into the troubling questions around why, who, and from what areas teachers are leaving. More specifically, the results helped shape this section of the review into the following areas: retention in general, new teacher retention, retention in hard-to-staff schools, and the costs of retention.

Retention in General

Richard Ingersoll has written much on the subject of teacher supply and teacher attrition (2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2002). Much of his work examines the large national data sets resulting from the administrations of SASS and its accompaniment, TFUS (NCES, 1995, 1996, 1997). Ingersoll’s distinction between teacher attrition as a result of teacher-leavers (those who leave the profession) versus teacher-movers (those who remain in teaching but move to another school or position) is helpful. Based on his analysis of the 2000 SASS
administration, annual turnover for teachers was reported as 15.7%, of which 7.3% was from teacher-movers and 8.4% was from teacher-leavers. This is regarded as significantly higher than the rate of turnover for all other non-teaching occupations, which is 11-12% (Ingersoll, 2002).

Seeking insight into a better understanding of what motivates teacher-leavers has guided much of Ingersoll’s research in recent years. Written by Ingersoll in 2003, *Who Controls Teachers’ Work?* offers an informative look into the notion of power and control within schools as social organizations. A central tenet of his writing is that schools cannot be reduced to the simplistic organizational models of “loosely-coupled systems” or “top-down bureaucracies.” He has argued that, to better understand the complexities of schools, one has to more fully understand the dynamics of coordination and control within schools. Citing the paradox that schools are similar to production-oriented industries while simultaneously being inherently social organizations, Ingersoll described the dilemma of all who have ever been charged with managing a factory floor—or a schoolhouse: “How does one harness the skill and expertise of employees and still ensure the simultaneous need for both organizational accountability and employee commitment?” (p.131). In other words, there are no “silver bullets” or quick fixes to the problem of teacher retention.

According to a study of the NCES, a majority of the teachers who left teaching in the United States in 1996 cited inadequate administrative support as a major reason for leaving the classroom (Perie, 1997). There have been a number of other studies that have attempted to examine teacher retention (Boe et al., 1993; Boe et al., 1994; Boe et al., 1996; Boyer et al., 1998, 1999, 2004; Cherniss, 1995; Curran, 2000; Fetler, 1997; Gonzalez, 1995; House, 1988; McCreight, 2000; North Carolina Public School Forum [NCPSF], 1996; Rubland, 2002;
Shen, 1997). In these studies, an aggregate list of factors related to teachers leaving the profession has been identified:

- salary, compensation, and benefits
- classroom assignments and workloads
- support and guidance from administrators
- support and induction for new teachers
- support for professional development
- school safety
- stress
- levels of autonomy and decision making
- lack of opportunities for job advancement
- lack of secretarial services
- levels of parental support and student readiness

While there is an emergence of literature dealing with notions of working conditions and the larger frames of teacher quality, including teacher turnover and teacher retention, there is little that links these concepts. Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin (2001) sought to make this link by augmenting previous analyses of teacher compensation studies and by examining the additional effects of “environmental” factors on teacher mobility. Their study found that, while salary was a minimal factor influencing teachers’ decisions to move from one school to another (less than 0.5%), other reasons, such as a desire for a more homogeneous student body, were more strongly involved in mobility.
New Teacher Retention

There has been a growth of retention studies looking at new teacher retention in particular (Boe et al., 1999; Chauncey, 2005; Richin et al., 2003). In 2005, the MetLife Teacher Survey focused on the dilemmas facing new teachers. When asked if they could see themselves teaching in the next five years, 7% of respondents said that they were “very likely” to leave teaching, and an additional 10% said they were “likely” to do so. Calls for intensive support mechanisms and induction programs are common recommendations from studies of new teachers. Others have focused attention on the needs of retaining minorities or those who teach special subject areas, such as math, science, or special education (Boe et al., 1996; Boe et al., 1998; Boyer et al., 2004; Cross & Billingsely, 1994; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1987; Gersten, 1995; Gonzalez, 1995; Middleton & Mason, 1988; Murphy, DeArmond, & Guinn, 2003; National Association of State Boards of Education, [NASBE], 1998; Nickson & Krisonis, 2006; Schnorr, 1998; Watts & Hull, 2003; Wise, 1993). Many of these findings have also suggested the importance of mentors—as well as special incentives, such as direct compensation, recognition, and opportunities for continued professional growth—within the school system (Gillie-Gossom, 2007; Kirby & LeBude, 1998; NCTAF, 1997).

Retention at Hard-To-Staff Schools

It is important to note that teacher retention is more of a problem for so-called hard-to-staff schools. Because of the perception of difficult student or parent populations, lack of resources, or geographical placement, some schools are simply more difficult to staff adequately. Far too often, these schools are serving high-minority populations or those of low socioeconomic status (Berry & Hirsch, 2005; Ingersoll, 2001; McClure & Reeves, 2004). The
MetLife Survey of 2005 reported that, of the 17% of new teachers reporting that they would likely not be teaching in the next five years, 54% of them were from low-income schools, and 61% were from inner-city or rural schools. The dilemma of teacher attrition in these schools that are already strapped is especially hard. As evidenced by Ingersoll’s investigation of teacher attrition reported within the 2000 SASS dataset, there were 7% more teacher-leavers from high poverty school settings than from low poverty schools. As Ingersoll argued, “[I]nadequate administrative support, poor student discipline policies and practices, and limited authority to make decisions are more likely to impact teacher retention in these hard to staff schools than other factors such as salary” (p. 42).

Costs of Retention

A significant policy question that stems from this research is the notion of what costs are borne by states and districts when there is so much turnover. In August 2005, the Alliance for Excellent Education sought to design estimates within each of the 50 states. Using costs associated with the Department of Labor’s estimation that attrition costs are roughly 30% of an employee’s salary, the calculation yields a staggering number for policymakers, educators, and the public alike: $2.2 billion per year. If one adds to salary costs an estimation of other costs associated with teachers moving to other districts, the costs rise to $4.9 billion, and the range flows from $8.5 million for North Dakota to an incredible $500 million for the state of Texas. In North Carolina, these costs are estimated at $84 million for salary-related costs and $104 million if other costs of recruitment are then added (NCTAF, 2007). It should be noted that none of the financial costs include the programmatic costs of the lost continuity to school faculties. Those charged with addressing this dilemma would be wise to pay attention to
other studies that demonstrate that experienced teachers make a difference in improving student learning (Hanushek; 2005; NCTAF, 2007; NYT, 2005; Sanders, 2004).

Of relevance to North Carolina is that fact that more than one out of every three teachers leaves the classroom by the end of his or her 5th year (NCPSF, 2006). According to the System Level Teacher Turnover Report, issued by the NC Department of Public Instruction in October for 2005-2006, 12,730 teachers left their school systems during the 2004-2005 school year. These figures represent an aggregate system-level turnover rate of 12.58%, pointing to an alarming trend for those charged with recruiting teachers. As school districts allocate more resources into recruiting more qualified candidates, if those who are heavily recruited do not end up staying, it yields a very difficult scenario for schools seeking to create sustainability and to enhance learning. Both the attributes that come with experienced teachers and the established norms that support school-wide change and improvements will be hampered by the constant focus on simply getting more new staff, which leaves little room for building on their collective expertise and wisdom.

Many efforts have been employed to deal with the “recruitment and retention” dilemma. Strategies such as signing bonuses, housing incentives, tuition reimbursement, streamlining the hiring process, and creating fewer barriers to entering the profession have done little to confront the retention portion of the dilemma (Berry, 2007; Education Week, 2006; News and Observer, 2006). While such strategies have done much to try to address recruitment challenges, the literature points to two major domains of efforts to grapple with teacher retention: job satisfaction and working conditions.
Summary of Retention

To summarize these findings, teacher retention is an intense dilemma for policymakers and educators. With one third of all new teachers leaving the profession after only three years and almost half leaving after five, schools are missing the enhanced teaching that comes from experienced, stable, and cohesive faculties. The SASS dataset is the only nationally representative sample of teacher opinions related to overall rates of satisfaction with the teaching profession. These data have illuminated a number of the important variables associated with teacher retention. There are distinctions between teachers who simply move from one school to another and those who leave the profession altogether. High-poverty, inner-city, and rural schools are more likely to see attrition due to both types of leavers.

There is a variety of factors cited as influencing teacher-leavers. These include salary, workloads, support, professional development, safety, autonomy, and opportunities to be involved and engaged in decision-making within the school. A number of researchers have sought to discern more about what motivates math, science, and special educators as well as new teachers to leave the profession. The costs of teacher attrition make teacher turnover an important policy challenge, and, while a number of policy levers have been used to impact teacher recruitment efforts, few have been extended into the retention arena.

While this study did not seek to address the issues of teacher supply or how to improve upon recruitment strategies, it serves as a complementary search for a better understanding of the issues related to teacher retention.

Job Satisfaction

The current literature on job satisfaction reveals a significant number of studies examining the nature of what constitutes job satisfaction as well as what creates or hinders job
satisfaction. This section of the review is divided into three parts. The first section deals with efforts to define job satisfaction and the motivational theories connected to those definitions. The second section describes investigations of job satisfaction among teachers and the variety of variables used to view the concept of teacher job satisfaction. The third section examines findings from national datasets looking more specifically at teacher job satisfaction.

Defining Job Satisfaction and Connecting Motivational Theories

Before the 1950s, most of the literature regarding job satisfaction referred to work as simply a function of an economic need. However, recent explorations of satisfaction in the workplace have revealed much about the quality of worklife. As organization studies have multiplied in the post-World War II era, so has the impetus for a greater understanding of workers and their environments (Hultaker, 1977). Beginning with Maslow’s theory of hierarchical needs (1943) and contrasted with Herzberg’s notion of workers’ desires for growth (1966), efforts to provide a fuller definition of job satisfaction have grown. Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from gratification or satisfaction about one’s job” (p. 81). In other words, job satisfaction evolves from the interaction of one’s values and one’s perceptions of the job and its environment (Hopkins, 1983). Similarly, Sundstrom (1986) discussed how job satisfaction is a “summary evaluative judgment that reflects the individual’s past and present experience, including experience with the physical environment” (p. 39).

In relation to these notions of satisfaction, the literature provides insight into the issues of human motivation and the factors involved in leading one to being satisfied or dissatisfied. Through their writings on motivational theory, Maslow (1943, 1954, 1970) and Herzberg (1959, 1964, 1968) have offered differing perspectives about what motivates people.
However, both writers have suggested that, in order for people to move themselves toward a particular task or event, some motivational force stimulates the particular response.

Written in 1943, Maslow’s classic article “A Theory of Human Motivation” argued that humans are motivated to do certain things because of the existence of a hierarchical order of needs. Herzberg’s 1968 article “One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?” stated that workers are more motivated to action if their work involves “richer” meaning and allows for personal growth.

Maslow’s thesis maintained that all humans have needs and that, because of those needs, people are moved to action only if those actions satisfy a particular need. According to Maslow, five levels of needs exist. Beginning with the physiological needs such as hunger and oxygen, followed in succeeding order by the need for safety, love, and then esteem, each need-level allows for the following level to be met and culminates with a final level of need called self-actualization. Maslow’s hierarchy is built on the notion that humans are constantly striving to meet needs ranging from desire for belonging to a group to a sense of self-respect. In fact, Maslow might say that life is nothing but people simply striving to have their needs met. Though these levels of needs can change for different people, and most behavior is multimotivated, the highly prized, but often missed, goal of satisfying our highest level of need—for self-actualization, or a sincere state of self-fulfillment—is a need not experienced by everyone.

This theory of human motivation posits that educators should focus their energies on helping and encouraging students and teachers meet their needs. If needs are present, managers and organizations should realize this fact and offer assistance to that end. For example, schools should not only have clean air to breathe and provide for a safe place to
learn and work, but they should also be a place where one’s need for love and high self-esteem can be met. To support the goals of increased job satisfaction, people should be rewarded for their progression through these stages of need, and, if rewarded properly, students and teachers may act in desired patterns of behavior toward the goals of the organization.

Herzberg (1968) diverged from Maslow’s needs-satisfaction theory to what he pointed out is a “hygiene versus motivation” continuum. Herzberg would urge school administrators to look beyond the “basic” levels of satisfying needs (through such means as wages, benefits, increased communications, etc.) and to think about ways to complete what he terms “job enrichment.” Citing references to industrial engineering, the behavioral sciences, and organizational theory, Herzberg’s “eternal triangle” concept proposed that there is a great deal of difference between hygienic factors such as working conditions, salary, status, security, and the major motivational needs of personal growth. Herzberg’s suggestion for leaders who want to motivate others was to gain a better understanding of the power of the ability to achieve. It is through achievement that one gains the experience of psychological growth. A desire for such growth is what truly motivates people to action. The stimuli for growth needs—and as a result, also for job satisfaction—are tasks that induce growth and provide for true motivation, not mere hygienics.

Referring to the extrinsic and intrinsic motivators for job satisfaction, Korman discussed the difference between factors related to job satisfaction that are within “management control” and others that are administered personally or within “personal control” (as cited in Reyes, 1990). Regardless of the origin of the factor, be it from the boss or the worker, there are environmental and psychological factors related to the level of one’s
degree of satisfaction with one’s job. Monday, Porter, and Steers (as cited in Engvall, 1997) discussed this notion as one of commitment to one’s job. They defined commitment as:

- A strong belief in and acceptance of the organizational/professional goals and values
- A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization/profession
- A strong desire to maintain membership in the organization/profession

*Job Satisfaction in Teaching*

Commonly accepted is the idea that good working conditions lead to more satisfied workers (Crotts & Michaels, 2003; Hoke, 2004; Miller, 2003). While there have been studies to examine the impact of positive working conditions on productivity since the early 20th century, the empirical evidence for positive working conditions as a factor in overall job satisfaction and retention rates has only grown with contemporary studies within the fields of human resource management and organizational development (Lee, 2005; Whitney & Kohn, 2003).

The thinking is that more satisfied workers are more likely to stay on the job and to bring cumulative work experience, knowledge, expertise, and history to their various roles. As a result, better working conditions lead to decreased employee turnover, which in turn leads to greater retention rates for employees (Graham, 2004). Extending this notion to schools yields the assumption that, in addition to schools and classrooms as places of learning for students, they are also places of employment for teachers. Supporting this thinking is research showing there is a strong relationship between teachers’ perceptions of their teaching
conditions and their stated intentions of staying in teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Hirsch et al., 2006; Ingersoll, 2001; MetLife, 2005, 2006; NCES, 2001).

While traditional examinations of job satisfaction studies have not been easily replicated into the world of teacher work, several studies have undertaken the specific task of bringing about a more robust understanding of the factors affecting teachers’ satisfaction with their job (Abelson, 1986; Clarke, 1995; Kershaw, 1994; Klecker & Loadman, 1996; Perie & Baker, 1997). In a study of job satisfaction for teachers in developing countries, Garrett (1999) stated what many might identify as the obvious: defining job satisfaction in teaching is complex work. Garrett described job satisfaction in teaching as “multi-faceted and composed of a range of factors including teacher salaries, working conditions, pupils’ performance, and work colleagues, status in the community, and the complexity and stress of the job” (p. 57).

Klecker and Loadman’s (1996) study showing a positive linear correlation between teacher empowerment and job satisfaction used seven measures of teacher job satisfaction. These seven measures are salary, opportunities for advancement, degree of challenge of the job, autonomy, general working conditions, interaction with colleagues, and interaction with students.

For Teacher Attitudes about Work (1990), Robert Kottkamp administered a survey indexing indicators of teachers’ levels of satisfaction in the workplace. While producing limited statistical analyses and some correlational data suggesting that job satisfaction was linked to levels of satisfaction with salary and parental support, Kottman issued a call for a more robust research agenda around the questions of teacher job satisfaction.

Smylie (1990) has researched the concept of levels of commitment on the part of teachers. He identified a key ingredient of a teacher’s level of commitment to the profession
as being his or her own perception of the efficacy and ability to carry out appropriately his or her expected duties. If teachers perceive themselves as adequately functioning in their roles as teachers, the thinking is that they are generally more satisfied with their teaching role. Quaglia, Marion, and McIntire (1991) essentially confirmed this view in their study, which shows that those who see teaching as a “career, all-encompassing and life-long, rather than a job” (p. 23) are more inclined to be satisfied within their jobs.

A study with a unique design by Roisum Foley (2004) offered similar results. Rosium Foley selected a group of music educators in Minnesota and asked them to nominate three colleagues within their region whom they viewed as “models of superior music teaching” (p. 64). Roisum Foley reported highly significant differences between the “superior” teachers’ rankings of longevity, satisfaction, and likelihood of leaving the profession than their peers.

Some studies have examined differences in job satisfaction levels between public and private school teachers (Cox-McNeill, 2003; Kris, 2004; McGrath & Princiotta, 2005; Reyes & Pounder, 1993). They have found greater degrees of satisfaction and organizational commitment in teachers in schools having a normative value orientation (private schools) than those in a more utilitarian value orientation (public schools). Sentovich (2004) used a multi-level analysis study to discover variances between public, private, and charter school teachers’ perceptions of job satisfactions. Her findings build on personal motivation as an element of job satisfaction, noting the importance of how personal relationships contribute to greater levels of job satisfaction. Sentovich corroborated much of the working conditions findings by also attributing greater job satisfaction levels to teachers who have “adequate resources like time and materials, when they have autonomy in their own classrooms, and when they are satisfied with their class sizes and salary” (p. 148). Building on the importance
of personal relationships, Sentovich called for more research into the pivotal role of principals in being able to influence organizational factors that could possibly enhance teacher job satisfaction levels. The connection of personal relationships as a variable affecting job satisfaction is supported in the findings of the MetLife Teacher Surveys as well (2005, 2006).

One variable of job satisfaction considered by Imber and Neidt (1990) is the degree to which a teacher is involved in the decision-making processes of a school. Their research citing increased levels of job satisfaction from teachers after they participated in the more process-oriented structure of decision-making lends credence to the idea that teachers who are treated as professionals are happier with their jobs. An issue brief by the Education Commission of the States in 2001 highlighted this behavior, saying that “teachers are looking for the right combination of leadership and autonomy” (p. 17). Other variables shown to have a relationship to job satisfaction include contingent rewards, communication, workplace fairness, self-efficacy, assistance with student discipline problems, and engaged support from leadership (Bell-Roundtree, 2004; Cox-McNeil, 2003; Education Week, 2006; Kris, 2004; Xiaofeng & Meyer, 2005; Zurmehly, 2004).

Teacher Job Satisfaction and National Datasets

Each of the previous studies utilized sampling of discrete populations within local or state arenas, but an analysis of TFUS of 1993-1994 utilized findings from a nationally representative sample of educators participating in the 1992-1993 administration of SASS. NCES (1997) reported the following findings relevant to this research:

- Elementary school teachers reported greater levels of satisfaction than their secondary counterparts.
Across all categories of analysis, teachers who enjoy greater degrees of parental support reported greater levels of satisfaction.

Some background characteristics such as age and experience were dependent on levels of satisfaction, but the greater level of relationship occurred between their reported levels of administrative support, parental involvement, and level of teacher controls over their own environment.

Weiss (1999) extended the NCES research by looking more deeply at the responses of first-year teachers within the SASS data set. Her findings confirmed a strong relationship between overall job satisfaction levels and commitment to teaching as a profession, good facilities, teacher induction, and professional support. Alt, Kwon, and Henke’s work (1999), which also compared public school teachers and private school teachers from the same dataset, revealed similar analyses. No more than 30% of public school teachers reported high satisfaction with any of several aspects of their work in 1993-1994, while over 50% of private school teachers reported high satisfaction with the same aspects of their work.

In addition to satisfaction, the literature contained discussion around a concept known as dissatisfaction. There are some factors within a work environment that lead to greater levels of displeasure or negativity associated with one’s job (Herzberg, 1968; Hopkins, 1983; Hultaker, 1977). Kanter (1977) suggested the possibility of transference of emotional climate between one’s personal and professional lives. While Kanter’s study first framed this notion in a linear fashion, Voydanoff (1990) expanded on Kanter’s work to posit that the nature of influence could indeed be reciprocal. In other words, one’s personal emotional status could affect job satisfaction and vice versa. Price (1997), among others in the field of
organizational psychology, has argued that the notion of job satisfaction is therefore a multifaceted construct.

The literature review yielded some powerful evidence that job satisfaction is connected to a willingness to continue in teaching. Ever since 1986, MetLife has administered to teachers a national survey on a variety of topics, including general satisfaction measures with the profession. The data from the 2006 survey revealed that teachers are more satisfied than they have ever been in the 20 years of the survey’s history. More interesting than this comparative data is the fact that, despite an improvement in the overall levels of satisfaction by 20% in 20 years, the percentage of teachers reporting likelihood to leave the profession has remained constant at around 27%. Furthermore, the intensity of those reporting on a response scale of “fairly likely” versus “very likely” to leave has increased by an additional 4 percentage points over the 20-year history of the survey.

Summary of Job Satisfaction

In summary, early studies of job satisfaction were limited in their ability to provide both a definition of job satisfaction or context from the workplaces of teachers. Motivational theories have guided much of the research of job satisfaction. While there are both internal and external motivators leading people to be satisfied, much of today’s literature has focused on connecting or at least manipulating those external factors (such as commitment to organizational goals, self-efficacy, relationships with colleagues, and leadership) as well as aspects of working conditions (such as opportunities for professional development, student discipline, workplace fairness, facilities, and professional support).

Recent studies of national datasets have generally supported the theoretical premise that administrative support, parental involvement, and increased opportunities for teachers to
have some level of control over their own environments are all factors leading to increased job satisfaction. While it was not the focus of this study, there is literature dealing with the notion of factors associated with job dissatisfaction and the interaction of one’s personal or emotional state with levels of job satisfaction.

Working Conditions of Teachers

Teachers’ working conditions are a subject of increased discussion in today’s current literature (Education Week, 2005; Grossman, 2003; Hirsch, Emerick, Church, & Fuller, 2007; Loeb, Elfers, Knapp, Plecki, & Boatright, 2004; NEA, 2006; Novick, 2007). As states grapple with increasing retirements of teachers and an increased demand for qualified candidates, much attention has been drawn to the conundrum of what factors are at play within the teaching environment that might be preventing teachers from staying (Education Week, 2006, 2007; NCES, 2004).

This section of the review is divided into two parts. The first section begins with a discussion of five selected constructs of working conditions. After a discussion of the most relevant studies within each construct, the second section explores the assumptions represented within the CTQ’s instrument for these selected constructs of working conditions.

Constructs of Working Conditions: Time, Leadership, Facilities and Resources, Empowerment, and Professional Development

While there are a number of internal factors associated with teacher working conditions, some studies have examined external issues, such as labor markets and salary (Boe, Bobbitt, Cook, Whitener, & Weber, 1997; Murname & Olsen, 1990; Shen, 1997). Others have attempted to describe working conditions by framing the characteristics of a
teacher’s work experience. Johnson (2006) identified teacher working conditions as the following:

- The physical features of buildings, equipment, and resources that serve as a platform for teachers’ work
- The organizational structures that define teachers’ formal positions and relationships with others in the school, such as lines of authority, workload, autonomy, and supervisory arrangements
- The sociological features that shape how teachers experience their work, including their roles, status, and the characteristics of their students and peers
- The political features of their organization, such as whether teachers have opportunities to participate in important decisions
- The cultural features of the school as a workplace that influence teachers’ interpretations of what they do and their commitment, such as values, traditions, and norms
- The psychological features of the environment that may sustain or deplete them personally, such as the meaningfulness of what they do day to day or the opportunities they find for learning and growth
- The educational features, such as curriculum and testing policies, that may enhance or constrain what teachers can teach

While these operational descriptions are helpful in characterizing the nature of teacher working conditions, a more specific set of variables that can be measured can also lead to a more coherent understanding of their level of impact. A number of studies have provided this
insight by discussing some aspect of the following five components of teacher working conditions: *time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development* (Gersten, 1995a, 1995b; Holmes, 1998; Kershaw, 1994; Johnson, 1990, 2006; Learning Point Associates, 2007; Leithwood & McAdie, 2007; Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luzak, 2005; Nickson & Kritsonis, 2006; Reichardt, 2001; Virginia Education Association [VEA], 1991; Wyman, 1991). Studies relevant to each construct are discussed for their relationship to the parameters of this study.

**Time**

An important consideration of teachers’ perceptions of time with their work experience is related to opportunities they might have to collaborate with colleagues. Lortie (1975) described the solitary nature of the teaching profession. Little’s 1990 study highlighted the importance of independence and privacy, particularly to veteran teachers. Although “the collective capacity of a school, program, or group to serve students is arguably improved by joint decision-making on matters of curriculum, instruction, and testing,” wrote Little, “school-teaching has endured largely as an assemblage of entrepreneurial individuals whose autonomy is grounded in norms of privacy and noninterference and is sustained by the very organization of teaching work” (p. 72).

Rosenholtz (1989) found significant differences in progress on reforms between schools in which teachers collaborated and those in which they did not. She concluded that students pay a price when their teachers work alone because those teachers are unlikely to have shared goals for student learning and achievement.

Subsequent studies have confirmed that there is a payoff for students when their teachers work together and when the school is an interdependent workplace. McLaughlin and
Talbert (2001) found that high school teachers who succeeded in engaging all students with challenging academic work developed the innovative practices necessary to do so in their professional communities.

In their study of school practice, Newmann and Wehlage (1995) concluded that professional community among teachers is a necessary component for school improvement. In the most successful schools they studied, there were “opportunities for teachers to collaborate and help one another achieve the purpose; and teachers in these schools took collective—not just individual—responsibility for student learning” (p. 181). Louis, Kruse, and Marks (1996) reported that high-performing schools also had strong professional communities in which teachers’ pedagogical strengths could be reinforced by the norms and practices of the professional community.

Scholars have also documented, however, the difficulty that schools have in developing such collaborative cultures, particularly among the more experienced segment of the teaching force. Because schools have many internal compartments, collegial interaction does not occur naturally. As Rosenholtz (1989) explained:

Norms of collegiality do not simply happen. They do not spring spontaneously out of teachers’ mutual respect and concern for each other. Rather, they are carefully engineered by structuring the workplace with frequent exposure to contact and frequent opportunities for interaction. (p. 90)

Collaboration among teachers requires more than good intentions and norms that promote joint work, for the open exchange of ideas and feedback takes time. It also requires a school schedule that allows for ongoing interaction.

Evans (1996) explored the challenges that school leaders face when they try to engage veteran teachers who are accustomed to working in isolation to adopt collaborative practices,
observing, “[R]estructuring faces an extraordinarily complex human resource problem: to
make new schools with mostly older veteran teachers. Most of America’s educators are
veteran practitioners who are not eager to embrace a new round of innovation” (p. 64).

An equally important consideration of teachers’ perceptions of time as a construct of
working conditions includes their teaching assignments. In 2000–01, 19% of U.S. teachers
spent teaching time outside their area of preparation (NEA, 2003). Although high, that figure
marked a decline from 31% in 1961. National data from the 1990 SASS revealed high levels
of out-of-field teaching and large school-to-school differences in this practice in U.S. schools
(Ingersoll, 2002). About 12% of those who taught regular K–6th grade classes did not have a
major or minor degree in pre-elementary, early childhood, or elementary education. At the
secondary level, rates of out-of-field teacher assignment were much higher, with
approximately one third of all secondary math teachers lacking a major or minor in math or a
related discipline. About one fourth of English teachers had no major or minor in English or
related subjects, and one fifth of science and social science teachers lacked such credentials in
their fields. Ingersoll (2002) concluded, “[I]n each of the fields of history, English, and math,
more than four million secondary students are taught by teachers with neither a major nor a
minor in the field” (p. 35).

Teaching out-of-field creates problems for students and teachers alike. As Ingersoll
(2002) noted, “[H]ighly qualified teachers may actually become highly unqualified if they are
assigned to teach subjects for which they have little training or education” (p. 49). Attending
the algebra class of a teacher who is not competent in math inevitably limits what students
will learn. Misassignment also generates dissatisfaction among the teachers themselves, who
must scramble to stay ahead of their classes and who experience the discomforts of uncertainty and ignorance.

Further, Ingersoll (2003) found that “out-of-field assignments are significantly correlated with decreases in teachers’ morale, engagement, and commitment” (p. 27). Misassignment is inequitably experienced by new teachers, who are often expected to teach classes or courses that are left over once experienced teachers have chosen their schedules. Johnson and Birkeland’s study of new teachers in Massachusetts (2003) found that misassignment was a major source of some respondents’ dissatisfaction, eventually leading them out of teaching.

In addition, the number of different courses that teachers must juggle, even when they all fall within their particular fields of license, greatly affects teachers’ capacity to do a good job and, thus, their satisfaction with teaching. The average teaching load for a secondary school teacher in the United States is five classes a day, with two different subjects or preparations (Ingersoll, 2003).

While all of the selected constructs of working conditions are important, the literature revealed a significant obsession with efforts to grapple with resources of time for teachers to perform their work.

**Leadership**

While a number of studies pointed to the influence of principal leadership as the vital ingredient within any school initiative (Murphy, 1991; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995; Quinn, 2002; Rutter et al., 1979), the role of administrators in providing the kind of support and guidance needed for healthy working conditions was also featured prominently in several
studies (Bidwell, 1997; Billingsley, 1995; Buxton, 1997; Fetler, 1997; Gersten, 1995; NCPSF, 1996; Perie, 1997; Shen, 1997).

Perie’s study (1997) clearly identified lack of administrative support as the number one factor relating to low teacher morale and subsequent departure from the profession. In Fetler’s work (1997) in studying teacher retention rates in California, 98% of teachers polled felt that principals should help them in handling problems with students and their parents, but only 58% reported receiving such assistance. “Teachers complained,” wrote Fetler, “that their effectiveness is handicapped by cumbersome, slow-moving and in some cases, autocratic and inefficient administrators” (p. 42).

By virtue of creating schedules for courses, planning sessions, and the day-to-day calendar, the principal has the ability to establish solid lines of communication as well as to provide opportunities for collaboration, sharing, and enhanced understandings (Blase & Blase, 2000). Supporting high-quality opportunities for professional learning (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond, 2003), working closely with district resources (Johnson, 1990), and working with external groups to promote and extend the larger educational community (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond, 2003) are all examples of principals’ influence over working conditions of teachers.

A 1997 NCPSF study entitled A Profession in Jeopardy highlighted the magnitude of this issue, calling for a “required orientation and seminar program for principals and other administrators regarding mentoring and providing support for teachers” (p.5). Berry and Hirsch (2005) called for “time for teachers to develop their teaching craft, and sufficient materials and resources to teach effectively” (p. 13) and “strong school leadership” (p. 14) to improve working conditions for teachers, particularly schools deemed hard to staff.
A 1991 study of teacher perceptions of work life in Virginia schools reported that the greatest impact on teacher working conditions included the “quality of interactions with their principal” (VEA, p. 26). Rossmiller (1988) conducted a qualitative study of eight schools and found a direct relationship between principals’ leadership activities and teacher engagement by examining a variety of quality-of-worklife indicators:

- respect from relevant adults
- participation in decision-making
- frequent and stimulating professional interactions among peers
- organizational structures and procedures allowing performance feedback
- opportunity to use skills and knowledge, learn new skills, and experiment
- adequate resources to carry out the job
- congruence between personal and school goals

The more work that a school leader performed to support teacher engagement in each of these indicators, the more likely teachers from that school were to report a “pleasant, orderly working environment” (p. 10).

Gersten’s survey of special educators (1995) examined the role of administrative support by looking at the differences between supports from the central office level as opposed to school-site-based administrative support. This study revealed no correlation between the two levels of support, but it did reveal a number of results that suggest improved lines of communication, resources, and shared understanding of school vision as strategies for enhancing teacher commitment.

Clearly, the role of the principal has a tremendous impact on workplace conditions. Serving as the conduit between policies and practice, culture and norm-setting, and as the
ultimate cultivator of a school’s climate, the principal plays a major component in the
evolution of any teacher’s perceptions of working conditions.

Facilities and Resources

When schools make decisions on how to use their facilities and resources, the
resulting organizational features of those decisions have an impact not only on students and
learning but also on teachers as employees. Having access to supplies such as paper, pens,
textbooks, bulletin boards, file folders, notepads, and so forth, is viewed as vital to good
teaching. The availability of services such as photocopying and technology is also important.
A number of studies report glaring examples of insufficient access to many of these items
(Corcoran, Walker, & White, 1988; Johnson, 1990). Out-of-date textbooks, little to no
support for office supplies or technology maintenance, and other maladies are not uncommon.

Many teachers spend their own resources to build a workable classroom. As Johnson
(2006) reported:

[Teachers] buy stickers to reward careful homework, groceries for in-class cooking
projects, paperback books to promote independent reading, posters to decorate the
classroom, colored markers for art projects, film for photographic projects, plants and
animals for science, and software for in-class publishing. (p. 39)

Teachers spent an average of $443 each on instructional resources in 2001 (NEA, 2003).
Another study reported that, on average, first-year elementary teachers spent $701 out-of-
pocket for classroom materials (Quality Education Data, 2002).

Ingersoll’s analysis (2002) of the 2000 SASS data and the 2001 TFUS discussed how
the availability of resources—particularly when considered as highly generalized resources—
impacts the staffing trends of schools. He argued:

The data show, in particular, that inadequate support from the school administration,
student discipline problems, limited faculty input into school decision-making, and to
The difficulty of teaching classes with too many students is a significant concern for many teachers as well (Public Education Network [PEN], 2004). While there is significant debate about the value of reducing class sizes, elementary teachers whose class sizes approach 40 and secondary teachers who are assigned five sections with 25 to 30 students each—for a total teaching load of 125 to 150 students per day—report having less success and, therefore, find less satisfaction in their work (Johnson, 1990).

Just like any organization, workplace standards, expectations, and norms all emerge in schools. As Rosenholtz (1989) explained, as teachers seek “to make sense of their school world in order to simplify, understand, predict, explain and control events within it, their interpretations will be strongly influenced by the structure of their daily activities” (p. 7). Resources of communication structures and leadership factors all shape the environment by which a teacher engages his or her workplace. The obvious parameters of safety, climate, and overall morale are all affected by the cultural norms of what works to shape the day-in and day-out operations of school life.

In addition to these studies on the cultural interpretations of a school as a workplace, others such as Schneider (2003) have studied the relationship of school working conditions for urban settings in Chicago and Washington, D.C. Teachers were asked to rate the quality of their facility resources along scales, evaluating the adequacy of resources such as science labs and music rooms as well as “physiological factors, including indoor air quality, thermal comfort, lighting and noise” (p. 14). Schneider’s study revealed that, in both samplings of teachers, 40% of those who rated their school facilities with a C or lower were considering
leaving the school to teach in another, and close to 30% reported they were planning to leave teaching altogether.

The cleanliness and safety of a school’s facilities are important aspects of teacher working conditions. A carefully maintained facility can be interpreted as a tangible show of respect for the students there to learn as well as for the teachers there to teach. Bunsen burners that malfunction in the chemistry lab, electrical systems that fail to support classroom computers, weak lighting that makes it hard to read, and poor acoustics that discourage discussions during class can all compromise even the best teacher’s effectiveness (Johnson, 1990).

A study specific to North Carolina teachers revealed that more than 70% of teachers in an anonymous survey reported “a safe environment for teaching and learning, adequate materials and supplies, increased salary, and respect as professionals” as important professional needs (Orsini, 2004, p. 26). This study, however, did not extend a link to these variables and a teacher’s level of overall satisfaction or intention to stay or leave the classroom. Corcoran, Walker, and White (1988) reported findings from teachers discussing the importance of working in safe buildings and well-resourced schools.

In a related study (PEN, 2004), teachers from four school districts (Chattanooga, TN; New York, NY; Seattle, WA; and Washington, DC) and the state of West Virginia listed “lack of resources and materials” and “classroom conditions” as among the top five negative influences on their efficacy with students (p. 18). Researchers concluded, “The physical condition of schools and the quality of instructional resources made a tremendous difference in the sense of efficacy that teachers felt” (p. 18).
Education Week provided the following description of how teachers sometimes view these environments:

Classroom teaching conditions are a lot like those of blue collar workers. Teachers rarely have their own offices and lack the resources that other professionals have access to, such as a secretary, telephone, typewriters, fax machine or copier. The teacher’s workday is highly structured, with little or no time for intellectual interaction with colleagues. (1999, p. 13)

It is known that teachers in schools having resources to invest in higher-quality working conditions have access to smaller class sizes, more control over decision making, parental support, and opportunities for extended learning (NCES, 1997; NCTAF, 2002). Furthermore, while some studies report that teachers are willing to leave schools to move from poor neighborhoods or high-minority student populations (Carroll, Reichardt, & Guarino, 2000), other studies revealed that, in fact, working conditions associated with these schools—poorer facilities, less availability of textbooks and supplies, less administrative support, and larger class sizes—were the greater predictor of a teacher’s intention to stay or leave (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Glennie & Coble, 2004; Harris, 2002; NCTAF, 2003). As Choy (1986) noted:

Working conditions play an important role in a school’s ability to attract, develop and retain effective teachers. Schools that are able to offer their teachers a safe, pleasant and supportive working environment are better able to attract and retain good teachers and allow them to do their best. (p. 38)

These studies highlighted the view that access to adequate resources, those that are tangible as well as cultural in nature, are all key to positive working conditions for teachers.

Teacher Empowerment

While aspects of the teacher empowerment construct were the least documented, the literature did speak to the notion that teachers who are more engaged and empowered to act
within and beyond their school setting actually report more favorable perceptions of their working conditions.

Klecker and Loadman (1996) surveyed more than 10,000 teachers in experimental “restructured” schools that were a part of a statewide Venture Capital Schools Project. While schools were organized in a variety of patterns, all were shaped around teacher leadership models and initiated by self-designed and teacher-led models of restructuring. Reporting a high positive linear correlation between teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction, they found that at least half of the variance within the job satisfaction findings was explained by efforts to affect teacher empowerment stemming from the restructuring activities within the Venture Capital Schools Project.

It is important to note that teachers have not traditionally been a part of major policy decisions within the unit of a school. Left outside the purview of administrators to manage as well as to lead schools, teachers have retained local jurisdiction over the actions of classroom-based activities, but little else. Yet efforts to engage and actively involve teachers in the worklife of their schools beyond their own classrooms are seen as key to promoting greater levels of teacher retention.

In recent years, as reformers reasoned that teachers could improve the school by drawing on their professional knowledge to support school activity, a number of reforms seeking to engage teachers in decisions about policy, budget, and personnel have resulted in new terms being introduced into the teacher workplace. These terms include “school-based management,” “school improvement team,” and “teacher leadership,” among others (Ogawa & White, 1994). Ogawa and White studied a number of these reforms and found that, despite hopes of school-wide improvements, such efforts were diverted by less significant
administrative or social concerns and neglected important matters of curriculum and instruction.

In an analysis examining the levers of policy controls within schools, Ingersoll (2003) found little change in teachers’ influence over day-to-day operations of schools. He viewed this result as “especially striking because these were years of intense policy debate over the control of schooling, when great fanfare was attached to numerous reforms aimed at changing the organization and control of schools” (p. 24). Ingersoll did find, however, considerable school-to-school variation in teachers’ influence: “Schools that delegated more control to teachers had fewer problems among teachers and less conflict between teachers and administrators” (p. 29). This was particularly true when teachers were involved in schoolwide decisions about discipline and tracking. Findings such as these demonstrate the importance of teachers’ becoming fully engaged in the workflow of schools.

While efforts to shape schools in ways that draw upon and utilize teachers’ professional knowledge are still emerging, it is important to note several aspects of teacher leadership roles that might enhance working conditions. In a Massachusetts study of 50 new teachers, the overwhelming majority of respondents who planned to remain in education for a substantial time expected to supplement their teaching with expanded roles in professional development, curriculum writing, or mentoring, even though these roles were only beginning to emerge in their schools (Peske et al., 2001). Troen and Boles (2003) set forth proposals for careers that provide differentiated roles for teachers and explain how these roles would benefit schools.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which awards advanced certification to “accomplished” teachers, now provides an unbiased means for identifying
exemplary teachers. Research by Goldhaber and Anthony (2004) concluded that board-certified teachers are indeed more effective than are unsuccessful candidates for board certification. It is not yet clear, however, that successful candidates are well qualified to assume responsibilities beyond their classrooms or that differentiated roles will provide the best use of their talents.

Such developments suggest that teachers may be exercising broader influence in their schools, and that, through newly defined positions such as master teachers, peer-assistance team members, and mentors, they will feel both connected and rewarded for being active participants within their workplace.

As effects of the “teacher professionalization” movement’s call for increased resources in support of teachers and teaching continue to emerge, groups such as NCTAF (1996) have stated that a major ingredient in the improvement of the quality of the nation’s teaching force is in creating conditions in which “teachers can teach, and teach well” (p. 35). Providing more opportunities for teachers to be empowered, motivated, and supported in that pursuit will certainly enhance teachers’ working conditions.

*Professional Development*

Professional development that is short-term, driven by an external agenda, or disconnected from classroom practice is not viewed by many as high-quality professional development (Johnson, 2006). Typically referred to as “sit and get” opportunities to listen to a so-called expert are not great learning opportunities or enhancements to daily classroom practice. However, access to good professional development within a work environment supports professionalism and is valued for the positive impact it can have within the workplace.
Professional communities within schools also contribute to teachers’ ongoing development and satisfaction. McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) recounted the benefits to teachers of working jointly to generate new knowledge of practice and to support each other’s professional growth. They observed, “Teachers in these schools experience professional growth because they work together to become better teachers and to become a better school” (p. 19); in addition, they “experience careers marked by collective accomplishments and a sense of continuing professional growth” (p. 24).

One might expect that the introduction of standards-based accountability would be accompanied by extensive, sustained support for teachers about how to interpret the standards and how to use the data gained from assessments. McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) concluded, however, that while professional learning communities achieved “extraordinary success in nurturing successful careers” (p. 47), they found few such workplaces in the schools they studied.

Dennis Holmes’ study, “The Professional Development Needs of Experienced Teachers: A Report of a Study of the Professional Development Needs of Experienced, Tenured Teachers in the District of Columbia Public Schools” (1988), illustrated public school teachers’ perceptions of professional development offerings. Teachers reported professional development offerings as “loosely-connected to the important organizational units in the school system that impact the classroom” (p.17). This study documented a clear preference from veteran teachers wanting professional development based on content relative to school-based needs and “practical strategies for daily classroom implementation” (p. 19).

Elmore and Burney (1997) reported on practices in New York City’s District 2, in which time and resources were used more often to support teachers’ instructional needs within
their classrooms. Group sessions focused on interpreting data about student performance, planning classes and units with colleagues, and learning how to teach new curricula. Though nearly half of the teachers left the district during the efforts to implement reforms associated with these characteristics of professional development, those who remained were energized by its focus on teaching and learning.

Working conditions that support teachers’ specific needs for accessing professional development are highly regarded by teachers (Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luzak, 2005). Johnson (2006) provided an important discussion about three specific areas of need for teachers in today’s classrooms: meeting the needs of individual students, curriculum alignment, and managing the pressures of assessments for accountability measures. The varied interpretations of high-stakes testing and accountability systems can have a significant effect on teacher retention. As reported by Tye and O’Brien (2002):

Teachers who enter the profession motivated by the prospect of seeing their students learn and succeed often are distressed when their schools focus excessively on compliance and sanctions. Graduates of a large teacher education program who had subsequently left teaching ranked the pressures of increased accountability (high-stakes testing, test preparation, and standards) as their number-one reason for leaving. By contrast, respondents still in teaching who might consider leaving “ranked paperwork and accountability pressures high—second and third, respectively,” in the factors that would drive them out. (p. 72)

Given these contexts, opportunities for growth and learning about dealing with such challenges are fundamental to creating positive working conditions for teachers.

*The Center for Teaching Quality Studies*

The most recent body of work to look at teacher working conditions has come out of the work of the CTQ. Since 2002, North Carolina Governor Michael Easley has supported the use of the CTQ model in the nation’s first statewide Teacher Working Conditions
Initiative instrument. Beyond North Carolina’s Teacher Working Conditions Initiative, the Center’s efforts have created a model for examining selected constructs of working conditions with states such as Ohio and Kansas as well as with specific districts such as Clarke County, Nevada (Hirsch, Emerick, Church, & Fuller, 2007, 2006a, 2006b; Hirsch, 2005, 2005a). These studies have produced a discrete analysis of the five constructs discussed above: *time*, *leadership*, *facilities and resources*, *teacher empowerment*, and *professional development*. A number of studies (Hirsch et al., 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Hirsch, 2005a, 2005b) reported the following findings from the CTQ initiative in North Carolina:

- All of the constructs shared a positive relationship to academic indicators. Measures such as Adequate Yearly Progress and growth targets for North Carolina ABC’s state assessment scores showed positive relationships where working conditions were generally satisfied.

- *Facilities and Resources*—in particular, safety, cleanliness, and access to sufficient instructional resources—as well as *leadership* and *empowerment* were all significantly correlated with student achievement based on these measures.

- *Leadership* variables also showed significance across high- and low-performing schools. Most consistently was the variation between high- and low-growth schools and their leadership’s ability to “shield teachers from interruption.”

- Middle schools in which 80% or more of the faculty agreed that there is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect are 2.2 times more likely to meet or exceed academic growth expectations. Middle schools in which 90% or more
of the faculty agreed that the school is clean and well maintained are 2.7 times more likely to meet or exceed growth expectations.

These results supported the theoretical notion that “teaching working conditions are also student learning conditions” (Hirsch, 2007, p.12). While some constructs of working conditions seem to have more impact than others, their findings revealed that the teachers’ perceptions of working conditions constructs had significant relationships to student achievement (Hirsch et al., 2006a, 2006b, 2007).

In addition, teachers with positive perceptions of their workplaces indicated that they were much more likely to stay at their current schools than educators who were more negative about their conditions of work, particularly in the areas of leadership and empowerment. In fact, the CTQ reports revealed that all of the working conditions constructs were significantly correlated with teachers’ future employment plans.

A fascinating revelation of this study illuminated the disparity between teachers’ and principals’ perceptions of working conditions. Across the board, there were significant differences between both groups on each question and ranking of satisfaction (Hirsch et al., 2006a, 2006b, 2007). The issues of time to work with colleagues and involvement in important decisions related to hiring, budget, and professional development opportunities were the two working condition constructs that received the lowest levels of satisfaction rankings from teachers. All the while, administrators saw these variables with significantly greater levels of satisfaction and generally perceived that conditions were much more favorable than the perceptions of classroom teachers revealed. Interestingly, the construct that seemed to have the greatest effect on satisfaction for both groups was that of leadership. Perceptions of working conditions were not dependent on other variables such as respondents’
level of experience, form of teacher preparation, or demographic characteristics such as race or gender.

What follows is a description of each construct and the assumptions about how each represents teacher working conditions.

*Working Conditions Construct Assumptions*

*Time*, the ultimate finite resource, is a measure of how much time is explicitly available to a teacher in order for him or her to get done the tasks that are required. The issue of time is very much a construct of teachers’ working conditions. The CTQ model posited questions about the nature of time as it relates to activities of delivering instruction, planning and collaboration with colleagues, non-instructional duties, and extracurricular responsibilities. Questions related to how many hours are devoted to these activities were asked.

The construct of *leadership* was represented by a question set within the CTQ model that deals with perceptions of the levels of trust, support, and administrative management within a school. Probes that identify perceptions of how well the school leadership communicates clear expectations to students and parents, shields teachers from disruptions, administers discipline, evaluates performance, and provides feedback were all used. Measures of how school leadership addresses the issues of overall working conditions, in addition to the overall effectiveness of leadership within a school, were also taken.

*Facilities and Resources*, under the CTQ model, was a broad construct dealing with teachers’ access not only to things such as instructional materials, including computers, printers, software, and the internet but also to administrative support that might come in the form of access to phones, faxes, email, copy machines, paper, pens, and the like. This
construct also probed teachers to reveal their perceptions about their access to workspace, both the cleanliness and maintenance of schools in general and teacher workspaces in particular. This construct was where the CTQ model also investigated the nature of feeling safe and secure at school, the level of disruptions within the school day, and behavioral observations of drug and alcohol use, gang activity, bullying, vandalism, and variables of tardiness and absenteeism.

Teacher involvement in decision making and engagement within a school were variables measured in the CTQ model’s questions related to a construct referred to as teacher empowerment. To what degree are teachers involved in making decisions related to programmatic matters of a school? How engaged is the School Improvement Team? How satisfied are they in the degree to which they are involved in setting grading and student assessment practices, determining the content of in-service professional development programs, and other functions such as the hiring of new teachers and deciding how the school budget will be spent?

The offering of professional development for teachers is considered a pivotal element in furthering teacher knowledge and developing practitioners who have access to the latest research, trends, and best practices for their profession. Questions from the CTQ model related to professional development asked respondents about their access to resources to participate in professional development, the amount of time allocated for such activities, and the effectiveness of professional development to which they have had access. Questions also probed the nature of what areas of professional development needs exist and the amount of time devoted to those areas of need.
Summary of Working Conditions

In summary, as states confront growing levels of teacher attrition, a large group of research has emerged around the concept of teacher working conditions, particularly around the association of working conditions with job satisfaction and retention studies. More positive working conditions are thought to lead to more satisfied workers who are then less likely to leave the profession. While some teacher attrition is attributed to teacher-movers, working conditions have been documented as factors for why teacher-leavers have left the classroom. Drilling down to the perspective of the “real” classroom-level teacher is important for making inferences about working conditions and their relationships to teacher retention trends. Some of the factors associated with working conditions that have been explored to date include leadership and access to resources. The largest body of literature related to working conditions has emerged from the CTQ. Producing a discrete analysis of variables identified as valid constructs of teacher working conditions, much of the CTQ analyses have revealed positive relationships between academic indicators and levels of satisfaction with working conditions such as supportive leadership, opportunities to be involved in decisions, and perceptions of safety and the cleanliness of facilities.

The Conceptual Framework

Building on this review of the literature dealing with teacher retention, job satisfaction, and working conditions, the conceptual framework used in this study was an adaptation of Brownell and Smith’s Teacher Career Decision-Making model (1993). Extending Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model for educational research (1976), Brownell and Smith articulated a range of factors involved in the decision-making process for teachers to
stay or leave the profession. Brownwell and Smith’s model\(^3\) was divided into four interrelated systems: the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem, all of which are nested and produce a myriad of dynamics to influence a teacher’s decision to stay or leave teaching.

Adaptation of Brownell and Smith’s Model

This study has expanded on Brownell and Smith’s model by examining the intricate relationships of specific environmental factors, called working conditions, on teachers’ decisions to remain in teaching. As pointed out by Brownell and Smith, there are a myriad of factors at play in this decision process, but we can only begin to better understand the dilemma of teacher attrition by examining the interconnected relationships of these factors. More specifically, this study sought to examine the perceptions of working conditions by a select group of highly recruited individuals and then to determine their concurrent relationships to job satisfaction. Viewing aspects of teacher retention through a lens that examines only whether or not a teacher remains in teaching, without a better understanding of the complexities and environmental factors at play, is limited.

Figure 2 illustrates Brownell and Smith’s conceptual model in which the microsystem consists of factors such as class size, student assignments, and teacher characteristics. The mesosystem represents those factors such as administrative and collegial relationships and opportunities for professional growth. The exosystem represents the social structures and

\(^{3}\) Brownell and Smith’s concept frame is itself a further elaboration on Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory. It was Bronfenbrenner who first formulated the four systems (micro-, meso-, exo- and macro-) and posited that there are within each system a set of roles, norms, and rules that can powerfully shape human development. For more information, see: Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
socioeconomic influences of the school setting. The macrosystem reflects the cultural beliefs and prevailing worldviews of the school within a larger system.

Figure 2. Teacher Career Decision-Making Model (Brownell and Smith, 1993).

This study’s focus was explicitly on those factors within the microsystem and mesosystem that can impact teacher retention. Figure 3 illustrates this adaptation by highlighting the relationship of working conditions at the mesosystem that permeate the microsystem. The working conditions factors are represented by the boxes in the outer circle, constantly bombarding, interacting with, and impacting the individual teacher at the center.

Following the connective impact of these working conditions (as represented through the constructs of time, leadership, facilities and resources, empowerment and professional
Figure 3. Working Conditions’ Impact on Retention (Denning, 2008).
development) through the lens of the teacher arrows, the thinking is that these environmental factors have a dynamic impact on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction then impacts the individual teacher’s decision to stay or leave the classroom, as represented by the box at the center of this frame. This study endeavored to shed light on these connective relationships and provide information on how to more positively affect the relationships at play within this model.

This framework emerged from the literature’s findings that environmental factors do affect job satisfaction. Based on the assumption that there are other mitigating factors involved in one’s overall level of job satisfaction, it was important to dissect those factors that have ultimate influence on a teacher’s decision to stay or leave the classroom that are within some degree of external control or manipulation. While there are a number of variables that could be studied within this same paradigm, this study did not delve into the personal or emotional assumptions affecting teacher retention such as family relationships, child-rearing, or intrinsic motivators such as altruism. Instead, this study focused on those constructs of working conditions identified within the literature review that have a keen impact on a teacher’s decision to stay or leave teaching.

Logistic regression was utilized to test these relationships and to examine the perceptions of a select group of individuals, the North Carolina Teaching Fellows, who were highly recruited to teach within North Carolina’s public schools. By using an approach that took into account the multiple effects of various variables interacting with and upon the teacher as a decision maker at any one point in time, this study provided a more holistic examination of why teachers may decide to stay or leave the profession.
Conley and Cooper, in their book *The School as a Work Environment* (1991), discussed the complex nature of the worklife of teachers. Citing the need for schools to be places of active learning guided and coached by excellent teachers, Conley and Cooper called for schools to become sites where teachers are supported and motivated to engage not only their students but also their profession as well. While there are a number of studies that have examined the organizational development of schools and school cultures as they seek to engage both students and their profession, few have closely examined this development through the lens of the schools as an *organizational workplace* for its faculty (Fitzpatrick, 1986; Gottfredson, 1987; Hedges & Schneider, 2005; Hubbard, 2006; Peters & Besley, 2007; Villa & Jacqueline, 2005). This study sought to blend the study of schools as a place of work while also gaining a better understanding of the factors at play for teachers making decisions to stay or leave the profession.

Chapter 3 discusses more fully the methodology, purpose, study design, and strategies of this study.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the purpose and overall research design utilized in this study.

Building on the literature dealing with teacher retention, job satisfaction, and working conditions and utilizing an adaptation of Brownell and Smith’s conceptual framework of a Teacher Career Decision-Making model (1993), this study tested the relationships between North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions and their concomitant effects on job satisfaction and retention.

Given the current policy context and increased pressure for state systems to grapple with teacher supply and teacher quality issues, the literature actually revealed a number of insights into viewing schools as organizational workplaces where these issues play themselves out each day. With considerable focus being applied to gaining a better understanding about why teachers decide to stay or leave the profession, this study sought to add to the body of knowledge about what factors mediate those decisions. Brownell and Smith’s conceptual framework has posited a myriad of interrelated and connected systems affecting overall teacher attrition. By focusing on the microsystem and mesosystem layers of school and teacher relationships and environmental factors, this study has captured a more robust sense of how teachers’ working conditions influence their decisions to stay in teaching. After a survey of North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions, along with probes of their sense of job satisfaction and
possible intentions to stay or leave teaching, inferences were made about the nature of working conditions as a variable of teacher retention.

Rationale

In order to gain a better understanding of the issues associated with teacher retention, it was important to utilize a systematic form of inquiry to better account for the host of factors than can influence a decision to stay or leave teaching. This study did not attempt to look at historical or macrosystem level factors such as a decisions about family, marriage, or moving with one’s spouse. This study also did not address the important social structures of schools or the variety of socioeconomic influences that exists within schools. This study did, however, examine what Brownell and Smith refer to as the microsystem and mesosystem levels of working conditions. The microsystem of schools contains all of the individual perceptions and experiences of educators and illuminates how they as individual players view their workplace settings. The mesosystem lens allowed for an examination of the nature of relationships and interactions between each of the actors in a school setting. It is within the nexus of these two systems that systematic inquiry can delve into the rich complexities of schools’ working conditions in general and in teaching as a profession in particular.

Whereas past research into this area has focused heavily on observing the perceptions of teachers as a whole, this study not only examined the perceptions of a highly regarded and highly recruited group of teachers, but it also endeavored to secure responses from teachers who have been faced with a specific timeframe of choosing to teach or not. From this work, policymakers will gain not only insight into the work of
schools and teachers but perhaps more knowledge about the nature of what is taking place within the organizational workspaces of teachers.

In order to capture a wide array of perceptions and within a sample size that is large enough to allow for generalizations, this study utilized a quantitative analysis of survey responses. While a smaller study would have allowed for a closer examination of qualitative techniques within a smaller sample size, the results would have been limited in their ability to reveal much about the overall nature of working conditions’ impact on teacher retention within the state as a whole.

Little research in this area has been done specifically for the policy environment in North Carolina. While the area of research around teacher working conditions continues to emerge, little exists in studying the specific working conditions of a unique grouping of highly recruited, highly trained teacher education graduates. Moreover, little research has been undertaken to uncover a more robust understanding of what have largely been anecdotal or overly generalized survey responses. As suggested by Guba (1999), this research “fits” for an examination between policy and practice.

As school leaders grapple with the ongoing saga of teacher recruitment without first having a better understanding of the factors affecting teacher retention, many efforts to tackle such problems will be in vain. In light of heavy public investments, policymakers need to be aware of the realities of the teaching profession, a teacher’s sense of job satisfaction, and the working conditions that can lead teachers either to commit themselves to the profession or to leave the classroom. Additionally, practitioners need not only a greater sense of why their colleagues may be leaving the classroom but also an awareness of both the subtle and the obvious dimensions of their workplaces and the
subsequent effects of such environments on their craft, student learning, teacher-administrator relationships, and overall school morale.

Research Questions

The concept tested in this study was the relationship among teacher working conditions, overall levels of job satisfaction, and their combined impact on teacher retention. By targeting a group of teachers who represent a large investment of public expenditures as well as those regarded as highly prepared for entering the classroom, this study sought to illuminate the impact of schools as organizational workplaces, places where even the most highly recruited and/or best prepared teacher may not elect to stay if various factors of working conditions are not satisfactory.

The specific research questions of this study were:

1. *What are the perceptions of Teaching Fellows with regard to their working conditions?*

   It was expected that Teaching Fellows would have similar perceptions of their working conditions as do their peers across the state.

2. *What do these perceptions tell us about their levels of job satisfaction?*  
   Given the assumption that highly recruited individuals might have more career opportunities, it was expected that NC Teaching Fellows would be less satisfied with some aspects of working conditions. Similar expectations regarding overall levels of job satisfaction were expected to be less as well, particularly for those who are within their four-year teaching commitment. For those Fellows who have elected to remain in teaching beyond their fourth year, it was expected that they would have some degree of greater satisfaction with their job.

3. *What impact do working conditions and job satisfaction have on the retention of Teaching Fellows?*

   The concomitant effects of these perceptions of working conditions were expected to reveal a less than positive trend toward NC Teaching Fellows remaining in the profession. It was also expected that working conditions would have varying impacts on teachers’ decisions to stay or to leave the profession; this variation is dependent upon those who have already completed their four-year commitment versus those who have not.
Research Design

This study used survey data from North Carolina Teaching Fellows teaching in classrooms during the 2007-2008 academic year who were known to be within their first four years of teaching experience. In addition, all Teaching Fellows who could potentially be within their 5th or 6th years of teaching, meaning they have elected to teach beyond the required four-year commitment, were also surveyed. Efforts were also made to collect survey responses from those individuals who may have already elected to leave the teaching profession. In essence, four groups of respondents were surveyed:

- Fellows currently teaching within the required four-year period of commitment to the state
- Fellows currently teaching beyond the required four-year period of commitment
- Fellows who elected to leave teaching prior to completing their four-year period of commitment
- Fellows who elected to leave teaching after their four-year period of commitment

Utilizing the adapted conceptual framework from Brownell and Smith and grounded in an understanding of Conley and Cooper’s “complex worklife of teachers” (1991, p. 84), this study centered its analysis on the perceptions of teachers in regard to five variable constructs of teacher working conditions: **time, leadership, facilities and resources, empowerment, and professional development.** A detailed study of the factors of these constructs and their impact on Teaching Fellows’ intentions to stay or to leave provided insight into the larger forces of the teacher retention dilemma. Utilizing
statistical analyses that take into account the multicollinearity of these constructs and their levels of significance, this study aimed to zero in on the connective relationships between these constructs, overall job satisfaction, and their combined effects on teacher retention. The final analysis of these findings included a placement of these results into correlates of the adaptive model of those factors from a teacher’s microsystem or mesosystem and the influence each has had on the decision to stay or leave teaching.

_Further Details on North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program_

Established by legislation passed by the North Carolina General Assembly in 1986, the North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program is a teacher recruitment program for high school seniors aiming to recruit “talented high school graduates to the teaching profession” (NC Gen. Stat. § 115C-363.23A). The program provides $6,500 per year for a maximum of four years to 500 high school seniors who agree to teach for four years in North Carolina’s public schools. For each year of service provided in teaching, a year of the scholarship/loan is repaid. If the recipient cannot repay the scholarship through service, the loan is repaid to the State with 10% interest. The goals of the Teaching Fellows program are as follows:

- Provide an academically and culturally enriched preparation program that extends beyond the regular college program
- Provide opportunities and experiences that encourage the development of leaders and decision-makers
- Provide opportunities for building an understanding of education’s place in a greater social context
- Instill a sense of mission, service, and professionalism in the Teaching Fellows
- Improve the image of teacher-education candidates and programs campus-wide
- Recruit and retain greater numbers of male and minority teacher education candidates in North Carolina

The Teaching Fellows scholarship is open to legal residents of North Carolina who are citizens of the United States. Students must submit an application with a copy of their high school transcript, a verification of SAT scores, and a writing sample, along with references. The requirements for the scholarship/loan include elements such as an overall GPA of 2.25, evidence of leadership, and participation in extracurricular activities. The application process culminates in an extensive set of interviews and submission of a writing sample. The interview process begins at each of North Carolina’s 115 local school districts and advances to a regional interview level, where all applications are reviewed and scored for performance on all aspects of the selection criteria. To remain in the program, Fellows are required to maintain a 2.5 GPA or higher in all courses during their junior and senior years, to meet all local campus program requirements, and to participate in all campus and statewide programs, meetings, conferences, and experiences.4

4 There are 13 public and five private institutions that host a NC Teaching Fellows program. During the application and selection process, an aspiring Fellow is required to gain acceptance and admittance into any prospective higher education institution on their own merits. Each campus program is required to provide a program of experiences and opportunities to augment and enrich the teacher preparation experience. Activities include seminars, social activities, opportunities for enhanced field experiences, travel, cultural experiences, collaboration with local districts, and diversity and technology education.
Once employed in the schools, each Fellow must submit an Employment Verification Form (EVF) annually. The EVF is used by the Teaching Fellows Commission to ensure that Fellows are indeed completing their “payment through service” to any of the 115 local public school districts or affiliated charter schools within the state. The EVF, in addition to being a notarized, legal document, is signed by each school’s human resources administrator, who thereby affirms that the Fellow is indeed employed in a public school setting. The EVF holds a Fellow’s general demographic data, such as mailing address, phone numbers, campus affiliation, Social Security number, and contact information. Each Fellow is responsible for completing this information individually and then submitting it to his or her local human resources department. Upon completion, each local district then submits the notarized form to the Teaching Fellows Program, housed at the Public School Forum of North Carolina in Raleigh.

Jo Ann Norris, Associate Executive Director of the Public School Forum and administrator of the NC Teaching Fellows Program, has granted permission for the use of the EVF data within this research study. Ms. Norris, along with Dr. Gladys Graves, the Director of the NC Teaching Fellow Program; the NC Public School Forum staff; and members of the NC Teaching Fellows Commission\(^5\) were all supportive of this study.

\(^5\) There are a number of stakeholders involved in the work of this program. The North Carolina General Assembly has invested significant funds in this program and is interested in seeing the program meet its goals of helping the state provide high-quality candidates for its teaching force. The North Carolina Teaching Fellows Commission, as the policy-making body and organization charged with overseeing the implementation of the program and the Public School Forum and its staff are responsible for the day-to-day operations of the program. Schools and colleges of education throughout the state as well as Fellows themselves are interested in seeing the effects of the program.
Study Participants

Since the creation of the NC Teaching Fellows Program, 8,696 fellowships have been awarded. Of these, 1,608 Fellows are identified as having graduated within the past four years and would thus be expected to be currently repaying the state through their teaching service. An additional 803 teachers were identified as potential respondents who could be in their 5th or 6th year of teaching.

Data Collection

The study was designed to be non-experimental and utilized a mixed method of sampling to observe the perceptions of teacher working conditions. Because of the larger sample size, the survey instrument was almost entirely quantitative. However, there were select questions that provided for open-ended responses. These responses were coded and analyzed for their contextual meaning but similarly evaluated using mostly quantitative statistical procedures.

Out of the total possible population of 2,411 Fellows, the original study design called for a systematic random sampling of 800 of the potential 1,608 Teaching Fellows who would have been teaching within their four-year commitment and 100% sampling of all 803 of the Teaching Fellows who would have been teaching within their 5th or 6th year. However, after receiving the data file of contact information for Fellows who had completed the EVF yielded a potential population of only 1,814 Fellows, a decision was made to sample all potential 1,814.

The survey instrument made one-time observations. Because of the mixed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR OF AWARD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF AWARDS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>403*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>403*</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>495*</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>500*</td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>500*</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

- Yellow: If in the 5th or 6th year of teaching we have possible access but the contact information is limited to what was submitted in the Fellow’s 4th year of commitment (EVF is not required beyond four years)
- Green: Fulfilling four-year commitment; EVF means we have direct access to information
- Red: *1,803 are in undergraduate program and in preparation for teaching
grouping sample size, this design allowed for insight into those Fellows who are teaching within their four-year commitments, those who have elected to teach beyond their four-year commitments, and those who have elected to leave the classroom. The perceptions gathered from the instrument were analyzed to describe the characteristics of various demographic groupings, such as gender, geography and grade level, and to make inferences about group perceptions of the five constructs of working conditions (time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development).

Scale scores were assigned to each construct, culminating in an overall job satisfaction score. Correlations were then made about the level of impact that perceptions of working conditions may or may not have on job satisfaction. Logistical regression analysis using a binary variable was applied to see the additive impact of working conditions and job satisfaction on a teacher’s possible decision to stay or to leave the classroom.

The researcher had the resources necessary to conduct this research. Tools such as Microsoft Office software supported the letters of appeal as well as the follow-up postcards and unique survey code randomization done through Excel. A student version of the SPSS software package, user ID, and knowledge of the Qualtrics website were all available to the researcher. Access to the Internet, email, phones, and a keenly organized day-planner were also available. In addition to a strong interest in this study and a serious desire to see it to completion, the researcher has had extended leave from his full-time position throughout the fall of 2007 and the spring of 2008. All of these factors supported the completion of this study.
Instruments and Sampling

The instrument used in this survey (see Appendix A) is an adaptation of the North Carolina Working Conditions Initiative (NCWCI) Survey Instrument with some additional questions from the National Center for Educational Statistics’ (NCES) instruments for conducting this kind of research: the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFUS). All three instruments have items that have been demonstrated as valid and reliable for their ability to assess the five working conditions constructs of time, leadership, empowerment, facilities and resources, and professional development (Boruch & Terhanian, 1996; Kaufman, 1996). In addition, the core set of questions, which came from the NCWCI Survey Instrument, were also subject to an original factor analysis which was used to select construct questions for NCWI studies of working conditions in North Carolina.

A pilot administration of the survey was conducted four weeks prior to the opening of the survey administration to check for presentation and survey flow, using the www.tfsurvey.net website and accompanying Qualtrics software. The pilot administration yielded mostly aesthetic changes to questions.

In the development of this survey instrument, factors such as length, ease of access, comprehension of questions, and visual appeal were given strong consideration so as to facilitate ease of use for respondents. According to Ganassali (2006), research shows that respondents to web-based surveys decide by the time they get to the second screen as to whether or not they deem it possible to continue taking the survey. A review of survey drop-out rates demonstrated that almost 50% of respondents dropped out by the second screen shot, regardless of the length of the instrument; this finding indicates that
within the first few seconds a respondent makes a determination about the perceived length and amount of time required to complete the survey. To address these concerns, the flow of the survey was designed so that all responses were easily “clickable,” easy on the eyes, and aesthetically pleasing. An indicator bar, showing progress toward the end of the survey, was present on each survey page.

As the systematic random sample of the first group of 800 participants was deemed no longer feasible, all 1,814 Fellows with EVF mailing contact information were asked to participate in the survey. All members of the sample were contacted via a first-class letter of introduction and appeal to participate within the study. Each letter contained directions to the website, www.tfsurvey.net, and a unique password-protected code to gain entrance to the survey. The purpose of the unique code was to ensure that participants take the survey only once as well as to link the data back to the school code for future AYP and ABC comparisons.

No respondents for this study were excluded because of personal characteristics such as race, gender, sexual orientation, or any other special class. All respondents who are graduates of the Teaching Fellows Program from 1997-2003 were included in the appeal for participation, and all responses have been included. The sample of 1,814 Fellows represented almost 20% of the entire Teaching Fellow population and was expected to generate valuable inferences about the current perceptions of Teaching Fellows regarding their working conditions and levels of job satisfaction.

Respondents were asked to rate their levels of satisfaction and/or agreement about perceptions of various constructs of working conditions within their current school settings. Fellows who may have been teaching in a different school setting in the
previous year were asked to compare perceptions of their current school to the one in which they taught previously. Those respondents who are no longer teaching were asked to provide their perceptions of the working conditions in the schools in which they last taught. Comparisons of these rankings and perceptions were compared to all teachers who participated in the NC Working Conditions Survey. Utilizing multiple variables, including demographics, geography, and intentions to remain in teaching, these data were used to make conclusions regarding the potential impact of working conditions and job satisfaction with teacher retention.

Data Collection Strategies

This study utilized a number of accepted data collection techniques. The first technique included a letter of appeal (see Appendix B) asking over 1,800 Fellows to participate in the survey. The letter made a professional appeal for participants to go to a website and agree to participate in the online survey. The website, www.tfsurvey.net, was constructed by the researcher and provided a direct and secure link to the survey, which was hosted on the www.Qualtrics.com website. The survey was open for participants to enter responses the day the introductory letters were mailed and remained open throughout the entire study.

A follow-up postcard (see Appendix C) reminding participants of the original letter was mailed approximately 10 days later. When this initial effort to encourage participants to take the survey only yielded close to 275 respondents, a second postcard was mailed to further encourage survey participation. Both communications directed respondents to the online survey where there were no barriers or added qualifications of respondents based on race, gender, sexual orientation, or any other special class. In order
to solicit further participation in the study, all respondents were entered into a drawing for two $50 American Express gift cards.

_Issues of Consent, Confidentiality, and Security_

Respondents were given a unique survey code in their letters of introduction and appeal. By logging onto the website and utilizing the code that was available only to participants who read the letter, they expressed informed consent and knowledge of the parameters of the study. Once the participant logged on and entered the appropriate code, this act alone served as informed consent to participate.

All 1,814 respondents were solicited using the last known mailing information gathered from their last submission of an Employment Verification Form. The master sample list of respondents and their unique survey code were held on the university’s secure server and maintained with a password-protected code. The data was downloaded from the Qualtrics.com server into an SPSS file. SPSS was then used to run all of the statistical analyses. Again, the SPSS file was maintained with a password-protected code on the university’s secure server.

The Qualtrics system maintains data behind a firewall, and all data were accessed only by the Principal Investigator of the survey, who must provide a password and user ID. All pieces of data were keyed in by the participant or Principal Investigator.

---

_6_ The Qualtrics system has been used by government agencies and hundreds of universities and in many dissertations involving human subjects and even disadvantaged and at-risk populations, including government-sponsored studies collecting data about physical and dependency abuse for adults and children. Such extremely confidential studies using the Qualtrics survey methodology have already passed the highest level of scrutiny from numerous human subjects committees.
Additional technical assistance staff included server administrators at Qualtrics, who responded to hardware or software failures, or Lynn Hamilton, the UNC administrator for Table 2

*North Carolina Teaching Fellows By Year of Award with Sampling Strategy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR OF AWARD</th>
<th># OF FELLOWS WITH EVF</th>
<th>POTENTIAL # YRS OF TEACHING</th>
<th># TO BE SURVEYED</th>
<th>SAMPLING STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004**</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- If in 5th or 6th year of teaching we have possible access to respondents, but the contact information is limited to that which was submitted in the Fellow’s 4th year of commitment (EVF is not required beyond four years)
- Fulfilling four-year commitment; EVF means we have direct access to individuals
- *Originally, only 50% were intended to be systematically yet randomly selected.
- **These nine Fellows from the class of 2004 graduated in less than four year and were already eligible to be in the classroom.**
the Qualtrics Software Agreement. Ms. Hamilton has completed Human Subjects Research certification at UNC-CH and will access survey data only at the account owner's request.

Once data collection was complete, the data was downloaded from the Qualtrics database, all identifying information was stripped from the data set, and the results were analyzed in aggregate form only. Results without any identifying information will be sent to study participants who requested a copy. Every effort was made to appeal to the participants’ desire to be a part of a meaningful study of the teacher retention issue. This appeal, framed in the reassurances of confidentiality by the researcher, was intended to allay concerns about identifying teacher responses to individuals who might fear reprisal because of their responses.

Honoring the time of teachers was also important during this process as well. Given the constant demand for teachers’ limited time, making the survey instrument easy to comprehend and complete and a generally pleasant experience overall was a priority. Additional efforts were employed to share the story of why this research is so important. An appeal to participants as professional colleagues, drawing on any concerns they may have for the posterity of the profession itself, along with the introductory letter of appeal, the follow-up postcards, and the welcome screen on the website, all sought to encourage participation.

An issue to be confronted during the data analysis was the possibility of discovering both positive and negative situations and wanting to report on each. Environments discovered as strained, unhealthy, and possibly disheartening for teachers had to be masked in the researcher's own understandings of making a final report on the
data conclusions. In the same vein, positive environments discovered as supportive and exemplary in promoting job satisfaction also had to be written in a manner that does not identify participants and surroundings. The researcher’s role is not one of playing “school police” or “cheerleader.” Focusing on the purpose of the study and doing so with professionalism, courtesy, and consideration was an ever-present goal of the researcher's role and stature in this project.

Other than receiving the gift card incentive, there was no direct benefit to any individual to participate in this study. The information gained from the analysis and conclusions of this study were intended to be used to augment the knowledge base of how teachers’ perception of their working conditions and job satisfaction affects retention and to provide insights into the worlds of teachers’ work. It was hoped that these gains would generate suggestions for improving both policy and practice in the arena of teacher retention efforts.

Other than responding to emails or phone queries from respondents who needed technical assistance in accessing the survey, there was no direct interaction with survey respondents. Therefore, other than the potential risk associated with a breach of confidentiality, there was very minimal risk to participants. In the highly unlikely event there was a breach of confidentiality, any association of respondent perceptions of individual working conditions and/or job satisfaction could be used to malign or to discredit classroom teachers in schools where responses might be viewed as negative.

The Principal Investigator is the only person with access to the master data file that matched study codes with participant school and LEA codes. This master file is stored in Excel format in a password-protected document located on the Principal Investigator’s
private desktop computer. All other files are stored on the Qualtrics.com secure server or the university’s secure server.

Data Analysis

The majority of data gleaned from this survey was analyzed using standard statistical analysis techniques. The first analysis stemmed from a statistical factor analysis of all survey responses to ensure construct validity of the survey as well as to create domain averages including only questions that explain working conditions in the area described. Building on these questions as solid representatives of the constructs of working conditions, the study collected respondents’ perceptions to create an additive scale forming the overall satisfaction scale scores.

Correlations were then determined using the standard Pearson product-moment coefficient. The average cross-product of the standard scores of two variables allows us to see the power of one variable’s effect on the other; in this case, it illustrates the impact of a teacher’s perception of working conditions to his or her overall sense of job satisfaction.

Using the Lens of Brownell and Smith’s Conceptual Framework to Examine Teacher Retention

Then, using all of these statistical analyses to create categorical labels for each working condition construct based on the Brownell and Smith adaptive conceptual frame, each construct was identified through the lens of its mediation within the microsystem or mesosystem of a teacher’s decision-making processes to stay or to leave the profession. Based on the ranking of each construct to its impact on job satisfaction and placement with the microsystem or mesosystem, the analysis led to an examination of the interaction of each system’s working conditions impacts on the other.
Logistic regression then took the combined effects of perceptions of working conditions and job satisfaction to predict the likelihood of teacher retention. Logistic regression allows the researcher to predict a discrete outcome, such as group membership, from a set of variables that may be continuous, discrete, dichotomous, or a mix of any of these. Generally, the dependent or response variable is dichotomous, such as presence/absence or success/failure. Since logistic regression makes no assumption about the distribution of the independent variables, this statistical approach is a good fit for this study. As the independent variables do not have to be normally distributed, linearly related, or of equal variance within each group, the relationship between the predictor and response variables is not a linear function in logistic regression. Instead, the logistic regression function is used, which is the logit transformation of $\theta$:

$$
\theta = \frac{e^{(\alpha+\beta_1x_1+\beta_2x_2+\ldots+\beta_nx_n)}}{1+e^{(\alpha+\beta_1x_1+\beta_2x_2+\ldots+\beta_nx_n)}},
$$

where $\alpha$ is the constant of the equation and $\beta$ is the coefficient of the predictor variables.

All open-ended responses were entered into an Excel spreadsheet to record occurrence and similarity of responses. Themes were developed from the top three groupings of open-ended response items and added to the analysis that framed a discussion about the impact of working conditions and job satisfaction on a teacher’s decision to stay or leave the classroom.
CHAPTER IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

The goal of this study was to examine the nature of North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of their working conditions and the relationship of those perceptions to Fellows’ overall levels of job satisfaction. Those inferences were used to facilitate a better understanding of the relationship of those two variables on Fellows’ potential decisions to stay or leave the profession. To cultivate an understanding of those relationships, a one-time survey was administered in the early spring of 2008. The study assessed respondents’ perceptions of approximately 75 items covering four main areas: (a) demographic data, (b) general job satisfaction, (c) satisfaction with various working conditions constructs, and (d) retention.

Responses from each of these areas of the survey items were coded accordingly. The survey was constructed to frame responses from respondents who were currently teaching as well as those who had taught previously. After employing an exploratory factor analysis to determine which specific questions and factors loaded into working construct variables, mean scores were then calculated for each working construct domain. Using descriptive statistics, along with t-tests, MANOVA, ANOVA, and correlation coefficients, analyses were conducted to compare responses, both to the 2006 statewide survey of all North Carolina teachers as well as to a number of groupings within the sample population. Logistical regressions were then run to determine what factors might account for Fellows’ potential decisions to remain or leave the profession. Table Four
### Table 3

**Summary Chart of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEASUREMENT / DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
<td>Ordinal responses/intentions of future plans to stay or leave the profession</td>
<td>Continue teaching at my current school 45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave teaching totally 8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teach as long as able 32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leave soon as I can 6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
<td>Logistical regression/use variables to predict staying or leaving</td>
<td>Increases in <em>Leadership-Empowerment</em> scores predicted 3.39 times more likely to leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increases in <em>General Job Satisfaction</em> scores predicted 12.66 times more likely to leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>Scaled responses/to construct questions, then averaged</td>
<td>Time 2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Working</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Facilities and Resources</em> 2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Leadership-Empowerment</em> 3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Professional Development</em> 2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>Group means, using MANOVA and ANOVA/to see differences between groups</td>
<td>No statistically significant difference in group means between the following groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Working</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-teachers vs. non-teachers -gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4 yrs/fewer vs. 5 yrs/more -race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-campus -field of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>Correlation coefficients/to measure constructs and years of experience</td>
<td>Statistically significant for a positive correlation between years of experience and professional development: .122*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Working</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistically significant for a negative correlation between years of experience and leadership: -.112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> 4.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilities and Resources</strong> 30.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong> 3.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong> 7.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong> 19.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant less satisfaction than peers across the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>Scale responses to general satisfaction questions/then averaged to create satisfaction</td>
<td>2.51 = aggregated level of overall job satisfaction as measured across all 18 general satisfaction variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>Correlation coefficients/to measure constructs and general satisfaction</td>
<td><strong>Facilities and Resources</strong> .398**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong> .357**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time</strong> .203**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership-Empowerment</strong> .609**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** *p<.01. *p<.05.*
provides a summary of these findings, all of which will be further explicated later within
the chapter.

In an attempt to preserve the maximum amount of information collected from the
survey responses, all observations were included in each analysis. Where values were
missing for a given calculation, the analysis used the total range for any given variable’s
possible valid responses. Significance levels of .01 and .05 were used for all tests.

In preparation for conducting all analyses, a number of valid statistical procedures
were employed to sort, clean up, and arrange the data file. After downloading the
Qualtrics data file into a comma-separated value file and then uploading the dataset into
Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), identifying information was removed
from the file. Reverse-direction questions were recoded, descriptive statistics such as
frequencies and percentages were run, and the file was reviewed in preparation for
running the exploratory factor and regression analyses. Where appropriate, all questions
were recoded so that scores would be reflected with a score of 1.0 indicating a level of
least satisfaction and a score of 5.0 indicating a level of most satisfaction. Appendix D
contains the codebook used to track and record each survey item and codes for responses.

The final analyses confirmed findings from the literature about the relationship of
working condition constructs upon Fellows’ levels of general job satisfaction. With most
group scores for Fellows falling below 3.0, Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions
and general job satisfaction levels were determined to be less than positive. Moreover,
Fellows’ perceptions and general satisfaction levels were statistically lower than that of
their statewide peers. Fellows teaching beyond their four-year commitment reflected a
statistically significant degree of greater satisfaction with their roles than those still within
their four-year commitment. A relationship between three out of the five variables also demonstrated a statistically significant, albeit negative, predictor for Fellows’ potential decisions to leave the profession. While leadership, general satisfaction, and time were expected to be positive predictors for improving teacher retention, in this study, these three variables were not.

Chapter Four presents the descriptive statistics and sample distributions, describes the process of data management and analysis, and explains the development of the comparative analysis that led to the logistical regression calculations. The latter part of the chapter presents results of the hypotheses from the research questions and discusses other comparisons and analytic outcomes of this study.

Descriptive Statistics

All NC Teaching Fellows who could have been teaching for six years or fewer were invited to participate in the survey. Contact information for these Fellows was obtained from the Employee Verification Form (EVF), which all Fellows must complete each year to either validate their year of teaching service or to communicate their intentions for repayment.7 The total population of Teaching Fellows with a potential for teaching four years or fewer and whose information was available was 1,714. In addition to the group of 1,714 Fellows, there was also contact information for an additional 99

---

7 Fellows have seven years from their year of graduation to complete their four years of teaching service as repayment. The EVF is how the Teaching Fellows Commission monitors which Fellows are teaching, as well as which Fellows are in graduate school, military service, caring for family members, teaching out of North Carolina, or other unique situations. This process, along with the fact that some Fellows graduate in periods that do not follow a traditional four-year period of study for a bachelor’s degree, yields a wide array of variance between the number of Fellows between and across classes.
Fellows. These additional Fellows had the potential to have taught for 12 years or fewer. With the inclusion of the additional 99 Fellows, a full sample population of 1,813 was invited to participate in the survey. (See Appendix E for a full distribution of all Fellows, distributed across each of the potential years for teaching, who were contacted for participation in the survey.)

A letter of appeal directing Fellows to the website www.tfsurvey.net was used to invite participation in the survey. The URL provided a direct and secure link to the www.Qualtrics.com website where all data were safely secured. Each respondent was provided a randomly assigned access code and password. While the intention was to randomly select Fellows with one to four years of teaching experience, the decision was made to solicit responses from the entire sample population of all 1,813 potential respondents. Two different follow-up postcards were sent after the initial mailing to encourage and remind potential respondents to participate.

Of the 1,813 Fellows within the sample population, 427 individuals actually responded to the survey. Of these, 86% were still in a teaching position, 2.1% were working in a role within education but not teaching (administration, central office, curriculum specialist, etc.), and 11% were in some other, non-education-specific role. This distribution is shown in Table 4. Of the 427 respondents, 1.6% failed to fully complete the survey but, where appropriate, their responses were retained. Fifty-nine of the invitation letters were returned because of insufficient addresses or lack of any forwarding contact information. These bad addresses accounted for close to 3% of the
original 1,813. This yielded a response rate of 24% out of the total sample of 1,813 potential respondents.

Table 4

*Current positions of all respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (including intervention specialist, vocational, literacy specialist, special education teacher, etc.)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Media Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am employed with a local education fund or other non-profit agency that supports the work of public schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am employed with a state, regional or national agency that supports the work of public schools.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>427</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the number of respondents who identified themselves as school or central office-based was so small (N=9), two basic groups of respondents emerged: teachers (N=365) and all others (N=55).

The number of respondents having between one and four years of experience in
the classroom was close to 80%. Twenty-one percent of respondents had five or more years of classroom teaching experience. Thirty-seven percent of respondents identified as having studied elementary education, 8% as having studied middle grades education and 48% as having studied secondary or subject area-specific education. Ninety percent of respondents identified as white, and 6% identified as Black or African American.

Respondents were given an opportunity to describe themselves with regard to educational attainment, awards, and recognition. Of all respondents, 27% have earned a master’s degree; 5%, a second bachelor’s degree; and 0.5%, a second master’s degree. An additional 5% have earned some sort of other certification degree of advanced graduate study. Of the 5% who have sat for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards credential, 75% received passing scores. Seven percent reported having been named as a local, regional, or state teacher of the year; and another 7% reported having won some other award recognizing their professional experiences as an educator. See Appendix F for a list of all open-ended responses indicating what other awards have been given to Teaching Fellow respondents.

The respondents were highly similar to that of the sample population. Gender representation within the sample population was 83% female and 17% male; of survey respondents, 84% were female, and 16% were male. (See Figure 4.)

As compared to the number of potential respondents from each campus, most campuses were represented adequately in the sample. (See Figure 5.) Looking across the distribution of the 14 campuses, eight campuses had participation equal to or above the level of their potential number of Fellows from the sample. Of the six campuses that did
not have participation equal to that of their sample percentage, only two of those campuses had response rates less than 2% of what would have constituted a fully representative sample. (See Appendix G.)

Based on the years in which Fellows were awarded their scholarships, the distribution of potential respondents who could have still been within their four-year commitment was close to 71%, and those who could have been teaching for five years or more was 29% of the potential sample. Figure 6 shows that of those who responded, 79% were still within their four-year obligation to teaching, while 20% of respondents were teaching beyond their four-year commitment.

Out of the 107 local education agencies (LEAs) that had at least one Teaching Fellow employed within their system, 81%, or 87 LEAs, had at least one Teaching Fellow participate in the survey. (See Figure 7.) Of all LEAs that were represented by survey respondents, only nine had less than 15% of their total Teaching Fellows population
participate. Of the 20 LEAs that had no representation within the survey responses, most only had one or two Fellows within their entire LEA; and only seven had three or more Fellows. Of the 942 schools in North Carolina that had at least one Teaching Fellow within their school, 333 were represented by survey respondents.
Of the total sample population, 95% were from North Carolina, and 5% were from states other than North Carolina. Representatively, out of all respondents, 96% were from
North Carolina, and 4% of respondents were from outside of North Carolina. (see Figure 8.) For more on the comparative nature of the sample to the population, see Appendix H.

Figure 8. Percentage of NC Residents to Non-Residents Comparison, Sample Population to Respondents.

Statistical Analysis

Once the data file was properly recoded and cleaned, the process of assembling respondents’ perceptions of working conditions, general job satisfaction, and retention began. The first step in this process was to identify which questions from the working conditions constructs would be selected for the purpose of creating group means around each working condition construct. An exploratory factor analysis technique was used, with the goal of generating agreement about which questions for each working construct provided the most valid approximation for each aggregated working condition variable.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

The exploratory factor analysis, with a five-factor solution, was conducted using
Varimax rotation. The five factors are presented in Appendix I, where they accounted for 48.18% of the variability in the data.

While several variables loaded simultaneously on multiple factors, the questions selected were those that met the criteria of a .258 threshold on a single factor, as well as made for a theoretical fit. This process yielded three time variables, 16 facilities and resources variables, and five professional development variables. Because of the high loading factor for both leadership and empowerment constructs, leadership and empowerment were identified as appropriate for measuring a co joined variable known as leadership-empowerment. Largely because of the potential for dual interpretations of leadership and empowerment behaviors, as well as the high factor loading, this combined construct seemed a reasonable fit for this study’s focus. The resulting new, co joined variable then yielded 35 variable questions and was used accordingly with the other construct question sets for all analyses. See Appendix J for a list of these variables and their associated questions.

The questions associated with each particular factor were then averaged to create a working condition domain average. As already described, because of the similarity in questions around leadership and teacher empowerment, these two sets of questions and their factors were combined. This led to the four domain averages as representations of respondents’ levels of satisfaction and perceptions with each of the four working conditions construct variables.

---

9 This phenomenon occurred within the statewide administration of the NCWI effort as well. Because of the multicollinearity between questions attempting to exact distinctions between behaviors of leadership and those that also seek to empower the work of teachers, it is not surprising that these questions ended up loading on a common, singular factor.
Using the Factor Analysis to Determine Working Conditions Perceptions

The factor analysis validated which set of working conditions construct questions could be used to determine group means of working conditions perceptions. These aggregated group means are presented in Table 5. The lower level of satisfaction of Teaching Fellows with the *facilities and resources* reflected Fellows’ dissatisfaction with the occurrence of variance problems taking place within a school context. For example, 36% of Fellows reported that “student acts of disrespect for teachers” happen on a daily basis, while 32% reported that “student verbal abuse of teachers” happens at least once a week or daily. Dissatisfaction with behavior toward teachers was not the only area of concern. Forty-four percent of Fellows reported that student bullying happens at least once a week or daily, and 19% reported physical conflict among students as something that happens at least once a month in their school.

Table 5

*Working Conditions Domains: Means and Standard Deviations; All Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WC Domains</th>
<th>Sample M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Fellows seemed less satisfied with their opportunities for professional development due to the nature of what professional development they have access to as well as how it fits their needs. Thirty-four percent of Fellows reported disagreement or strong disagreement with the statement that “teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.” Only 10% of Fellows strongly agreed with the statement that “professional development provides teachers [at their school] with the knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively.”

After facilities and resources and professional development, Teaching Fellows were least satisfied with their options for weekly non-instructional time and, particularly, with the lack of time for planning. An examination of the factors associated with each of these group means provides insight into the workplaces of Teaching Fellows. Sixty-four percent of all Fellows reported only having five hours or less of planning time a week, and 24% report having less than three hours of planning time a week. When probed on their opportunities for planning time that involved collaboration with other colleagues, 32% of Fellows disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that time was available in their school for such work.

The nature of Fellows’ perception of leadership as a construct of their working conditions was highlighted by the reactions to questions about the nature of trust and communication within the school as an organizational workplace. More than 50% of all Fellows reported strong agreement with the statement that “there is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect” at their school. When asked to respond to the statement, “School leadership communicates clear expectations to students and parents,” over 54% responded in agreement or strong agreement. The third highest factor of satisfaction with leadership
as a working condition construct was demonstrated in Fellows’ reaction to “school leadership consistently supports teachers.” Fifty-one percent of Fellows expressed agreement that this behavior was evident within their working conditions.

*Comparing Group Means of Working Conditions Perceptions; Teachers and Non-Teachers*

After this examination of how Teaching Fellows, as an aggregated sample, viewed their working conditions, it was important to establish a control for factors that might influence these group means. The first step toward this goal was to conduct an analysis to determine if there were differences in these scores from two groups of respondents: those still teaching and those who are no longer teaching. Non-teachers included all those Fellows who have left teaching, either before or after their four-year teaching commitment, as well as those still in some educational setting. Before a statistical analysis was conducted, a simple review of the two group means showed that the only working condition construct with any degree of variance was that of time. While such a result might support the notion that Fellows who were no longer in a classroom setting would be more satisfied with time as a factor of their working conditions, a MANOVA was conducted to determine if indeed there were simultaneous difference on all four domains (*time, leadership-empowerment, facilities and resources, and professional development*) by participant group (Teachers vs. Non-Teachers). While there were differences between the two groups, the analysis resulted in a non-significant simultaneous difference, $F(4, 306) = 0.907, ns$ (eta=.01, power=.287). The four ANOVAs on each of the four domains by participant group were not significant (Table 6). Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations of the domains by participant group.
Table 6

ANOVA on Facilities and Resources, Professional Development, Time, and Leadership-Empowerment by Group (Teacher vs. Non-Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>(.584)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>(.650)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>(.572)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>(.500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* df=1, 309. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations by Group (Teachers vs. Non-Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing Group Means of Working Conditions Perceptions; Teaching Fellows Sample and Statewide Population

To tease out the context of how Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions compared to their colleagues across the state, the next analysis compared respondents’ results with that of the 2006 statewide administration of the similar NC Working Conditions Initiative Survey. While it is important to note that the instruments were similar, because of the smaller sample size, the factor analysis used in this study yielded different factors from those in the statewide administration. Of those questions that were exact duplicates and ended up loading on the same factors within both surveys, leadership contained 21 duplicates, professional development contained five, and empowerment contained five. There were no simultaneous questions from time or facilities and resources that loaded on both surveys. Within that context for the comparison and using five independent group t-tests, each of the domain scores was compared to the statewide scores. Survey respondents had lower scores on each of the four domains compared to the population. (See Table 8.) Consequently, this analysis conveys that, taken as a group, the Fellows within this sample were less satisfied to a degree that is statistically significant when compared to their counterparts across the state.

Comparing Group Means of Working Conditions Perceptions; Potential Years of Teaching: Four or Less and Five or More

A similar analysis was completed to see if there were differences in the responses of those who would be expected to have not yet already completed their four-year teaching commitment (all awards granted since 2000) as compared to those who would be expected to have already completed their four-year commitment (all awards in 1999 and before). While the group means reflected that those with scholarships awarded since 2000 (within
Table 8

*T-tests, Means, and Standard Deviations on Domains by Teaching Fellows Sample and Statewide Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>2006 NC Statewide Results</th>
<th>Sample All</th>
<th>Non-Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-value</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.21**</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>30.34**</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>3.74**</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>7.35**</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>19.37**</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p<.01.

their four-year teaching commitment) were slightly more satisfied than those awarded in 1999 and before (teaching beyond the four-year period), the group expected to have more teaching experience was also slightly more satisfied with their working conditions via the *leadership* construct. To see more fully the nature of difference between these group means, however, a MANOVA was conducted. Again using the four domains (*time*, *leadership-empowerment*, *facilities and resources*, and *professional development*) and comparing the variance of those responses with the variable called *years potential*
teaching (a recoded variable using the prefix associated with each access code\textsuperscript{10} based on the year of their award), the test resulted in a non-significant simultaneous difference, $F(4, 300) = 2.06$, $ns$ (eta=.03, power=.61). The four ANOVAs on each of the four domains by group were not significant (Table 9). The means and standard deviations of the domains by participant group are presented in Table 10.

Assessing the Relationship of Working Conditions Perceptions to Actual Years of Experience

To further explore the question of what relationship exists between the four domains (time, leadership-empowerment, facilities and resources, and professional development) and another variable called actual years of experience (not just when they could have completed their fellowship commitment), an additional statistical test was performed. Four correlations were conducted between the two variables of actual years of experience and each of the four working construct domains. This test excluded all Fellows who were no longer in a teaching role. Based on this analysis, professional development was positively related to years of experience, meaning, as Fellows’ years of experience increased, so did their satisfaction with questions related to professional development as a working conditions construct. There was a negative relationship between leadership-empowerment and years of experience: As years of experience in teaching increased, scores representing satisfaction with leadership decreased (Table 11). Facilities and

\textsuperscript{10} All respondents were assigned a prefix code to their randomly assigned access code number. Each prefix code was matched with the year of the Fellow’s award, indicating a measure from when the Fellow would have been expected to have graduated and potentially be teaching. Those who would have been expected to be teaching for four years or fewer were assigned prefix codes of X, L, G, U, and A. Those who would have been expected to be teaching for five or more years were assigned all other codes Y, C, S, Q, T, R, N and M.
Table 9

ANOVA on Facilities, Professional Development, Time, and Leadership-Empowerment by Potential Years of Teaching (four or fewer years vs. five or more years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>3.457</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>(.588)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>(.642)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>(.554)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>(.500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df=1, 303. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations by Potential Years of Teaching: Four or Fewer and Five or More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999 and Before (5 or more years)</th>
<th>Since 1999 (years 1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resources and time did not demonstrate a statistically significant correlation with actual years of experience. As Fellows’ years of experience increased, so did their likelihood of being more satisfied with aspects of professional development as a construct of their working conditions. Conversely, as Fellows’ years of experience increased, their likelihood of being more satisfied with aspects of leadership-empowerment as a construct of their working conditions decreased.

Table 11

Correlations between Actual Years of Experience with Four Working Conditions Construct Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.122*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>-.112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05.

Assessing the Relationship of Perceptions of Working Conditions to Other Variables

To look for any other explanatory effects for differences in the four working condition constructs, four additional MANOVA tests were conducted. Efforts to assess
whether there was a simultaneous difference on the four domains (time, leadership-
empowerment, facilities and resources, and professional development) by gender, race,
campus, and field of study also led to MANOVA test results. All of these analyses yielded
non-significant results for the variance in differences among these selected variables.

Gender

The variance of means between gender responses of Teaching Fellows to working
conditions was minimal. To control for any effect that gender might have on the
differences between respondents’ levels of satisfaction with the four domains, a
MANOVA was conducted, resulting in a non-significant simultaneous difference, $F (4, 300) = 0.84, ns (\eta=.01, power=.27)$. The four ANOVAs on each of the four domains by
group were not significant (Table 12). The means and standard deviations of the domains
by participant group are presented in Table 13.

Race

In looking at differences of perceptions of working conditions by race, the
variables of white versus all other races resulted in a non-significant simultaneous
difference, $F (4, 302) = 2.03, ns (\eta=.03, power=.60)$. Despite respondents of any race
other than white indicating somewhat of a greater level of satisfaction with professional
development than their white colleagues, the four ANOVAs on each of the four domains
by race were not significant (Table 14). The means and standard deviations of the
domains by race are presented in Table 15.
Table 12

ANOVA on Perceptions of Four Working Conditions Construct Domains (Female vs. Male)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.168</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>(.590)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>(.655)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>(.576)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>(.495)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df=1, 303. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations by Gender (Female vs. Male)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

ANOVA on Perceptions of Four Working Conditions Construct Domains by Race (White vs. All Other)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>3.897</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>(.581)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>(.656)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>(.574)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>(.493)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* df=1, 305. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations by Race (White vs. All Others)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Others</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus

In looking at differences by campus, the variables of those twelve campuses\(^{11}\) that had enough respondents to be included in the analysis resulted in a non-significant simultaneous difference, \(F(44, 1107) = 1.10, \text{ns (eta=.04, power=.97)}\). The four ANOVAs for the four domains by group were not significant (Table 16). While preparation from any of the different campuses might explain some element of the variation in perceptions of working conditions, the variance is too difficult to explain as a function of campus as a background variable. The means and standard deviations of the domains by participant group are presented in Table 17.

Table 16

ANOVA on Perceptions of Four Working Conditions Construct Domains by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>(.584)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>(.670)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>(.564)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>(.489)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df=11, 292. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square errors.

\(^{11}\) Two campuses were excluded from this analysis because they did not have a sufficient number of responses to provide a reasonable calculation.
Table 17

*Means and Standard Deviations by Campus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Facilities and Resources</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appalachian State University</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. East Carolina University</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elon University</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meredith College</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NC State University</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNC-Asheville</td>
<td>2.29 .63</td>
<td>2.47 .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNC-Chapel Hill</td>
<td>2.42 .69</td>
<td>2.65 .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UNC-Charlotte</td>
<td>2.17 .93</td>
<td>2.32 .51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UNC-Greensboro</td>
<td>2.29 .61</td>
<td>2.71 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UNC-Pembroke</td>
<td>2.37 .79</td>
<td>2.73 1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field of Study

In looking at the raw data showing differences by field of study (elementary, middle grades, and secondary), there appeared to be variation in the mean scores between grade levels. On all constructs except for facilities and resources, Teaching Fellows working in an elementary school environment appeared to have the least amount of satisfaction among all groups. However, when tested for the level of significance between the three group means, there was a non-significant simultaneous difference, $F(8, 596) = 0.57, ns$ (eta=.01, power=.27). The four ANOVAs on each of the four domains by field of study were not significant (Table 18). The means and standard deviations of the domains by participant group are presented in Table 19.

Using Group Means to Measure General Job Satisfaction

While the variables for perceptions of working conditions were derived from the factor analysis and each construct’s subsequent domain analysis, a measure for general job satisfaction was created by calculating scale scores for all of the responses to each of
Table 18

*ANOVA on Perceptions of Four Working Conditions Construct Domains by Field of Study (Elementary vs. Middle vs. Secondary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>(.596)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>(.662)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>(.573)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>(.508)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* df=1, 306. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Table 19

*Means and Standard Deviations by Field of Study (Elementary vs. Middle vs. Secondary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the 18 *general satisfaction* questions. These questions manifested themselves around
aspects of how teachers and schools experience a school as an organizational workplace. Examples of these questions included levels of agreements to statements such as, “Overall, this is a good place to teach and learn,” “I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school,” and “I like the way things are run at this school.” A complete listing of these questions, their associated means, and standard deviations is found within Table 20.

While all of these general job satisfaction scores reveal insight into Fellows’ various perceptions of their job, some variables are more noteworthy than others. Of these 18 variables, there appeared to be the most satisfaction with salary. It could be argued this result shows how Teaching Fellows are more interested in improving aspects of their work settings rather than simply receiving increased monetary compensation. While the variable with the least amount of satisfaction appeared to be the efforts of Fellows to coordinate the content of their courses with other teachers, perhaps the most disturbing data revealed that Fellows’ overall level of satisfaction with their jobs and Table 20

*General Satisfaction Variables: Means and Standard Deviations; All Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Satisfaction Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it.</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe us as a satisfied group.</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave teaching as soon as possible.  
I like the way things are run at this school.  
I think about transferring to another school.  
Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn.  
I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.  
I am satisfied with my teaching salary.  
I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired to go.  
Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.  
I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.  
I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.  
I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.  
I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with that of other teachers.  
I am satisfied with my class size.  
I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.  

schools—in general—is low. The group mean of 2.19 as a response to the statement, “I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school,” indicates that most Fellows were either in strong disagreement or neutral in their response. To the most general statement, “Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn,” the group mean was
2.07, indicating an even smaller level of positive agreement about Fellows’ views of their jobs.

For the purpose of all further analyses, all general satisfaction responses were collapsed into one variable as a proxy for *general satisfaction*. These grouped means were then used in all subsequent analyses. Then, to see the difference between the group mean scores for *general satisfaction* between Fellows still within their four-year commitment versus those teaching a 5th year or more, a t-test was conducted. Fellows in their 4th year or less had a group mean score of 2.47, while Fellows in their 5th year or more had a group mean score of 2.88. The resulting t-score of 6.78 was statistically significant at the .01 confidence level, indicating that Fellows teaching beyond their four-year commitment were more generally satisfied.

*Using Correlations to Examine the Relationship of Working Conditions Perceptions to General Job Satisfaction*

The next analysis looked at the nature of the relationship between *working condition perceptions* and overall levels of *general job satisfaction*. To pursue this inquiry, five Pearson correlations were conducted between the composite *general job satisfaction* mean scores and the four working condition construct domains (*time*, *leadership-empowerment*, *facilities and resources*, and *professional development*). It is important to make the distinction that correlational relationships are not to be inferred as causal; instead, the nature of the relationship between two variables that is demonstrated in a correlation shows what effects movement in one variable might have upon the other.

Table 21 shows the correlation coefficients for these tests between five groups of respondents. *General job satisfaction* was positively correlated with *time, facilities and resources*, and *professional development*. These data could be used to argue that, when
given opportunities for planning and professional development, or when one’s access to 
basic resources such as supplies and support are increased, overall levels of general job 
satisfaction could be improved. Surprisingly, general job satisfaction was negatively 
correlated with leadership-empowerment. While the negative correlation between 
leadership-empowerment and overall general job satisfaction was not expected from these 
results, more research is needed to delve into why Fellows’ responses to improvements in 
leadership-empowerment as a construct of their working conditions yields a lessened 
degree of general satisfaction.

Determining Group Means on Retention

Retention responses came from respondents’ answers to questions about their 
future intentions to remain in teaching and the length of time they predicted they would 
stay in a teaching role. A reflective question which asked, “If you could go back to your 
college days and start over, would you still chose to become a teacher?,” was included in 
this analysis. A full listing of these questions is identified within Appendix K. Tables 
22, 23, and 24 illustrate Fellows’ responses to the three retention variable questions.

The responses of Fellows to each of the retention variable questions illuminated 
what Fellows reported are their intentions for staying in teaching. Forty-six percent of 
Fellows still within their four-year teaching commitment indicated that their plans are to 
“continue teaching at their current school.” When the question asks about Fellows’ 
intentions to stay at their current school “until something better comes along,” the 
percentage of Fellows who have already completed their four-year commitment appeared

12 A fourth retention question was also asked but not included in this analysis. That 
question asked respondents if they had applied for a job outside of teaching within the past 
12 months.
to have a great level of intention to remain. For both groups (those still within their four-year commitment and those who are teaching five years or more), these results suggest that Fellows have minimal intentions to leave the profession immediately. Of all Fellows, the number of respondents stating they plan to leave from either group was under 10%.

The second retention question provided further knowledge of how Fellows foresee their careers in teaching. Combining the responses “as long as I am able” and “until I am eligible for retirement” brought to 50% the percentage of Fellows who

Table 21

*Correlations Among Satisfaction and the Four Working Conditions Construct Domains*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction All</th>
<th>Satisfaction Non-Teachers</th>
<th>Satisfaction Teachers (Yrs 1-4)</th>
<th>Satisfaction Teachers (Yrs 5 or &gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.490**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 361</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 368</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 360</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/ Empowerment</td>
<td>-.609**</td>
<td>-.692**</td>
<td>-.583**</td>
<td>-.750**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 365</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p<.01.
indicated plans to remain in teaching for a considerable period of time (Table 21). While Fellows still within their four-year teaching commitment appeared to have a slightly greater degree of uncertainty about where they see themselves in the future (18.1%), both groups contain a considerable percentage (approximately 30%) of respondents who indicated they would probably continue teaching “unless something better comes along.”

Table 22

*Future Intentions: Frequency and Percent; All with Years Four or Less and Five or More*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?</th>
<th>All Fellows</th>
<th>Years 1-4</th>
<th>Years 5 or &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue teaching at my current school</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue teaching at my current school until a better opportunity comes along</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue teaching but leave this school as soon as I can</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue teaching but leave this district as soon as I can</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the profession altogether</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about choices to go back to their college days and still elect to become a
teacher, 45% of all Fellows reported that they “certainly would” still choose to become a teacher. The responses to this question seem to indicate that those who are still teaching beyond the required four years might have a stronger interest in the profession.

Out of all respondents who said that they “probably would,” 39.78% of those were Fellows who had already completed their four-year teaching commitment. Less than 4% of all respondents declared that they “certainly would not become a teacher” if given the opportunity to go back to college and do so again. (See Table 22.)

Table 23

*Plans to Remain: Frequency and Percent All with Years Four or Less and Five or More*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following statements best describes how long you plan to remain in teaching?</th>
<th>All Fellows</th>
<th>Years 1-4</th>
<th>Years 5 or &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as I am able</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until I am eligible for retirement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will probably continue unless something better comes along</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided at this time</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logistic Regression: Combining the Effects of Working Conditions Perceptions, General Job Satisfaction, and Intentions to Remain or Leave Teaching

To examine the relationship between the combined effects of each of these three variables for job satisfaction, perceptions of working conditions, and potential decisions to remain or leave the profession, a logistic regression was conducted with general job satisfaction and the four domains (time, leadership-empowerment, facilities and resources, and professional development) as predictors on a dichotomous variable for

Table 24

Go Back to College: Frequency and Percent All with Years Four or Less and Five or More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?</th>
<th>All Fellows</th>
<th>Years 1-4</th>
<th>Years 5 or &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainly would become a teacher</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably would become a teacher</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chances about even for and against</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably would not become a teacher</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retention scores for all respondents were dichotomized by averaging each of the three retention variable questions, and then a median split was conducted, with certain responses yielding a teacher-retention outcome and others yielding a teacher-leaving outcome. (See Table 25.) The Chi square was statistically significant, $X^2 (5) = 66.44, p < .001 (R^2=.257)$. Surprisingly, as *leadership* and *general job satisfaction* scores increased by 1-unit, participants were 3.39 and 12.66 times, respectively more likely to leave (see Table 25). The result of these analyses is not what was anticipated. The expected outcome for any of these variables was that, as levels of satisfaction along any of the dependent variables of *working condition perceptions* or *general satisfaction* increased, there would also be an increase in the likelihood that Fellows would be inclined to stay in the profession. While the result is certainly counter-intuitive, these findings indicate that there is a relationship between these two variables. Efforts to seek a better understanding of the relationship between the *leadership-empowerment* aspects of a teacher’s working conditions and potential decisions to stay or leave teaching are worth much more rigorous study.

To account for any effects that years of experience might have on this relationship, two additional logistic regression analyses were also performed. Table 27 highlights the analysis performed only on all teachers within years one through four (still within their four-year teaching commitment). Utilizing the same retention scores presented in Table 25, this second regression demonstrates a statistically significant Chi square, $X^2 (5) = 50.86, p < .001 (R^2=.268)$. Again, the counter-intuitive outcome yielded a relationship where as *leadership* and *overall job satisfaction* scores increased by 1-unit, Fellows with
one to four years of experience were 3.80 and 1.14 times, respectively more likely to leave.

This analysis supports the findings of a relationship between these variables and their impact on potential decisions to stay or leave the profession. While time, facilities and resources, and professional development were not statistically significant for their ability to positively predict an increase in retention, leadership and general satisfaction were found to be statistically significant as a negative predictor of Fellows’ likelihood for leaving the profession.

Table 25

*Retention: Averaging Future Intentions, Go Back to College and Plans to Remain on a Dichotomous Variable (2.5 or less = Stay, 2.75 or more = Leave)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total retention</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Logistic Regression on Retention using Five Predictors Perceptions of Working Conditions and General Job Satisfaction; All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>15.138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>42.219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>12.656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completing the same analysis on Fellows with five or more years of experience yields two different, yet still statistically significant, variables as predictors on retention. Represented in Table 28, with a Chi square, $X^2 (5) = 23.49, p < .001 (R^2 = .376)$, variables for time and overall job satisfaction seemed to impact Fellows’ potential future decisions about staying
or leaving the profession. Similar to the other two regressions, as scores for these variables increased by 1-unit, Fellows with five or more years of experience were 2.48 \((time)\) and 1.17 \((general\ satisfaction)\) more likely to leave. This finding indicates that for Fellows teaching five years or more, \textit{leadership-empowerment} is not a negative predictor for increasing retention, but \textit{time} and \textit{general satisfaction} are.

This analysis illustrates the importance of \textit{time} as a working condition construct. Because of its greater level of predictive ability for teacher retention, particularly for those who were teaching for five years or more, this relationship between \textit{time} and Fellows’ future plans for remaining in teaching is important.

Table 27

\textit{Logistic Regression on Retention using Five Predictors of Working Conditions Perceptions and General Job Satisfaction; Fellows in Years Four or Fewer}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>2.941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>12.287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>26.640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

\textit{Logistic Regression on Retention using Five Predictors of Working Conditions Perceptions and General Job Satisfaction; Fellows in Years Five or More}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>2.941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-Empowerment</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>12.287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>26.640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions and Hypothesis Test Results

The data analysis and results provide the following findings and outcomes to the research questions and hypothesis tests of this study.

The first research question asked was, “What are the perceptions of Teaching Fellows with regard to their working conditions?” Analyses showed that Fellows were less satisfied with aspects of their facilities and resources and professional development working condition constructs. Of the four variables used to rate perceptions of working conditions, Fellows were slightly more satisfied with aspects of time and leadership working condition constructs. There were no statistically significant differences between a number of comparisons of Fellows, including comparisons between teachers and non-teachers, years of experience, gender, race, campus, and field of study.

The hypothesis for this question (H1) was an expectation that Fellows would have similar perceptions of their working conditions as their peers across the state. H1 cannot be accepted because of the significant level of dissatisfaction by Fellows with regard to their working conditions. Fellows had differing perceptions of the most satisfying working conditions construct than their peers across the state. Furthermore, the overall
response of Fellows was one that indicated a strong level of disagreement with statements expected to confirm high levels of satisfaction with working conditions.

The second research question was, “What do these perceptions tell us about their levels of job satisfaction?” In addition to being less satisfied with their perceptions of working conditions, the assessment of Fellows’ overall job satisfaction levels demonstrated that Fellows were not a generally satisfied group of teachers. The overwhelming response to 17 out of 18 general job satisfaction questions yielded responses indicating that they were either neutral or in disagreement with statements about general job satisfaction. Particularly around the issues of collaboration with colleagues and the general nature of whether or not Fellows saw their schools as “good places to teach and learn,” Fellows’ overall level of job satisfaction was low.

The hypothesis for this question (H2) was an expectation that Fellows would have been less satisfied with some aspects of working conditions and general job satisfaction, particularly for those still within their four-year teaching commitment. It was further expected that those teaching beyond their fourth year would have some degree of greater satisfaction with their job (H3).

H2 can be confirmed because of the general job satisfaction scores for all Fellows (2.67) demonstrate less-than-neutral levels of satisfaction. Where 3.0 represents a neutral response, there was only one working condition construct score that showed a degree of some satisfaction (leadership-empowerment = 3.28). H3 can be confirmed by seeing that, when the data for general job satisfaction scores are disaggregated by two groups (those still within their four-year commitment versus those who have elected to teach beyond the required four years), there is a statistically significant difference showing that those
teaching five years or more were more generally satisfied (2.88) than those still within their four-year teaching commitment (2.47).

The third and final research question for this study asked, “What impact do working conditions and job satisfaction have on the retention of Teaching Fellows?” In looking at the relationships between these five variables (time, leadership-empowerment, facilities and resources, professional development, and general job satisfaction), the data reveal a connection between Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions, their general job satisfaction, and their likelihood to stay or leave the profession. Whereas as the correlation coefficients for all variables were statistically significant (Table 21), this relationship is also evidenced by the logistical regression analyses used to predict which variables might influence a Fellow’s potential decision to stay or leave the profession.

The hypothesis for this question (H4) was that the concomitant effects of these perceptions of working conditions would reveal a less-than-positive trend toward Fellows’ deciding to remain in the profession. It was further expected (H5) that working conditions would have varying impacts on teachers’ decisions to stay or to leave the profession, particularly upon those who had already completed their four-year teaching commitment.

H4 can only partially be accepted because of the nature of the concomitant effects of perceptions of working conditions and general job satisfaction upon Fellows’ potential decisions to stay or leave the profession. While the correlation between general job satisfaction and leadership-empowerment was statistically significant, the correlation was negative, indicating that, as Fellows’ perceptions of the leadership-empowerment construct improved, they have an adverse effect on Fellows’ levels of general job satisfaction. While this result was not expected, it cannot fully support the rejection of
H4. The data does not reveal a fully explanatory relationship between increases in leadership-empowerment as a predictor for leaving the profession either.

Similar to H4, H5 can only partially be accepted because of the mixed results of perceptions of working conditions and general satisfaction and their effects on potential decisions to stay or leave the profession. While facilities and resources and professional development did not yield influence within a logistical regression analysis predicting retention, leadership-empowerment and general satisfaction both had a statistically significant effect on Fellows’ potential decisions to stay or leave. As presented in Tables 26, 27, and 28, the nature of this relationship is negative, meaning that as perceptions of working conditions and general satisfaction scores increased, the possibility for increased likelihood of leaving the profession also increased. These data further demonstrate a variance between the two groups of Fellows who are either still fulfilling or have already met their four-year teaching commitment. While both groups were negatively impacted by improvements in perceptions of working conditions and general job satisfaction, different variables affected each group differently, showing a unique relationship between the concomitant effects of each of the variables upon retention.

Summary

The survey employed in this study yielded a wealth of information. While the overall response rate was 24%, the sample was highly representative of the Teaching Fellows population in terms of gender, distribution across years of potential teaching, and geographic and LEA distribution across the state. The results provide insight into the attitudes of Fellows and their views of current working conditions and levels of job satisfaction. Confirming findings from the literature about the relationship between
working conditions and general satisfaction, the survey results show that, as working conditions perceptions improved, so did levels of general job satisfaction. With a scale of 1.0 – 5.0, where 3.0 equates to neutral levels of satisfaction, and where, of all Fellows’ responses, only one working condition construct got a group mean response higher than 3.0, the findings from this study indicate that Fellows are a relatively less satisfied group of teachers; this is particularly evident in comparison to their peers across the state of North Carolina. Fellows who were teaching beyond their four-year commitment were significantly more satisfied than their peers still teaching within their first four years. The analysis demonstrates that, when examining the responses of all Fellows, two variables, leadership-empowerment and general satisfaction, had a significant negative ability to predict the potential decisions of Fellows to leave the profession. In examining Fellows who were teaching beyond their four-year commitment, leadership-empowerment was not a statistically significant influence on potential decisions to leave, but the variables of time and general job satisfaction were.

The following summary presents each of this study’s research questions, their associate hypotheses, and the findings for each.

H1 (rejected): Fellows’ scores for facilities and resources (2.59) and professional development (2.59) were lower than scores for time (2.92) and leadership-empowerment (3.28). Fellows were significantly less satisfied with their perceptions of working conditions than their peers across the state.

H2 (supported): Fellows’ score for the general job satisfaction variable was 2.67, indicating a group mean close to neutral but leaning toward being generally not satisfied. While 17 out of 18 general job satisfaction questions indicated that Fellows were generally dissatisfied as a group, differences between various groupings of Fellows (including teachers vs. non-teachers, years of experience, gender and race) were not statistically significant.

H3 (supported): Disaggregating general job satisfaction scores by two groups, those within their four-year commitment as compared to those teaching five years
or more, the group means are statistically significant. Fellows still within their four-year commitment had a *general job satisfaction* score of 2.47, while those teaching five years or more had a score of 2.88. Fellows teaching five years or more were generally more satisfied than those who had not yet met their commitment.

H4 (partially supported): With correlation coefficients of .547 (*professional development*) and .490 (*facilities and resources*), the relationship between perceptions of working conditions showed a statistically significant, positive correlation to Fellows’ level of *general satisfaction*. However, the correlation coefficient for *leadership-empowerment* was -.5.38, indicating a negative correlation to Fellows’ level of *general satisfaction*. Since the nature of the relationship between the variables showed a mixed correlation to job satisfaction, and not all variables had a negative prediction for retention, H4 cannot be fully supported.

H5 (rejected): Because the concomitant effects of working conditions perceptions and levels of general satisfaction had a mixed result for their ability to predict retention, H5 cannot be supported. While the variables of *leadership-empowerment* and *general satisfaction* had a negative influence on Fellows’ potential decisions to stay or leave the profession (if they were still within their four-year teaching commitment), the variables of *time* and *general satisfaction* influenced teachers’ decisions to stay or leave (if they had already completed their teaching commitment). The influence of the other two variables (*facilities and resources* and *professional development*) did not affect retention in a statistically significant positive manner.

The data also revealed that Fellows, as a group, are supportive of continuing in their roles as teachers. Forty-five percent of all Fellows indicated that their future intentions were to “continue teaching at [my] current school.” Close to 50% of Fellows responded that their plans were to remain in teaching “as long as I am able” or “until retirement.” When asked if they would return to college and make the same decision to become a teacher again, 45% responded that they “certainly would,” while only 3% responded that they “certainly would not.”

Chapter Five discusses the interpretations of these findings and implications of this study.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

Introduction and Problem Statement

Retaining high-quality teachers for America’s classrooms is of utmost importance. To compete in an ever-increasing global economy and supply the enriched learning environments needed for students to prosper in the 21st century, keeping high-quality teachers in the teaching profession is essential. The heightened level of expectations to reach goals of improvements in student achievement as mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 only increase this urgency for finding more ways to keep great teachers in America’s schools. Within that context, this study’s aim was to provide insight into the complexities facing the profession as educational leaders and policymakers work not only to improve strategies and programs for preparing high-quality teachers but also for supporting and retaining them.

Building on the literature dealing with teacher retention, job satisfaction, and working conditions, this study utilized an adaptation of Brownell and Smith’s conceptual framework of a Teacher Career Decision-Making model (1993) to view the relationships between North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions and their concomitant effects on job satisfaction and retention. This study utilized survey data from teachers who were teaching within a four-year commitment to the state as well as those who had elected to teach beyond the required four-year commitment. Teaching Fellows who had elected to leave the classroom within the last six years were also surveyed. This chapter discusses the survey results and presents interpretations of the findings, including
a set of speculations about some of the most counter-intuitive findings. After setting forth a series of recommendations based on this research, the chapter concludes with suggestions for future research.

Review of Methodology

The methodology employed in this study involved a quantitative analysis of survey responses to questions about perceptions of various constructs of working conditions, overall job satisfaction, and plans to continue teaching. This study took the core set of questions within the North Carolina Working Conditions Initiative (NCWCI) Survey and replicated them for a one-time administration to a group of North Carolina Teaching Fellows who were expected to be within their first six years of teaching.

Specifically, respondents were asked to rate their levels of satisfaction and/or agreement about perceptions of time, leadership, facilities and resources, teacher empowerment, and professional development as constructs of working conditions within a school setting. Respondents’ levels of overall job satisfaction were measured according to their levels of agreement with 18 indicators dealing with a variety of general issues and aspects of their roles as classroom teachers. Respondents were also asked to provide answers to retention questions which probed on their future intentions regarding teaching. Following a response rate of 24% that yielded a highly representative sample of respondents, descriptive statistics were compiled for all survey responses. Statistical procedures were used to produce statistics showing means and standard deviations between those Fellows who are new to the profession, those who have decided to teach beyond the state’s four-year commitment, and those who had already decided to leave the profession, either before or after the completion of their four-year obligation to teach.
A Varimax procedure was completed to conduct an exploratory factor analysis on each of the working conditions construct questions. This procedure not only built on the foundation of the NCWCI survey instrument, but it also helped determine which questions would be used to construct group means for each working conditions construct analysis. Group means were calculated using the scale scores of 1.0 to 5.0, where a 5.0 indicated the most positive response and the greatest amount of satisfaction or agreement and a 1.0 indicated the least positive response and the greatest amount of dissatisfaction or disagreement. For all questions that probed on the general job satisfaction variable, responses were calculated as a composite of the 18 general satisfaction question responses. Retention questions were reported descriptively. Comparisons among groups and along a number of variables were made using MANOVA and ANOVA statistical tests. Requiring significance at the .05 and .01 levels, differences among and between groups were calculated. Where appropriate, correlations were run to delve into the relationships between variables. After creating a dichotomous variable for retention outcomes (stay or leave) based on the range of answers available within each retention question, logistic regressions were run to see the impact of working conditions perceptions and general job satisfaction variables as possible predictors for retention.

Summary of Results

Confirming findings from the literature, Fellows’ responses indicated that, as perceptions of some working conditions perceptions improved, so did levels of general job satisfaction. Fellows were found to be less satisfied with their perceptions of working conditions and general job satisfaction in comparison to the results of a statewide administration of the same survey in 2006. Of the four working conditions constructs,
facilities and resources and professional development had the lowest mean score for satisfaction. However, across all working conditions constructs, as well as a variable for overall job satisfaction, Fellows were not very satisfied. The group mean for 17 out of 18 general satisfaction questions was below 3.0 on a scaled range of 1.0 – 5.0, where 3.0 equaled fully neutral. Fellows who had already completed their four-year teaching commitment and remained in the profession were more satisfied than their peers who were teaching in their first four years. While improvements in perceptions of some working conditions correlated to improvements in general job satisfaction scores, the same improvements provided mixed results in attempts to control for the influence of those variables on potential decisions to stay or leave the profession. Specifically, leadership-empowerment and general satisfaction emerged as a negative predictor for improving retention outcomes for some Fellows, while, with other Fellows, time also appeared as a negative predictor for improving teacher retention. These counter-intuitive findings were not expected. Close to 50% of Fellows demonstrated interest in continuing their roles as teachers, despite these findings.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that the linkages between the working condition constructs of time, leadership-empowerment, facilities and resources, and professional development have somewhat of a mediating effect on a teacher’s job satisfaction. Further, they provide insight into some of the potential barriers to improving teacher retention. How do these connections present themselves, and what do they mean in the real-world experience of teaching and learning in today’s schools? These questions are examined in light of the study’s findings and with respect to three areas: The first section describes the relationship
of Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions with general job satisfaction, both to offer speculation on some of the unexpected findings and to examine all of the findings together. The second section discusses the difficulty of teacher retention efforts given the challenges of these findings. The final section summarizes this discussion given today’s current policy challenges.

**Relationships of Working Conditions and Overall Job Satisfaction**

This study’s results confirm a number of findings from the literature about the relationship between perceptions of working conditions and job satisfaction. Environmental factors, as expressed in the constructed variables of time, leadership-empowerment, facilities and resources, and professional development, do have an influence on the degree to which teachers find agreement and satisfaction in their roles within a work setting. While any of a number of other issues, such as teacher compensation, have been studied for their impact on teacher satisfaction (Ballou & Podgursky, 1997; Crosby, 2002; Kelley, 1997; Odden and Kelley, 2002), the findings of this study support the interconnectedness within Brownell and Smith’s concepts of microsystem and mesosystem.

Data from the facilities and resources construct variable questions illuminate the theory of Maslow (1943), which asserted that individuals are not motivated to do certain things until their basic needs are met. (For more information about Maslow’s work, see Chapter 2.) The majority of questions from the facilities and resources construct variable asked respondents to indicate the occurrence of certain behaviors or events within their school. The questions were built on the assumption that a school that has fewer acts of violence (disrespect, bullying, and so forth) and disruption (absenteeism, tardiness, and so forth) would be thought of as a safe school with a culture and climate much more conducive
to learning. As Johnson (2006), PEN (2004), and Schneider (2004) have argued, meeting such basic needs as safety and stability is essential to enhance teachers’ overall sense of job satisfaction. When 36% of Fellows reported that “student acts of disrespect for teachers” happen on a daily basis and 32% reported that “student verbal abuse of teachers” happens at least once a week or daily, it seems clear that such patterns could lead to a diminished sense of job satisfaction for teachers working within those schools. It seems appropriate, then, that a key ingredient to increasing job satisfaction would be the reduction—if not total elimination—of debilitating disruptions and undesired behavior. While these improvements would be beneficial for all teachers, it is especially important for younger professionals such as these Fellows, just starting their careers, to have these basic needs met within their workplace.

In addition to facilities and resources, data from this study corroborates the need for ongoing professional development for teachers. Herzberg’s (1968) work suggests that employees are more motivated to action if their work involves “richer meaning and opportunities for professional growth” (p. 47). (For more on Herzberg’s work, see Chapter 2.) It seems appropriate, then, to conclude that Fellows, some of the brightest high school seniors within the state, would be keenly interested in furthering their knowledge and seeking out opportunities for professional growth. Given the context in which Fellows find themselves working, the need for quality professional development is even more pressing.

For example, 34% of all Fellows expressed disagreement or strong disagreement with the statement that “teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.” Another important issue surfaces when it is seen that over 50% of all Fellows reported that at least 15% of their students have Individualized Education Plans (IEP), meaning that they
qualify for some aspect of special education services. Yet only 14% reported having any professional development in the past 12 months to support working with special education students. Further, of those who reported having any professional development experiences, 18% said they only had eight hours or less of such professional development. Similarly, when looking at the 48% of Fellows who reported teaching Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, only 16% said they had participated in LEP professional development activities within the past twelve months. Of those, 12% reported having only eight hours or less of such professional development. Additionally, these data reveal that the urgent professional development needs of Fellows are not being met. A central tenant of No Child Left Behind expectations is that states will show demonstrative progress towards improved achievement among subgroups. In order to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), teachers must be prepared to provide additional supports, strategies, and interventions to the special education and LEP student populations in their classrooms. The fact that Fellows are not receiving these kinds of targeted professional development opportunities raises questions about who determines what kinds of professional development experiences are most important. In other words, if these needs are not being addressed through professional development, what issues are being addressed? Such questions need to be addressed to meet teachers’ authentic professional development needs and support their growth and development as professional practitioners; this, ultimately, will bolster their levels of overall job satisfaction.

As reported by Lortie (1973), Neman and Wehlage (1995), and Rosenholtz (1989), giving teachers time for collaboration and planning is important to their success as well. With the wide range of expectations and demands placed on teachers—planning quality lessons, providing instruction, performing assessments, participating in school-wide
problem-solving, demonstrating community engagement, and so forth—providing them with the time to accomplish these goals is of the utmost importance. Data from this study suggest that, in addition to time to accomplish such tasks, providing teachers with planned and protected time to do their work and to work with their colleagues would enhance teacher job satisfaction.

This is obviously an area of less-than-positive satisfaction for Fellows. They reported a group mean of 2.92 (within a range of 1.0 – 5.0, where a 3.0 rating equals a fully neutral response) for their responses to questions about the nature of time as a construct of their working conditions. While Fellows reported working, on average, about 55 hours a week, they were provided with less than one hour of planning time per day. In addition, most of that planning time appears to be in isolation: Thirty-two percent of Fellows expressed strong disagreement with the statement that their planning time was collaborative. Given the growing call for more educational approaches that prepare students for “the 21st century” and the current focus on interdependent and convergent thinking, as well as teamed approaches to problem solving (Henke, 2007; Wisconsin Dept of Education, 2006), it is easy to see why Fellows’ dissatisfaction with such limited opportunities within their own workplace would increase job dissatisfaction.

The fact that time, facilities and resources, and professional development all showed a positive correlation to improved general satisfaction scores is not surprising. As Carter argues in Conley and Cooper’s The School as a Work Environment (1991), schools should constantly be focused on ways to “develop the knowledge and thought processes consonant with the dilemmas and demands of teaching” (p. 60). This goal is one of the greatest challenges to schools today. Within the context of attracting high quality practitioners, it is
essential that we create work environments that are respectful of teachers’ needs to develop
their own capacities as professionals and that meet their basic needs of safety, freedom from
disruptions, and the time to get their jobs done.

*Unexpected Outcomes and Possible Explanations*

While three out of the four working conditions construct variables showed a positive
correlation with *overall job satisfaction*, one variable showed a surprisingly negative
correlation: *leadership-empowerment*. This unusual finding about *leadership-empowerment*
emerged as a result of the logistical regression analyses where increases in *leadership-
empowerment* scores and increases in *overall job satisfaction* scores actually *increased* the
likelihood of Fellows’ leaving the profession. Examining *leadership-empowerment* as a
predictor for *retention*, the findings showed that, as scores for *leadership-empowerment*
increased by one unit, a Fellow’s likelihood of leaving the profession increased by 3.39.
Similarly, Fellows were found to be 12.66 more times likely to leave the profession if scores
for *general job satisfaction* increased by 1-unit. These findings hold true even when
controlling for other factors within this study.

These counter-intuitive findings were not expected. They are surprising not only
because such a finding could be interpreted as a suggestion for practitioners who aim to
retain teachers to exude undesirable leadership or empowerment strategies within the
workplace; but also because it seems so contrary to what the literature concerning
organizational development and leadership theory have overwhelmingly suggested. A clear
assumption within this study was that, as schools improved their organizational capacity to
enhance perceptions of working conditions and overall job satisfaction, efforts to retain
teachers would improve. Because these unexpected findings do not support this general assumption, the following are several possible factors that could explain these results.

First and foremost, every effort has been made to verify the results of these statistical procedures, confirming that the findings were arrived at appropriately and according to best practice. Even after having an outside consultant examine the processes and procedures used in this research, the outcomes consistently show a non-linear approach to how these factors are all connected, both one to each other and also to the ultimate outcome of teacher retention. Nonetheless, it is possible that researcher error could fit as an explanation for these seemingly contradictory findings.

A second consideration could be the diverse perceptions with which Fellows may view the leadership-empowerment constructs. Variations occurred in this construct across all groups, including those who had left teaching versus those who remained. While more than 50% of all Fellows reported that they work in “an environment of trust and mutual respect,” 54% of Fellows agreed or strongly agreed that they work in schools where “leadership communicated clear expectations to students and parents.” Only 36% of Fellows currently teaching agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “School leadership tries to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers”; yet 51% of those who taught previously but are no longer teaching agreed or strongly agreed with the same statement. When asked to respond to the statement, “The faculty and staff have a shared vision,” 62% of those still teaching agreed or strongly agreed, while only 51% of those who had taught at some point in the past agreed. Variations were also present with the range of years of teaching experience. While 42% of first-year teachers agreed with the statement about minimalizing routine administrative paperwork, only 29% of teachers in their 5th year
of teaching agreed; for those teaching seven years or more, the percentage of respondents in agreement had diminished to only 25%. Similarly, 73% of first-year teachers reported agreement with the shared vision statement, while the level of agreement had slipped to 59% for those within their 3rd year and 56% of those in their 4th year. At the same time, it should be remembered that, overall, Fellows’ responses to general satisfaction construct questions were very close to neutral. Such extreme variation, within and across all of the leadership-empowerment responses, and the fact that such variation occurred within a relatively small sample size, could be factors in explaining such contradictory findings.

A third explanation for the counter-intuitive nature of these findings around leadership-empowerment and overall job satisfaction could stem from the design of the NCWCI Survey Instrument and its adaptation within this study. While factor analysis procedures were utilized to seek out grounded theories of reliability for each of the construct variables, wide-scale studies specifically designed to look at the reliability and validity of the NCWCI Survey Instrument have not been undertaken. The use of the NCWCI Survey Instrument has not been without controversy, either. While findings from the Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ) studies have produced a number of interpretations about the influence of working conditions on academic achievement, teacher turnover, and satisfaction, there are still concerns about the nature of how the instrument is administered. It could be that some schools’ staffs are pressured to answer surveys in certain ways as a means for political “cover” from some administrators, disgruntled employees, or district leadership. Or it could be that, regardless of repeated appeals for candor and assurances of anonymity and protection from reprisal for their responses, teachers remain uncomfortable with sharing their most frank assessments of the schools in which they work. It is also possible that the
An additional concern about the specific instruments used to collect these data is the decision to combine the variable question sets of leadership and empowerment. The factor analysis which yielded the close statistical relationship between these two variables embodies the confusing relationship between the two constructs. While the literature points to distinctive behaviors within each arena, one can see their cojoined nature: behavior that is commonly referred to as leadership, such as the work of a school-based school improvement team, can only emerge when individuals are empowered to work within such a team. Some would argue that that characteristic of leadership—encouraging and promoting teacher involvement in school-based decision-making activities—is indicative of clear leadership behavior. Others, however, might argue that it speaks to teachers’ feeling supported, involved, and capable of participating in such activities, thus then being evidence of a school culture with strong teacher empowerment dynamics at play. This dual treatment and perspectives of both constructs of leadership and empowerment, then, could also be a factor these unusual findings.

In addition to these concerns about the instruments used for data collection, one could view the phrasing of the leadership-empowerment questions problematic in interpretation or tone. One issue that has emerged in the leadership-empowerment question section of the instrument is the uncertainty of who is defined as “we,” as within a question that asks respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “In this school, we take
steps to solve problems” (italics added). In addition, language found in such statements as “school leadership shields teachers from disruptions” could be perceived by some respondents as patronizing or belittling of their own efforts to deal with disruptions. All of these issues related to the NCWCI Survey Instrument might have had an effect on the study’s unusual findings.

These findings could also be evident of bias within those self-selected respondents who chose to participate in the survey. While the nature of the sample was indeed highly representative of the population being studied, it could be that those Fellows who chose to respond were simply motivated for whatever reason to express their lack of satisfaction via the survey response.

An additional explanation for these unusual findings could stem from an important discussion within the literature. In McGregor’s 1960 work regarding motivation, what he called the “Theory Y” approach uses more humanistic efforts that appeal to individuals’ sense of purpose and belonging. (In contrast, the “Theory X” approach uses rewards and punishments to mandate desired or undesired behavior.) Theory Y informed the development of the survey instrument, whereby positive answers on such approaches would have indicated a positive view of working conditions and general satisfaction. While the survey’s construction made assumptions about the benefit of such approaches, such a bias within the instrument may have contributed to some of the most counter-intuitive of these findings.

For example, it may be that the dynamics of work within a school setting are such that some teachers, while working in an environment that empowers them to be involved in leadership roles and decisions, are, on the contrary, more interested in and motivated by their
own sense of self-direction and leadership that comes from classroom management and teaching. In other words, while some behaviors might employ teachers to become more empowered within the work of their school as an organization, due to the individualistic nature of classroom teaching, some teachers, including Fellows, might view questions of empowerment as burdensome and contradictory to their own sense of self-mission and desire for isolation within their own classroom setting. Further, while some of the questions within the *leadership-empowerment* construct section described behaviors that some might view as overly proscriptive, some teachers may actually enjoy working conditions where leadership expectations and behaviors are not pressing teachers to excel or stretch their practice to meet the needs of all students. While undesirable, this interpretation of how some respondents might have viewed the *leadership-empowerment* construct questions may have yielded the findings where leadership-empowerment efforts actually seemed to promote Fellows’ possible decisions to leave the profession.

While perhaps cynical, this view of teachers also explains why the dynamic of years of experience showed a lessened appreciation for what was assumed to be positive leadership behaviors on the survey. New teachers are eager to “get through” each challenge in and of itself. As they grasp the interconnected expectations of content mastery, classroom management, and instructional design, combined with roles of coach, cheerleader, social worker, and caregiver, new teachers have different appreciations for what they view as leadership traits and behaviors within their school. More experienced teachers, in contrast, have the strength of experience, history, and reflective practice to both be perhaps more critical of what they observe as leadership and empowerment strategies as well view them from a radically different lens than less experienced teachers.
One additional possible explanation of this result could be what some researchers refer to as an emerging generational perspective. Fellows within this study’s sample are in their early- to mid-twenties. Like their counterparts who were born between 1982 and 1993, they have been described as “Generation Y.” There is a growing body of research about how to meet the needs and expectations of Generation Y (Johnson and Hanson, 2006). In a recent report from Deloitte Research, members of Generation Y have been described as “more self-reliant and self-managing than previous generations” (p. 9). Viewing the core set of survey respondents in this light may explain how Fellows’ overall views of leadership behaviors may be somewhat different than their more traditional, older colleagues. Some studies suggest that members of Generation Y are likely to change jobs seven or eight times over their careers (Huff, 2006; Kushnell, 2007). It could be that one reason for Fellows’ views of leadership-empowerment stems from their own generational perspective and vision for seeing themselves as employees. In addition, the influence of technology and interactive media, such as texting, instant messaging, and prolific use of the Internet, are all associated with young adults from Generation Y. Perceived to be highly entrepreneurial, a result of coming of age within a “networked world,” Fellows and other members of Generation Y are typically skilled at multitasking, making decisions, evaluating risks, and managing dilemmas (Deloitte Research, 2007). One result of an intersection of leadership and these attributes in teachers as workers in today’s schools could be that, as a more traditional view of supportive leadership traits emerges, it actually has a negative effect on Fellows’ job satisfaction.

It could also be that these data illuminate an aggregate profile of individuals who, after being selected and prepared as Teaching Fellows, have joined a profession whose culture they perceive as being desperately in need of reform. It is possible that, as heavily
recruited and valued candidates who have undertaken a highly resourced and organized four-
year program of preparation for teaching, many Fellows find themselves, as new teachers,
pressing ahead with a sense of idealistic urgency to meet the educational needs of their
students and classrooms. They are likely to be independent thinkers, risk-takers, eager to
innovate within their chosen profession. This profile of Teaching Fellows might explain why
many of them find themselves working in schools where they feel mostly dissatisfied.
Because of any of a number of educational, economic, social, or political barriers, it could be
that Teaching Fellows experience reduced levels of satisfaction because of the fact that—
despite efforts to immerse Fellows in “real-world” experiences and to fully prepare them
work in today’s schools—their idealistic worldviews and intentions constantly “bump”
against the inertia that exists within most schools’ organizational capacities.

Ironically, a goal of the Teaching Fellows program is to enrich the overall teacher
development process so that Fellows perceive themselves as innovators and educational
leaders. Specific program expectations include:

- Provide an academically and culturally enriched preparation program that
  extends beyond the regular college program
- Provide opportunities and experiences that encourage the development of
  leaders and decision-makers
- Provide opportunities for building an understanding of education’s place in a
  greater social context

These values in their educational programming speak to the possible disconnect between
Fellows’ expectations and the realities of the schools in which they find themselves
employed.
Regardless of whether the factor is generational, researcher error, sample size, instrument design, or the various lenses by which teachers view their workplaces, it is certain that more research is needed to investigate this study’s results about the nature of leadership-empowerment to overall job satisfaction and its concomitant impact on teacher retention.

**Using Brownell and Smith to Examine Findings**

This section examines each of the constructs in the context of Brownell and Smith’s Career Decision-Making model (1993) and seeks to show the interconnectedness of these issues and how they play out within a teacher’s workplace. Brownell and Smith’s model suggests that it is within the varying levels of a micro-, meso-, exo-, and macrosystem that teachers will ultimately make a determination as to whether or not to continue teaching. It is precisely within the realm of the microsystem that teachers find themselves grappling with many of the issues of Maslow’s basic needs (1960) as presented within the facilities and resources construct.

Factors that affect decisions to stay or leave teaching include the safety of the environment, extra duties and responsibilities, and demands on the limited resources of time. Just as human resources professionals strive to promote workplace hygiene and camaraderie within many corporate settings, a similar function is needed within a school context (Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1984). While there is great debate about the frustration of school leaders who are called to live in the dual worlds of instructional leadership and matters of building maintenance, it is clear that the impact of human capital management is a critical component to today’s educational leader. As Brennen (2007) suggested in a plea for educational leaders to develop a synergistic approach to leadership which combines both McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y (1960) with that of Senge’s holistic model (1990):
The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives. (p. 64)

For schools and leaders hoping to stem the tide of teacher retention, such advice is supported by this study.

Equally as important as the set of interactions that take place within a teacher’s conceptual microsystem is the day-to-day experience that occurs within the mesosystem. Brownell and Smith describe the mesosystem as the arena where a teacher might reflect on the decision to continue in the profession in light of the opportunities for professional growth and the presence of collegial relationships present within the workplace. The correlation coefficients afforded to the professional development and general satisfaction variables illustrate the importance of providing teachers with opportunities to advance their skills. More and more educational organizations are calling for opportunities for growth and advancement that are not limited to what is traditionally viewed as a building-level administrator. While this study did not explicitly pursue that dynamic with the Teaching Fellows, a unique prospect of future research is an opportunity to review the data collected in this survey for more signals about the strength of opportunities for growth within the profession. Another variable from this study that fit into Brownell and Smith’s conceptual frame is the relationship of teachers who agreed or strongly agreed with questions around a shared vision for a school. While it was expected that having a shared vision would be absolutely essential in supporting increased levels of job satisfaction, the data in this study did not bear that out.

Following the connective impact of these working conditions, it is worth noting that, within the conceptual framework of Brownell and Smith’s Career Decision-Making model,
there is a parameter of how, over a period of time, any of the various constructs can have a more or less mediating effect, as a result of history and experience. Each of these constructs can obviously impact the ultimate decision to stay or leave—for example, a teacher who is actually not all that satisfied with the profession, but who, over a period of time, has become accepting of his or her situation and ended up deciding to stay; or vice versa. In light of this parameter, the data in this study demonstrate some unique differences in the perceptions of those Fellows who are still within their first four years of teaching, those who elected not to teach for the full four years and those who are teaching beyond their four-year commitment. By surveying Fellows from both groups, this study revealed that those who have already completed their teaching commitment to the Teaching Fellows program are perhaps more satisfied than their peers who have not yet met their commitment. This finding could be an example of how students who have essentially always wanted to be involved in a classroom teaching setting used the Fellowship to build on that opportunity within their given mesosystem and further their notions of what it means to be involved in a classroom.

It is within this view of both the microsystem and the mesosystem that one can see more fully the implications of Herzberg’s theory (1968) that within organizations there are two dynamics present that influence satisfaction and dissatisfaction for employees. According to Hertzberg, motivation and what he referred to as “hygiene” issues are always interacting within individuals’ reactions and perceptions of their organization. While hygiene issues cannot motivate employees, they can decrease dissatisfaction but not necessarily increase satisfaction. Motivators, on the other hand, can enhance satisfaction by appealing to employees’ individual needs for meaning, personal growth, and recognition and opportunities for advancement. Given the duality of how both factors—motivation and
hygiene—have an impact on the connection and relationship of employees to organization, the study’s data and findings illustrate the importance of managing both. If school leaders are to confront the issues of teaching quality with a goal of enhancing teaching retention, leading and managing around these dual organizational dynamics is imperative.

Retention as a Construct

An important distinction regarding this study is the fact that retention, as a variable, was measured through answers to questions about the length of time respondents indicated they would continue teaching. While these data are revealing, they are also descriptions of individuals’ intentions and not necessarily specific, observable behavior. Future research might look at longitudinal data to capture explicitly, either in face-to-face interviews or focus groups, exit interview data and other sources of meaning from actual Fellows who have left teaching.

A stated limitation of this study was its focus on factors within the microsystem and mesosystem. Further research is needed to uncover more details about events in the other two layers of Brownell and Smith’s adaptive model, the exosystem and macrosystem. Both play a role in keeping teachers teaching. Economic issues such as funding for class sizes, technology, and professional development would be within a teacher’s exo- and macrosystem levels and would certainly be expected to have mediating effects on individual levels of satisfaction and, perhaps, intentions to stay in teaching. Political issues such as redistricting, equity of resources, and other sociopolitical forces would also perhaps be present within the exosystem and thus influence a teacher’s intention to stay or leave. The multiplicity of each of these layers and their interrelatedness, one to the other, only complicates these issues, particularly if one looks beyond local school-based issues and reflects on what factors from
the district, state, or even national arenas may have on perceptions of working conditions, satisfaction, and retention. While a focused examination of just two layers from Brownell and Smith’s model produced viable results about the relationships of working conditions and job satisfaction to retention, the exclusion of the other layers may have contributed to the results referred to as counter-intuitive; as such, those layers are certainly worthy of further study.

The Relationship of Working Conditions, Job Satisfaction, and Retention in the Current Policy Context

This study does illuminate and confirm what a number of other studies have demonstrated: good working conditions have a positive effect on teachers as workers. However, North Carolina Teaching Fellows do not work in schools that are in a vacuum or are shielded from policy debates about funding, standards, and what many might say is an argumentative public tone.

Whether it is from the increased accountability standards from the North Carolina ABCs program, strident pleas to meet AYP, and/or demands that teachers engage America’s 21st century students in a way that is entertaining, exciting, educational, and enriching—all at the same time—schools are under intense pressures to perform. It is within that context that policymakers and practitioners alike must accept the challenge of creating a quality, substantive teaching force, based on what we want teachers to know and be able to do, while all the time remaining focused on supporting and meeting the daily challenges and needs of educators.

North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ perceptions of working conditions are pertinent and eye-opening in what they convey about working in North Carolina’s schools. While Fellows are regarded as among North Carolina’s “best and brightest,” these data indicate that
the school conditions in which Fellows find themselves employed are far from ideal. It is our responsibility to build the profession and sustain the work of teachers and the students whose lives they touch, while at the same time creating positive work environments for teachers.

Recommendations

Solving the teacher retention dilemma will not occur without a clear position that teaching is both an honorable profession and one that truly should be supported. To that end, several recommendations emerge from this study regarding how to leverage that belief statement within the current policy context. The first recommendation is to ensure that schools are safe places to learn and work. In order for schools to become engaged communities of students, parents, and teachers alike, all stakeholders need to see the school setting as a place to be shared, valued, and respected. Any of the issues raised within the facilities and resources construct, such as bullying and disrespect toward teachers, should be viewed as a top priority for school leaders. Strong enforcement of policies that commit school resources to explicit prohibitions on fighting and respect for individuals and property should be encouraged. A zero tolerance approach to bullying, the use of inappropriate language, and other disruptive acts should be viewed not only as a means for building community but also for creating safe, inviting, proactive, and engaging places of work for teachers and staff alike.

A natural extension of creating schools as safe spaces for learning and work is the recommendation to create what Dufour (1996) calls a professional learning community. Via shared communication structures, protocols, and resources, professional learning communities are vehicles for teachers to work together as colleagues, to problem-solve together as well as to enrich their daily worklife. Fostering such an environment will not
only serve as a cultural statement about the value and testament to shared understanding and meaning-making, but it will also perhaps leverage precious resources in a manner that creates greater efficiencies within the school as an organizational workplace.

Furthermore, efforts to create professional learning communities, and any other professional development decisions, should be made in light of the documented and data-driven needs of teachers and students—not just what is easy to deliver or access. In addition, given the literature on the character traits, driving forces, and restlessness of Generation Y Fellows, serious efforts should be made to target resources of professional development for them in a manner that is a good investment of human capital over a short, as well as distant, period of time.

Open and honest communication strategies are essential to all schools. Efforts to sustain or improve achievement, create a new lunch schedules, host an open house: these are all examples of tasks that schools and teachers must accomplish together. Without a solid means to communicate and develop a shared understanding within the community, such collaborative efforts will be difficult. The implementation of working conditions that include consistent methods of communication (such as daily emails or memos that provide pertinent organizational information) and a clear understanding of whom to go to in the event of a crisis will enhance schools’ abilities to connect teachers and staff together.

Along with the recommendation for open communication, it is also advised that schools and districts accept the responsibility for talking openly about the nature of working conditions. Thinking about the nature of schools and schooling does not always have to be about the way things have been done in the past. And affording a teacher, school, or district the opportunity to think about what kinds of working conditions are best for students as well
as teachers would both ratchet up schools’ efforts to problem-solve and plan together and engender greater levels of overall job satisfaction—thereby increasing the likelihood of teacher retention.

Lastly, as the state grapples with the burgeoning challenge of maintaining teaching quality as well as teacher retention, a specific policy recommendation is that Teaching Fellows need a stronger grounding in the complexities of their schools as organizational workplaces. In addition to enhanced opportunities for leadership development, Fellows should be fully aware of the ongoing dilemmas and mediating effects of issues such as poverty, scarce resources, social factors, and the political arenas in which today’s schools operate. Likewise, it is imperative that schools and districts move to create more positive working conditions and become truly inviting, positive, engaging, and desirable places for both teaching and learning.

Limitations

While this study provides insight into the interconnected relationships of the working condition construct variables, this study was limited in its ability to fully examine the whole array of issues present within a teacher’s workplace and how all of these factors mediate levels of job satisfaction. In addition to the myriad other factors within Brownell and Smith’s concept of the exosystem and macrosystem arenas (1993), there are a number of other, intervening variables to be studied. Specifically, as the nature of multiple choice questions limit the range of responses to a selected set of parameters, they cannot fully cover the range of options, perceptions, or realities of teachers’ experiences within their workplace. This limitation is only complicated by the nature of the scaled scores for satisfaction, which
again allow for setting parameters for the study but may not fully explicate the range of satisfaction, particularly around the area of neutral responses.

Another limitation of this study was that the working conditions construct variables were created as a result of the statistical factor analysis. This decision was not made to deny the existence of other factors influencing teachers’ perceptions of working conditions and job satisfaction but to merely set out which questions were the most relevant within the confines of this analysis.

This study was limited in its ability to qualitatively delve into a number of the dynamic issues at play within teachers’ worklife experiences. While this quantitative study illuminates the survey responses of Teaching Fellows, a focused set of interviews and protocols for uncovering the exact nature of Fellows’ perceptions of work environments and job satisfaction was not a part of this study design.

Other limitations include the fragility of being able to track Fellows who have already left teaching and to better uncover the motivations, perceptions, and sense of job satisfaction factors for those that were hard to reach. While the EVF was a useful tool to capture a good number of Fellows and to have access to their responses, the scope of that level of inquiry was further limited by the difficulties of trying to get to Fellows who had already abandoned the profession.

Recommendations for Future Research

There are numerous opportunities for future research, both within this data and within this entire arena of authentic work environments of teachers. In addition to exploring the other aspects of Brownell and Smith’s model of the exosystem and the macrosystem (1993), more study is needed to better understand how macrosystem issues might be separated from
the exosystem. For example, at what point does a school district’s policy to offer English teachers an additional hour of planning “tip” the scale of satisfaction to where higher rates of retention might occur? Contrarily, at what point do issues related to state and federal testing create work environments where, despite all of the positive community-building, resources, and leadership behavior, there’s not a lot of incentive for a teacher to continue fighting what he or she views as a monolithic testing giant?

Examining any of a number of other issues related to time and its impact on working conditions perceptions is recommended as well. While many states, including North Carolina, have mandated that teachers be provided with a “duty-free lunch period” each day, there are a number of anecdotal reports that suggest that such policies are not being implemented, or, if they are, they consist instead of a 20-minute break. This study revealed that, despite efforts to prohibit new teachers from being required to participate in extracurricular activities such as clubs or sports, some Fellows felt it was expected that they either coach a sport or sponsor a club activity. While such activities are worthwhile and constitute a meaningful contribution to the worklife of a school’s community, they can be an immense obstacle to success, particularly to new and beginning teachers who are already stretched for time.

Clearly, this data set provides intriguing possibilities for further research, and the insights gleaned from that work might provide additional insights for both policymakers and practitioners alike as they pursue their common goals of improving teacher retention. The survey asked Fellows what they would do if they were given the option of going back to college and whether they would choose to become a teacher again. Such responses might shed further light into the macrosystem and where individual motivations and intentions
come to bear within the decision to stay or leave teaching. Other data recommended for
further inquiry include responses about additional coursework or degree programs that
Fellows may be pursuing, the extent to which Fellows are involved in after-school activities,
and Fellow’s opinions about which working condition construct has the great level of impact
on their students’ potential for success. Finally, building on the original instrument used to
design this study, further comparisons to other measurements of working conditions
perceptions and job satisfaction would be beneficial, both to the statewide administration of
the North Carolina Working Conditions Initiative as well as to further Schools and Staffing
and Teacher Follow-Up Surveys.
APPENDIX A

North Carolina Teaching Fellows Survey
Working conditions, Job satisfaction and Teacher retention

Thank you for submitting the correct password to participate in this survey. Now please enter your access code. The access code is located on the invitation letter you received. (The randomly assigned access code will not be used for personal tracking.)

Which aspect of teacher working conditions is most important to you in promoting student learning?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

Which of the following descriptions best describes your current position?
Teacher (including intervention specialist, vocational, literacy specialist, special education teacher, etc.)
Assistant Principal
Principal
School Counselor
Library Media Specialist
Central Office Role
I am employed with a local education fund or other non-profit agency that supports the work of public schools
I am employed with a state, regional or national agency that supports the work of public schools
Other

TEACHERS - LAST YEAR
Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past school year (2006-2007)?
I was teaching in the school where I am currently employed.
I was teaching in another public school IN THIS SCHOOL SYSTEM.
I was teaching in another public school IN A DIFFERENT SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NC.
I was a student at a college or university.
I was teaching at a college or university.
I was working in a position in the field of education IN THIS SCHOOL, but not as a teacher.
I was working in a position in the field of education SOMEWHERE DIFFERENT FROM
THIS SCHOOL, but also not as a teacher.
I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.
I was caring for family members.
I was employed in military service.
Other

Please indicate your other main activity for last year:

SCHOOL BASED LAST YEAR
Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past
school year (2006-2007)?
I was teaching in the school where I am currently employed.
I was teaching in another public school IN THIS SCHOOL SYSTEM.
I was teaching in another public school IN A DIFFERENT SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NC.
I was a student at a college or university.
I was teaching at a college or university.
I was working in a position in the field of education IN THIS SCHOOL, but not as a teacher.
I was working in a position in the field of education SOMEWHERE DIFFERENT FROM
THIS SCHOOL, but also not as a teacher.
I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.
I was caring for family members.
I was employed in military service.
Other

Please indicate your other main activity for last year:

NON SCHOOL BASED - LAST YEAR
Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past
school year (2006-2007)?
I was teaching in a public school IN THIS SCHOOL SYSTEM.
I was teaching in another public school IN A DIFFERENT SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NC.
I was teaching in a private school setting in North Carolina.
I was teaching in a public or private school setting OUTSIDE of North Carolina.
I was working in a position in the field of education, but NOT as a teacher.
I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.
I was a student at a college or university.
I was teaching at a college or university.
I was caring for family members.
I was employed in military service.
Other

Please indicate your other main activity for last year:

OTHER - LAST YEAR
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Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past school year (2006-2007)?
I was teaching in a public school setting in North Carolina.
I was teaching in private school setting in North Carolina.
I was teaching in another public or private school setting OUTSIDE of North Carolina.
I was a student at a college or university.
I was teaching at a college or university.
I was working in a position in the field of education but not as a teacher.
I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.
I was caring for family members.
I was employed in military service.
Other

Please indicate your other main activity for last year:

LONGEVITY TEACHERS
How many years (including this one) have you been employed as an educator?
First year
Second year
Third year
Fourth year
Fifth year
Sixth year
Seventh year or more

How many years have you been employed in the school in which you are currently working?
First year
Second year
Third year
Fourth year
Fifth year
Sixth year
Seventh year or more

How many students do you currently teach at this school? Of all the students you teach at your current school, what percentage have an Individual Education Plan (IEP) because they have disabilities or are special education students? Of all the students you teach at your current school, what percentage are of limited-English proficiency (LEP)? (Students of limited-English proficiency (LEP) are those whose native or dominant language is other than English, and who have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language.)

RETENTION FROM CURRENT TEACHERS AT SAME SCHOOL
In general, which aspect of your current school's work environment most affects teachers' willingness to continue working at your school?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

**Which aspect of your current work environment most affects your willingness to continue working at your school?**
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

**Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?**
Continue teaching at my current school
Continue teaching at my current school until a better opportunity comes along.
Continue teaching but leave this school as soon as I can.
Continue teaching but leave this district as soon as I can.
Leave the profession all together.

**If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?**
Certainly would become a teacher
Probably would become a teacher
Chances about even for and against
Probably would not become a teacher
Certainly would not become a teacher

**Which of the following statements best describes how long you plan to remain in teaching?**
As long as I am able
Until I am eligible for retirement
Will probably continue unless something better comes along
Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can
Undecided at this time

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?**
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.
State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.
The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it.
The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe us as a satisfied group.
If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave teaching as soon as possible.
I like the way things are run at this school.  
I think about transferring to another school.  
Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn.  
I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.  
I am satisfied with my teaching salary.  
I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired to go.  
Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.  
I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.  
I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.  
I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.  
I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with that of other teachers.  
I am satisfied with my class size.  
I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.

**In the last 12 months, have you applied for a job in an attempt to leave the teaching profession?**  
Yes No

**Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?**  
Yes No

**Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?**  
Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate)  
Vocational certificate program  
Bachelor’s degree granting program  
Master’s degree granting program  
Education specialist or professional diploma program (at least one year beyond Master’s level)  
Doctorate or professional degree granting program (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)  
Some other certificate or degree of advanced graduate studies program

**Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?**  
To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position  
To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education NOT as a K-12 teacher  
To obtain or for use in a position OUTSIDE the field of education  
For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)

**TIME**  
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.  
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Teachers (as in most teachers at your school) have reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students.
Teachers have time available to collaborate with their colleagues. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.
School leadership tries to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers.
The non-instructional time (any structured time during the work day to work individually or collaboratively on instructional issues) provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.

**How many total hours do you spend on ALL teaching and other school-related activities during a typical full week at this school? (Include hours spent working during the school day, before school, after school, and on weekends.)**

**In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally have available for non-instructional time?**
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

**In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do you have available for non-instructional time?**
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

**Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for individual planning?**
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

**Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for structured, collaborative planning?**
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours
In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do you generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

During this school year, do you or will you:
Yes No
Coach a sport
Sponsor any student groups, clubs, or organizations
Serve as a department lead or chair
Serve as a lead curriculum specialist
Serve on a school-wide or district-wide committee or task force

During the current school year, do you, or will you, earn additional compensation from working in any job outside this school system?
Yes No

Which of these best describes this job outside this school system?
Teaching or tutoring
Non-teaching, but related to teaching field
Other

LEADERSHIP
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in your school.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school.
The faculty are committed to helping every student learn.
The school leadership communicates clear expectations to students and parents.
The school leadership shields teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.
The school leadership consistently enforces rules for student conduct.
The school leadership support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.
Opportunities are available for members of the community to actively contribute to this school's success.
The school leadership consistently supports teachers.
The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.
The faculty and staff have a shared vision.
Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.
Teacher performance evaluations are handled in an appropriate manner.
The procedures for teacher performance evaluations are consistent.
Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.

The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about:
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Facilities and resources
The use of time in my school
Professional development
Empowering teachers
Leadership issues
New teacher support

Overall, the school leadership in my school is effective.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Which position best describes the person who most often provides instructional leadership at your school?
Principal or school head
Assistant or vice principal
Department chair or grade level chair
School-based curriculum specialist
Director of curriculum and instruction or other central office based personnel
Other teachers
None of the above

EMPOWERMENT

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher empowerment in your school.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Teachers are centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.
Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.
The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions and solving problems.
In this school we take steps to solve problems.
Opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession (other than administration) are available to me.

Please indicate how large a role teachers at your school have in each of the following areas:
Primary role Large role Moderate role Small role No role at all

Selecting instructional materials and resources
Devising teaching techniques
Setting grading and student assessment practices
Determining the content of in-service professional development programs
Hiring new teachers
Evaluating teachers
Establishing and implementing policies about student discipline
Deciding how the school budget will be spent
School improvement planning

FACILITIES AND RESOURCES
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about facilities and resources in your school.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate resources and instructional materials (e.g. items such as textbooks, curriculum materials, content references, etc.).
Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software, and internet access.
Teachers have sufficient access to communications technology, including phones, faxes, email, and network drives.
Teachers have sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.
The reliability and speed of Internet connections in this school are sufficient to support instructional practices.
Teachers have adequate professional space to work productively.
Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is clean and well maintained.
Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is safe.

To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur with students at your school?
Never happens Happens on occasion Happens at least once a month Happens at least once a week Happens daily

Physical conflicts among students
Robbery or theft
Vandalism
Use of alcohol
Use of illegal drugs
Possession of weapons
Physical abuse of teachers
Student racial tensions
Student bullying
Student verbal abuse of teachers
Widespread disorder in classrooms
Student acts of disrespect for teachers
Gang activities

To what extent is each of the following a problem in your school?
Not a problem Minor problem Moderate problem Serious problem

Student tardiness
Student absenteeism
Student class cutting
Teacher absenteeism
Student pregnancy
Students dropping out
Student apathy
Lack of parental involvement
Poverty
Students come to school unprepared to learn
Poor student health

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - STANDARD BLOCK

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your own professional development and professional development in your school.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Sufficient funds and resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development activities.
Teachers are provided opportunities to learn from one another.
Adequate time is provided for professional development.
Teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.
Professional development provides teachers with the knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively.

In which of the following areas, if any, do you believe teachers (in general) at your school need the most professional development to effectively teach students?
Content of the subject(s) you teach
Reading instruction
In which of the following areas, if any, do you feel that you need additional professional development to effectively teach your students?

Content of the subject(s) you teach
Reading instruction
Student discipline and classroom management
Teaching special education students
Teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students

In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities specific to and concentrating on the content of the subject(s) you teach?
Yes No

In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

Did the professional development you received in the content of the subject(s) you teach provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?
Yes No

Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on reading instruction?
Yes No

In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

Did the professional development you received in reading instruction provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?
Yes No
Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on student discipline and classroom management?
Yes No

In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

Did the professional development you received in student discipline and classroom management provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?
Yes No

Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on teaching special education students?
Yes No

In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

Did the professional development you received in teaching special education students provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?
Yes No

Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
Very useful
Useful
In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on teaching limited-English proficient (LEP) students?
Yes No

In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

Did the professional development you received in teaching limited-English proficient (LEP) students provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?
Yes No

Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

In the past 12 months, did you do any of the following?
(Exclude any administrative meetings. Check all that apply.)

Engage in individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally
Participate in university course(s) related to teaching
Participate in online learning opportunities
Make observational visits to other schools
Present at a workshop, conference or training session
Attend any other workshop, conference or training session in which you were NOT a presenter
Participate in regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction
Observe, or be observed by, other teachers in your classroom (for at least 10 minutes)
Act as a coach or mentor to other teachers or staff in your school, or receive coaching or mentoring
None of the above

RETENTION FROM CURRENT TS TEACHING AT DIFFERENT SCHOOL

Indicate which aspect, if any, of your last school's work environment most affected your decision to no longer work at that school.
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development
Other

What factors, other than work environment, affected your decision to no longer work at the school you were working at last year?

Which aspect of your current school's work environment most affects teachers' willingness to continue working at your school?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

Which aspect of your work environment most affects your willingness to keep working at your current school?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?
Continue teaching at my current school
Continue teaching at my current school until a better opportunity comes along.
Continue teaching but leave this school as soon as I can.
Continue teaching but leave this district as soon as I can.
Leave the profession all together.

If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?
Certainly would become a teacher
Probably would become a teacher
Chances about even for and against
Probably would not become a teacher
Certainly would not become a teacher

Which of the following statements best describes how long you plan to remain in teaching?
As long as I am able
Until I am eligible for retirement
Will probably continue unless something better comes along
Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can
Undecided at this time
To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.
State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.
The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it.
The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe us as a satisfied group.
If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave teaching as soon as possible.
I like the way things are run at this school.
I think about transferring to another school.
Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn.
I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.
I am satisfied with my teaching salary.
I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired to go.
Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.
I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.
I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.
I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.
I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with that of other teachers.
I am satisfied with my class size.
I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.

In the last 12 months, have you applied for a job in an attempt to leave the position of a pre-K–12 teacher?

Yes No

Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?

Yes No

Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?

Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate)
Vocational certificate program
Bachelor’s degree granting program
Master’s degree granting program
Education specialist or professional diploma program (at least one year beyond Master’s level)
Doctorate or professional degree granting program (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)
Some other certificate or degree of advanced graduate studies program

Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?

To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position
To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K-12 teacher
To obtain or for use in a position outside of the field of education
For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)

LONVEGIVITY EDUCATORS STILL IN A SCHOOL

How many years (including this one) have you been employed as an educator?
First year
Second year
Third year
Fourth year
Fifth year
Sixth year
Seventh year or more

How many years have you been employed in the school in which you are currently working?
First year
Second year
Third year
Fourth year
Fifth year
Sixth year
Seventh year or more

RETENTION FROM OTHER EDUCATORS YET STILL BASED IN A SCHOOL

In general, which aspect of your current school's work environment most affects teachers' willingness to continue working at your school?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

Which aspect of your current work environment most affects your willingness to keep working in your current school?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?
Return to teaching
Continue my current role
Move to a new role within education
Move to a new role outside of education

If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?
Certainly would become a teacher
Probably would become a teacher
Chances about even for and against
Probably would not become a teacher
Certainly would not become a teacher

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.
State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with current job.
The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it.
The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe teachers here as a satisfied group.
If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave education as soon as possible.
I like the way things are run at this school.
I think about transferring to another school.
Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn.
I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.
I am satisfied with my salary.
I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired to go.
Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.
I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.
I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.
I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as an educator.
I make a conscious effort to coordinate my work with that of other teachers.
I am satisfied with class sizes at this school.
I am generally satisfied with being a educator at this school.

Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?
Yes No

Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?
Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate)
Vocational certificate program
Bachelor’s degree granting program
Master’s degree granting program
Education specialist or professional diploma program (at least one year beyond Master’s level)
Doctorate or professional degree granting program (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)
Some other certificate or degree of advanced graduate studies program

**Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?**
To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position
To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K–12 teacher
To obtain or for use in a position OUTSIDE the field of education
For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)

**TIME - OTHER EDUCATORS STILL BASED IN SCHOOL**

**TIME**
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Teachers (as in most teachers at your school) have reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students.
Teachers have time available to collaborate with their colleagues.
Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.
School leadership tries to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers.
The non-instructional time (any structured time during the work day to work individually or collaboratively on instructional issues) provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.

**How many total hours do teachers at your school spend on ALL teaching and other school-related activities during a typical full week at this school?** (Include hours spent working during the school day, before school, after school, and on weekends.)

**In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally have available for non-instructional time?**
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

**Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for individual planning?**
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for structured, collaborative planning?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

In an average week at your school, how many hours do you generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

During this school year, do you or will you:
Yes No
Coach a sport
Sponsor any student groups, clubs, or organizations
Serve as a department lead or chair
Serve as a lead curriculum specialist
Serve on a school-wide or district-wide committee or task force

During the current school year, do you, or will you, earn additional compensation from working in any job outside this school system?
Yes No

Which of these best describes this job outside this school system?
Teaching or tutoring
Non-teaching, but related to teaching field
Other
LONGEVITY CENTRAL OFFICE

How many years (including this one) have you been employed as an educator?
First year
Second year
Third year
Fourth year
Fifth year
Sixth year
Seventh year or more

How many years have you been employed in your current role?
First year
Second year
Third year
Fourth year
Fifth year
Sixth year
Seventh year or more

RETENTION FROM NON TEACHERS YET NO LONGER IN A SCHOOL - USED TO TEACH SOMEWHERE

In general, which aspect of a school's work environment do you think most affects teachers' willingness to keep working there?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

Indicate which aspect, if any, of your last school's work environment most affected your decision to no longer work at that school.
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development
Other

What factors, other than work environment, affected your decision to no longer work at the school you worked at previously?

Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?
Return to teaching at my last school
Return to teaching but at a different school
Continue my current role
If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?
Certainly would become a teacher
Probably would become a teacher
Chances about even for and against
Probably would not become a teacher
Certainly would not become a teacher

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

In the last school where I worked, staff members were recognized for a job well done.
State or district content standards had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.
The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at my last school weren't really worth it.
The teachers at my last school liked being there; I would describe them as a satisfied group.
I left education because I got a higher paying job.
I liked the way things were run at my last school.
I thought about transferring to another school from my last school before I finally left.
Overall, my last school was a good place to teach and learn.
I didn't seem to have as much enthusiasm at my last school as I did when I began teaching.
I was satisfied with my salary at my last school.
I thought about staying home from school because I was just too tired to go.
Most of my colleagues at my last school shared my beliefs and values about what defined the central mission of the school.
I worried about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.
I received a great deal of support from parents for the work I did at my last school.
I sometimes felt it was a waste of time to try to do my best as an educator at my last school.
I made a conscious effort to coordinate my work with that of other teachers at my last school.
I was satisfied with class sizes at my last school.
I was generally satisfied with being an educator at my last school.

Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?
Yes No

Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?
Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate)
Vocational certificate program
Bachelor’s degree granting program
Master’s degree granting program
Education specialist or professional diploma program (at least one year beyond Master’s level)
Doctorate or professional degree granting program (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)
Some other certificate or degree of advanced graduate studies program

**Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?**
To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position
To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K–12 teacher
To obtain or for use in a position OUTSIDE the field of education
For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)

**TIME - EDUCATORS NO LONGER IN SCHOOL TIME**
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in the last school in which you worked.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Teachers (as in most teachers at the last school in which you worked) had reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students.
Teachers had time available to collaborate with their colleagues.
Teachers were protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.
School leadership tried to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers.
The non-instructional time (any structured time during the work day to work individually or collaboratively on instructional issues) provided for teachers in my school was sufficient.

At the last school in which you worked, how many total hours did teachers at your school spend on ALL teaching and other school-related activities during a typical full week at this school? (Include hours spent working during the school day, before school, after school, and on weekends.)

In an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many hours did most teachers generally have available for non-instructional time?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many were available for individual planning?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours
Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many were available for structured, collaborative planning?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

In an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many hours did most teachers generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

In an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many hours did you spend on school related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?
None
Less than 3 hours
More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
More than 10 hours

During the last year in which you worked in a school, did you do any of the following:
Yes  No

Coach a sport
Sponsor any student groups, clubs, or organizations
Serve as a department lead or chair
Serve as a lead curriculum specialist
Serve on a school-wide or district-wide committee or task force

During the last year in which you worked in a school, did you earn additional compensation from working in any job outside the school system?
Yes  No

Which of these best describes the job you performed outside the school system?
Teaching or tutoring
Non-teaching, but related to teaching field
Other

LEADERSHIP - EDUCATORS NO LONGER IN SCHOOL
LEADERSHIP
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in the last school that you worked.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

There was an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school.
The faculty were committed to helping every student learn.
The school leadership communicated clear expectations to students and parents.
The school leadership shielded teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.
The school leadership consistently enforced rules for student conduct.
The school leadership supported teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.
Opportunities were available for members of the community to actively contribute to this school's success.
The school leadership consistently supported teachers.
The school improvement team provided effective leadership at this school.
The faculty and staff had a shared vision.
 Teachers were held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.
 Teacher performance evaluations were handled in an appropriate manner.
The procedures for teacher performance evaluations were consistent.
 Teachers received feedback that can help them improve teaching.

The leadership at the last school that I worked made a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about:
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

facilities and resources
the use of time in my school
professional development
empowering teachers
leadership issues
new teacher support

Overall, the leadership of the last school that I worked in was effective.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

At the last school you worked in, which position best describes the person who most often provides instructional leadership?
principal or school head
assistant or vice principal
department chair or grade level chair
school-based curriculum specialist
director of curriculum and instruction or other central office based personnel
other teachers
none of the above
EMPOWERMENT - EDUCATORS NO LONGER IN A SCHOOL

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher empowerment in the last school that you worked.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Teachers were centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.
Teachers were trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.
The faculty had an effective process for making group decisions and solving problems.
In the last school I worked, we took steps to solve problems.
Opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession (other than administration) were available to me.

At the last school in which you worked, please indicate how large a role teachers had in each of the following areas:
Primary role Large role Moderate role Small role No role at all

Selecting instructional materials and resources
Devising teaching techniques
Setting grading and student assessment practices
Determining the content of in-service professional development programs
Hiring new teachers
Evaluating teachers
Establishing and implementing policies about student discipline
Deciding how the school budget will be spent
School improvement planning

FACILITIES AND RESOURCES - EDUCATORS NO LONGER AT A SCHOOL

FACILITIES AND RESOURCES
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about facilities and resources at the last school in which you worked.
Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Teachers had sufficient access to appropriate resources and instructional materials (e.g. items such as textbooks, curriculum materials, content references, etc.).
Teachers had sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software, and internet access.
Teachers had sufficient access to communications technology, including phones, faxes, email, and network drives.
Teachers had sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.
The reliability and speed of Internet connections in my last school were sufficient to support instructional practices.
Teachers had adequate professional space to work productively.
Teachers and staff work in a school environment that was clean and well maintained.
Teachers and staff work in a school environment that was safe.
To the best of your knowledge, how often did the following types of problems occur with students at the last school in which you worked?

Never happens  Happens on occasion  Happens at least once a month  Happens at least once a week  Happens daily

Physical conflicts among students
Robbery or theft
Vandalism
Use of alcohol
Use of illegal drugs
Possession of weapons
Physical abuse of teachers
Student racial tensions
Student bullying
Student verbal abuse of teachers
Widespread disorder in classrooms
Student acts of disrespect for teachers
Gang activities

To what extent was each of the following a problem in the last school in which you worked?

Not a problem  Minor problem  Moderate problem  Serious problem

Student tardiness
Student absenteeism
Student class cutting
Teacher absenteeism
Student pregnancy
Students dropping out
Student apathy
Lack of parental involvement
Poverty
Students come to school unprepared to learn
Poor student health

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - EDUCATORS NO LONGER AT A SCHOOL

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your own professional development and professional development in the last school in which you worked.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

Sufficient funds and resources were available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development activities.
Teachers were provided opportunities to learn from one another. Adequate time was provided for professional development. Teachers had sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology. Professional development provided teachers with the knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively.

**In which of the following areas, if any, do you believe teachers (at the last school in which you worked) need the most professional development to effectively teach students?**
- Content of the subject(s) you teach
- Reading instruction
- Student discipline and classroom management
- Teaching special education students
- Teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students

**In which of the following areas, if any, do you feel that you need additional professional development to effectively teach your students?**
- Content of the subject(s) you teach
- Reading instruction
- Student discipline and classroom management
- Teaching special education students
- Teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students

**In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities specific to and concentrating on the content of the subject(s) you teach?**
- Yes
- No

**In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?**
- 8 hours or less
- 9-16 hours
- 17-32 hours
- 33 hours or more

**Did the professional development you received in the content of the subject(s) you teach provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?**
- Yes
- No

**Overall, how useful were these activities to you?**
- Very useful
- Useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not useful

**In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on reading instruction?**
In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

Did the professional development you received in reading instruction provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?
Yes No

Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on student discipline and classroom management?
Yes No

In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

Did the professional development you received in student discipline and classroom management provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?
Yes No

Overall, how useful were these activities to you?
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on teaching special education students?
Yes No

In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

**Did the professional development you received in teaching special education students provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?**
Yes No

**Overall, how useful were these activities to you?**
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

**In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on teaching limited-English proficient (LEP) students?**
Yes No

**In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?**
8 hours or less
9-16 hours
17-32 hours
33 hours or more

**Did the professional development you received in teaching limited-English proficient (LEP) students provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?**
Yes No

**Overall, how useful were these activities to you?**
Very useful
Useful
Somewhat useful
Not useful

**In the past 12 months, did you do any of the following?**
*(Exclude any administrative meetings. Check all that apply.)*
Engage in individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally
Participate in university course(s) related to teaching
Participate in online learning opportunities
Make observational visits to other schools
Present at a workshop, conference or training session
Attend any other workshop, conference or training session in which you were NOT a presenter
Participate in regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction
Observe, or be observed by, other teachers in your classroom (for at least 10 minutes)
Act as a coach or mentor to other teachers or staff in your school, or receive coaching or mentoring
None of the above

LONGEVITY OTHERS WHO USE TO TEACH
How many years (including last year) were you employed at the school in which you taught last year?
Less than a full year
1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 or more years

How many years in total were you employed as an educator?
Less than a full year
1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 or more years

HAVE YOU EVER?
Within a K-12 setting, have you ever worked in any of the following positions?
Teacher (including intervention specialist, vocational, literacy specialist, special education teacher, etc.)
Assistant Principal
Principal
School Counselor
Library Media Specialist
Central Office Role
A role with a local education fund or other non-profit agency that supports the work of public schools
A role with a state, regional or national agency that supports the work of public schools
I have worked within a K-12, public education setting, but in some other role not listed here.
No, I have never working in a K-12, public education setting.

What other role have you worked in, within a K-12, public education setting?

LONGEVITY - OTHERS (2) WHO USED TO TEACH
How many years were you ever employed as a classroom teacher?
Less than a full year
1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 or more years

RET from NON EDUCATORS - NEVER TAUGHT ANYWHERE
In general, which aspect of a school's work environment do you think most affects teachers' willingness to keep working there?
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development

Indicate which aspect, if any, of a school's work environment most affected your decision to not teach.
Time during the work day
School facilities and resources
School leadership
Teacher empowerment
Professional Development
Other

What factors, other than a school's work environment, affected your decision to not teach?

Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?
Continue my current role
Enter the teaching profession in a K-12 public setting
Enter the teaching profession in a K-12 private setting
Enter the teaching profession in a setting other than K-12
Enter the education profession in some role other than teaching
Move to some other new role

If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you reconsider becoming a teacher?
Certainly would become a teacher
Probably would become a teacher
Chances about even for and against
Probably would not become a teacher
Certainly would not become a teacher

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?
I believe it is important for teachers to be recognized for a job well done. State or district content standards had an influence on my decision to enter into teaching. The stress and disappointments involved in teaching caused me to think that teaching was not really worth the effort.

THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

I did not go into teaching because I got a higher paying job.

THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

I think it's important for colleagues at the same school to share the same beliefs and values about what defines the central mission of a school.

Worries over the security of teaching because of the performance of students on state and/or local tests influenced my decision to not teach.

THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

I think it's important to teachers to make a conscious effort to coordinate their work with other teachers.

Class size influenced my decision to not teach.

THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?
Yes No

Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?
- Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate)
- Vocational certificate program
- Bachelor’s degree granting program
- Master’s degree granting program
- Education specialist or professional diploma program (at least one year beyond Master’s level)
- Doctorate or professional degree granting program (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)
- Some other certificate or degree of advanced graduate studies program

Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?
- To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position
- To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K–12 teacher
- To obtain or for use in a position OUTSIDE the field of education
- For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)

YOU ARE ALMOST FINISHED TAKING THIS SURVEY!
JUST A FEW MORE QUESTIONS, SUCH AS...

Please indicate your ethnicity:
American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian or Pacific Islander
Black or African American
Hispanic
White
Mixed or multiple ethnicity
Some other race or ethnicity

Please indicate your gender:
Male Female

What is the name of the college or university where you earned your bachelor’s degree?
Appalachian State University
Campbell University
East Carolina University
Elizabeth City State University
Elon University
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Meredith College
NC A&T State University
NC Central University
NC State University
Queens University
UNC Asheville
UNC Chapel Hill
UNC Charlotte
UNC Greensboro
UNC Pembroke
UNC Pembroke
UNC Wilmington
Western Carolina University

What was your major field of study during your undergraduate program?
Early childhood/Pre-K, general
Elementary grades, general
Middle grades, general
Secondary grades, general
Special Education, any
Arts & Music
English and Language Arts
English as a Second Language
Foreign Languages
Health Education
Mathematics
Natural Sciences
Social Sciences
Vocational/Technical Education
Computer Science
Library/Information Science
Other

**Do you have a master's degree?**
Yes No

**What was your major field of study for the master's degree?**
Educational Leadership
Curriculum or Reading Specialist
Early childhood/Pre-K, general
Elementary grades, general
Middle grades, general
Secondary grades, general
Special Education, any
Arts & Music
English and Language Arts
English as a Second Language
Foreign Languages
Health Education
Mathematics
Natural Sciences
Social Sciences
Vocational/Technical Education
Computer Science
Library/Information Science
Other

**Have you earned any of the degrees listed below?**
Vocational certificate
Associate's degree
SECOND Bachelor's degree
SECOND Master's degree
Educational specialist or professional diploma (at least one year beyond a master's level)
Doctorate or first professional degree (Ph. D, Ed.D, M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)
Some other certificate or degree of Advanced Graduate Studies
None of the above

**Have you taken an exam for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification?**
Taken and passed
Taken and have not yet passed
Not taken

**Have you ever received any of the following awards?**
Teacher of the Year (School, LEA, Regional or State level)
Sallie B. Mae
Milken Award
Wachovia
Disney
Other
None of the above

**What other awards have you received in recognition of your work within education?**

**THIS LAST QUESTION IS ENTIRELY OPTIONAL.**
If you would like to receive a copy of the results of this study, please include your email in the field below.
(Email addresses will not be viewed until after the analysis is complete. You will NOT be contacted for any reason other than to provide you a copy of the results.)
Dear Name:

I am writing to invite you to participate in an important study about the relationships of teacher working conditions, job satisfaction and teacher retention. The survey is being sent to NC Teaching Fellows who have graduated within the past six years. Your perceptions about teacher working conditions will inform public policy and support a more informed understanding of the world of work for North Carolina teachers.

While the Teaching Fellows Program and The Public School Forum are interested and support the goals of this study, neither organization is funding or sponsoring what is an independent study, being conducted by John D. Denning, a doctoral candidate from the UNC-CH School of Education. If you have any questions about this study, he may be reached via telephone at (919) 402.8089 or email at: denning@email.unc.edu.

Each survey participant has a unique access code and password, which ensures participants only take the survey once and matches school codes to past whole-school results from the NC Working Conditions Survey. The access codes will be kept during data collection for these purposes only and will be stripped from the final dataset before any reporting occurs. Districts, schools and individuals will not be identified within any analysis. To participate in the survey, go to www.tfsurvey.net and use the following password: teaching access code: A1234

It will take about 15-20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Your participation is voluntary; however, if you choose to participate, you may elect enter into a drawing for one of two $50 American Express gift cards. Winners will be randomly selected from all survey participant access codes and notified via first class mail. Again, the access code used to reach winners will not be used for reporting or identification purposes.

This study has been reviewed and approved by UNC’s Institutional Review Board on Research Involving Human Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact - anonymously, if you wish - the Institutional Review Board, UNC at Chapel Hill, CB # 7097, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7097, or by phone 919-966-3113.

Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to complete this important study about teacher working conditions, job satisfaction and retention in North Carolina.

John D. Denning, Doctoral Candidate | Jo Ann Norris, Associate Executive Director | Gladys Graves, Director
UNC at Chapel Hill       Public School Forum and Administrator       NC Teaching Fellows
APPENDIX C
Postcard for Follow-Up
for
North Carolina Teaching Fellows’ Perceptions of Working Conditions and Concomitant Effects on Job Satisfaction and Retention Study

If you've already taken the Teaching Fellows Survey about Working Conditions, Job Satisfaction and Retention - Thank You!

If you haven't, thanks for considering to do so. Participants will be entered into two drawings for $50 American Express gift cards.

~ REMINDER ~
If you haven't already completed the on-line survey about the relationships of teacher working conditions, job satisfaction & teacher retention in NC, please consider doing so.

Don't forget - if you choose to participate, you may win one of two $50 American Express gift cards!

If you have questions or concerns about this study, feel free to contact John D. Denning at the above address, by phone at (919) 402.8089 or email at: denning@email.unc.edu.

To participate in the survey, go to www.tfsurvey.net and enter the password and access code previously provided to you.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey!
APPENDIX D
North Carolina Teaching Fellows Survey
Working conditions, Job satisfaction and Teacher retention
ALL SURVEY ITEMS FOR CODEBOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>QUESTION TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judgments about WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role (Crt YR, LST YR, Past)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNED NUMBER</th>
<th>VARIABLE CODE</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1 V2 V3 V4 V5 V6 V7 V8 V9</td>
<td>V1 V2 V3 V4 V5 V6 V7 V8 V9</td>
<td>Qualtrics assigned code</td>
<td>Response set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for submitting the correct password to participate in this survey. Now please enter your access code. The access code is located on the invitation letter you received.

**OPENS-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V10</th>
<th>ACCESS CODE</th>
<th>Which aspect of teacher working conditions is most important to you in promoting student learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Time during the work day 2=School facilities and resources 3=School leadership 4=Teacher empowerment 5=Professional Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V11</th>
<th>MST IMPT WC</th>
<th>Which of the following descriptions best describes your current position?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Teacher (including intervention specialist, vocational, literacy specialist, special education teacher, etc.) 2=Assistant Principal 3=Principal 4=School Counselor 5=Library Media Specialist 6=Central Office Role 7=I am employed with a local education fund or other non-profit agency that supports the work of public schools 8=I am employed with a state, regional or national agency that supports the work of public schools 9=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>1:TCH LST YR</td>
<td>Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past school year (2006-2007)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=I was teaching in the school where I am currently employed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=I was teaching in another public school IN THIS SCHOOL SYSTEM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=I was teaching in another public school IN A DIFFERENT SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=I was a student at a college or university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=I was teaching at a college or university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6=I was working in a position in the field of education IN THIS SCHOOL, but not as a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7=I was working in a position in the field of education SOMEWHERE DIFFERENT FROM THIS SCHOOL, but also not as a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8=I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9=I was caring for family members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10=I was employed in military service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11=Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V14</th>
<th>1:OTHRLSTYR</th>
<th>Please indicate your other main activity for last year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V15</th>
<th>2:SCHBASLSTY</th>
<th>Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past school year (2006-2007)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=I was teaching in the school where I am currently employed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=I was teaching in another public school IN THIS SCHOOL SYSTEM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=I was teaching in another public school IN A DIFFERENT SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=I was a student at a college or university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=I was teaching at a college or university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6=I was working in a position in the field of education IN THIS SCHOOL, but not as a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7=I was working in a position in the field of education SOMEWHERE DIFFERENT FROM THIS SCHOOL, but also not as a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8=I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9=I was caring for family members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10=I was employed in military service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11=Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>SCHBSOTHLY</td>
<td>Please indicate your other main activity for last year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17</td>
<td>NONSCHBLY</td>
<td>Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past school year (2006-2007)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHOOL SYSTEM.
3=I was teaching in another public school IN A DIFFERENT SCHOOL SYSTEM IN NC.
4=I was a student at a college or university.
5=I was teaching at a college or university.
6=I was working in a position in the field of education IN THIS SCHOOL, but not as a teacher.
7=I was working in a position in the field of education SOMEWHERE DIFFERENT FROM THIS SCHOOL, but also not as a teacher.
8=I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.
9=I was caring for family members.
10=I was employed in military service.
11=Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V18</th>
<th>3:NOSCHBOTLY</th>
<th>Please indicate your other main activity for last year:</th>
<th>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=I was teaching in a public school setting in North Carolina.</td>
<td>1=I was teaching in a public or private school setting OUTSIDE of North Carolina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=I was teaching in private school setting in North Carolina.</td>
<td>2=I was teaching in private school setting in North Carolina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=I was teaching in another public or private school setting OUTSIDE of North Carolina.</td>
<td>3=I was teaching in another public or private school setting OUTSIDE of North Carolina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=I was a student at a college or university.</td>
<td>4=I was a student at a college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=I was teaching at a college or university.</td>
<td>5=I was teaching at a college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=I was working in a position in the field of education but not as a teacher.</td>
<td>6=I was working in a position in the field of education but not as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.</td>
<td>7=I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8=I was teaching at a college or university.</td>
<td>8=I was teaching at a college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9=I was caring for family members.</td>
<td>9=I was caring for family members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10=I was employed in military service.</td>
<td>10=I was employed in military service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11=Other</td>
<td>11=Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V19</th>
<th>4:OTH LY</th>
<th>Please select the statement below that best reflects your primary duties over the past school year (2006-2007)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=I was teaching in a public school setting in North Carolina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=I was teaching in private school setting in North Carolina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=I was teaching in another public or private school setting OUTSIDE of North Carolina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=I was a student at a college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=I was teaching at a college or university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=I was working in a position in the field of education but not as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=I was working in an occupation outside the field of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20</td>
<td>Please indicate your other main activity for last year:</td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td>How many years (including this one) have you been employed as an educator?</td>
<td>1=First year 2=Second year 3=Third year 4=Fourth year 5=Fifth year 6=Sixth year 7=Seventh year or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22</td>
<td>How many years have you been employed in the school in which you are currently working?</td>
<td>1=First year 2=Second year 3=Third year 4=Fourth year 5=Fifth year 6=Sixth year 7=Seventh year or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23</td>
<td>How many students do you currently teach at this school?</td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24</td>
<td>Of all the students you teach at your current school, what percentage have an Individual Education Plan (IEP) because they have disabilities or are special education students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V25</td>
<td>1:%LEP</td>
<td>Of all the students you teach at your current school, what percentage are identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP)? (Students of limited-English proficiency (LEP) are those whose native or dominant language is other than English, and who have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V26</td>
<td>1A:WCMSTCON</td>
<td>In general, which aspect of your current school's work environment most affects teachers' willingness to continue working at your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27</td>
<td>1A:WCMST2TCH</td>
<td>Which aspect of your current work environment most affects your willingness to continue working at your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V28</td>
<td>1A:FTR INT</td>
<td>Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
<td>1A:GOBCK COL</td>
<td>If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Certainly would become a teacher 2=Probably would become a teacher 3=Chances about even for and against 4=Probably would not become a teacher 5=Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30</td>
<td>1A:PLANS2RMN</td>
<td>Which of the following statements best describes how long you plan to remain in teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=As long as I am able 2=Until I am eligible for retirement 3=Will probably continue unless something better comes along 4=Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can 5=Undecided at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_1</td>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V32</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_2</td>
<td>State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V33</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_3 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V34</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_4</td>
<td>The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe us as a satisfied group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V35</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_5 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave teaching as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V36</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_6</td>
<td>I like the way things are run at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V37</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_7 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I think about transferring to another school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V38</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_8</td>
<td>Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V39</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_9 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V40</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_10</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my teaching salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V41</td>
<td>1A:GEN SATIS_11 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V42</td>
<td>Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V43</td>
<td>I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V44</td>
<td>I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V45</td>
<td>I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V46</td>
<td>I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with that of other teachers.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V47</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my class size.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V48</td>
<td>I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V49</td>
<td>1A: JOB APP</td>
<td>In the last 12 months, have you applied for a job in an attempt to leave the teaching profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V50</td>
<td>1A: ENROLLED</td>
<td>Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V51</td>
<td>1A: ENROLDESC</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V52</td>
<td>1A: GOAL ENRO</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V53     | 1:TIMGENSATI_1 | Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school. Teachers (as in most teachers at your school) have reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
|--------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| V54    | 1:TIMGENSATI_2 | Teachers have time available to collaborate with their colleagues.            | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| V55    | 1:TIMGENSATI_3 | Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| V56    | 1:TIMGENSATI_4 | School leadership tries to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| V57    | 1:TIMGENSATI_5 | The non-instructional time (any structured time during the work day to work individually or collaboratively on instructional issues) provided for teachers in my school is sufficient. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V58</td>
<td>How many total hours do you spend on ALL teaching and other school-related activities during a typical full week at this school? (Include hours spent working during the school day, before school, after school, and on weekends.)</td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V59    | In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally have available for non-instructional time | 1=None  
2=Less than 3 hours  
3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours  
4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours  
5=More than 10 hours                                                                 |
| V60    | In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do you have available for non-instructional time | 1=None  
2=Less than 3 hours  
3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours  
4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours  
5=More than 10 hours                                                                 |
| V61    | Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for individual planning? | 1=None  
2=Less than 3 hours  
3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours  
4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours  
5=More than 10 hours                                                                 |
| V62    | Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for structured, | 1=None  
2=Less than 3 hours  
3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours  
4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours  
5=More than 10 hours                                                                 |
### Questionnaire Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most</td>
<td>V63</td>
<td>In school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?</td>
<td>1=None, 2=Less than 3 hours, 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours, 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours, 5=More than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers at your school generally spend on school-related activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the weekend)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do you</td>
<td>V64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During this school year, do you or will you:</td>
<td>V65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach a sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor any student groups, clubs, or organizations</td>
<td>V66</td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a lead or department chair</td>
<td>V67</td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a lead curriculum specialist</td>
<td>V68</td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve on a school-wide or district-wide committee or task force</td>
<td>V69</td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V70</td>
<td>1:TIMJOBOUTS</td>
<td>During the current school year, do you, or will you, earn additional compensation from working in any job outside this school system?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71</td>
<td>1:TIMJOOUDES</td>
<td>Which of these best describes this job outside this school system?</td>
<td>1=Teaching or tutoring 2=Non-teaching, but related to teaching field 3=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V72</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_1</td>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in your school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V73</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_2</td>
<td>The faculty are committed to helping every student learn.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V74</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_3</td>
<td>The school leadership communicates clear expectations to students and parents.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V75</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_4</td>
<td>The school leadership shields teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V76</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_5</td>
<td>The school leadership consistently enforces rules for student conduct.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V77</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_6</td>
<td>The school leadership support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V78</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_7</td>
<td>Opportunities are available for members of the community to actively contribute to this school's success.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V79</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_8</td>
<td>The school leadership consistently supports teachers.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V80</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_9</td>
<td>The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V81</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_10</td>
<td>The faculty and staff have a shared vision.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V82</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_11</td>
<td>Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V83</strong></td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_12</td>
<td>Teacher performance evaluations are handled in an appropriate manner.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V84</strong></td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_13</td>
<td>The procedures for teacher performance evaluations are consistent.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V85</strong></td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_14</td>
<td>Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V86</strong></td>
<td>1/2:LDADCCRN_1</td>
<td>The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: Facilities and resources</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V87</strong></td>
<td>1/2:LDADCCRN_2</td>
<td>The use of time in my school</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V88</strong></td>
<td>1/2:LDADCCRN_3</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V89</strong></td>
<td>1/2:LDADCCRN_4</td>
<td>Empowering teachers</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V90</td>
<td>1/2:LDADCCRN_5</td>
<td>Leadership issues</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V91</td>
<td>1/2:LDADCCRN_6</td>
<td>New teacher support</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V92</td>
<td>1/2:LDUSEFUL</td>
<td>Overall, the school leadership in my school is effective.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V93</td>
<td>1/2:LDINSTLR</td>
<td>Which position best describes the person who most often provides instructional leadership at your school?</td>
<td>1=Principal or school head 2=Assistant or vice principal 3=Department chair or grade level chair 4=School-based curriculum specialist 5=Director of curriculum and instruction or other central office based personnel 6=Other teachers 7=None of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V94</td>
<td>1/2:EMPGENSA_1</td>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher empowerment in your</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teachers' Involvement and Decision-Making

- **V95**: Teachers are centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.
  - 1=Strongly Agree
  - 2=Agree
  - 3=Neutral
  - 4=Disagree
  - 5=Strongly Disagree

- **V96**: Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.
  - 1=Strongly Agree
  - 2=Agree
  - 3=Neutral
  - 4=Disagree
  - 5=Strongly Disagree

- **V97**: The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions and solving problems.
  - 1=Strongly Agree
  - 2=Agree
  - 3=Neutral
  - 4=Disagree
  - 5=Strongly Disagree

- **V98**: In this school we take steps to solve problems.
  - 1=Strongly Agree
  - 2=Agree
  - 3=Neutral
  - 4=Disagree
  - 5=Strongly Disagree

- **V99**: Opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession (other than administration) are available to me.
  - 1=Strongly Agree
  - 2=Agree
  - 3=Neutral
  - 4=Disagree
  - 5=Strongly Disagree

### Roles of Teachers

- **V99**: Please indicate how large a role teachers at your school have in each of the following areas:
  - Selecting instructional materials and resources
  - Devising teaching techniques
  - 1=Primary role
  - 2=Large role
  - 3=Moderate role
  - 4=Small role
  - 5=No role at all
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V101</th>
<th>1/2:EMPROLES_3</th>
<th>Setting grading and student assessment practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V102</td>
<td>1/2:EMPROLES_4</td>
<td>Determining the content of in-service professional development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V103</td>
<td>1/2:EMPROLES_5</td>
<td>Hiring new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V104</td>
<td>1/2:EMPROLES_6</td>
<td>Evaluating teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V105</td>
<td>1/2:EMPROLES_7</td>
<td>Establishing and implementing policies about student discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V106</td>
<td>1/2:EMPROLES_8</td>
<td>Deciding how the school budget will be spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V107</td>
<td>School improvement planning</td>
<td>1=Primary role 2=Large role 3=Moderate role 4=Small role 5=No role at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V108</td>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about facilities and resources in your school. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate resources and instructional materials (e.g., items such as textbooks, curriculum materials, content references, etc.).</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V109</td>
<td>Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software, and internet access.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V110</td>
<td>Teachers have sufficient access to communications technology, including phones, faxes, email, and network drives.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V111</td>
<td>Teachers have sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V112  | 1/2:FRGENSAT_5 | The reliability and speed of Internet connections in this school are sufficient to support instructional practices. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
|------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| V113 | 1/2:FRGENSAT_6 | Teachers have adequate professional space to work productively. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| V114 | 1/2:FRGENSAT_7 | Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is clean and well maintained. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| V115 | 1/2:FRGENSAT_8 | Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is safe. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| V116 | 1/2:FRPRBLSO_1 | To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur with students at your school? | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V117 | 1/2:FRPRBLSO_2 | Robbery or theft | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V118  | 1/2:FRPRBLSO_3 | Vandalism | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
|-------|----------------|-----------|--------------------------------------------------|
| V119  | 1/2:FRPRBLSO_4 | Use of alcohol | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V120  | 1/2:FRPRBLSO_5 | Use of illegal drugs | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V121  | 1/2:FRPRBLSO_6 | Possession of weapons | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V122  | 1/2:FRPRBLSO_7 | Physical abuse of teachers | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V123</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_8</td>
<td>Student racial tensions</td>
<td>1=Never happens, 2=Happens on occasion, 3=Happens at least once a month, 4=Happens at least once a week, 5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_9</td>
<td>Student bullying</td>
<td>1=Never happens, 2=Happens on occasion, 3=Happens at least once a month, 4=Happens at least once a week, 5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V125</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_10</td>
<td>Student verbal abuse of teachers</td>
<td>1=Never happens, 2=Happens on occasion, 3=Happens at least once a month, 4=Happens at least once a week, 5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V126</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_11</td>
<td>Widespread disorder in classrooms</td>
<td>1=Never happens, 2=Happens on occasion, 3=Happens at least once a month, 4=Happens at least once a week, 5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V127</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_12</td>
<td>Student acts of disrespect for teachers</td>
<td>1=Never happens, 2=Happens on occasion, 3=Happens at least once a month, 4=Happens at least once a week, 5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Variable Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V128</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_13</td>
<td>Gang activities</td>
<td>1=Never happens, 2=Happens on occasion, 3=Happens at least once a month, 4=Happens at least once a week, 5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V129</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_1</td>
<td>To what extent is each of the following a problem in your school?</td>
<td>1=Not a problem, 2=Minor problem, 3=Moderate problem, 4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V130</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_2</td>
<td>Student tardiness</td>
<td>1=Not a problem, 2=Minor problem, 3=Moderate problem, 4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V131</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_3</td>
<td>Student class cutting</td>
<td>1=Not a problem, 2=Minor problem, 3=Moderate problem, 4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V132</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_4</td>
<td>Teacher absenteeism</td>
<td>1=Not a problem, 2=Minor problem, 3=Moderate problem, 4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V133</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_5</td>
<td>Student pregnancy</td>
<td>1=Not a problem, 2=Minor problem, 3=Moderate problem, 4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V134</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_6</td>
<td>Students dropping out</td>
<td>1=Not a problem, 2=Minor problem, 3=Moderate problem, 4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V135</strong></td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_7</td>
<td><strong>Student apathy</strong></td>
<td>1=Not a problem  2=Minor problem  3=Moderate problem  4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V136</strong></td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_8</td>
<td><strong>Lack of parental involvement</strong></td>
<td>1=Not a problem  2=Minor problem  3=Moderate problem  4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V137</strong></td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_9</td>
<td><strong>Poverty</strong></td>
<td>1=Not a problem  2=Minor problem  3=Moderate problem  4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V138</strong></td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_10</td>
<td><strong>Students come to school unprepared to learn</strong></td>
<td>1=Not a problem  2=Minor problem  3=Moderate problem  4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V139</strong></td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_11</td>
<td><strong>Poor student health</strong></td>
<td>1=Not a problem  2=Minor problem  3=Moderate problem  4=Serious problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V140</strong></td>
<td>1/2:PDGENSAT_1</td>
<td><strong>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your own professional development and professional development in your school.</strong></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| V141 | 1/2:PDGENSAT_2 | Teachers are provided opportunities to learn from one another. | 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree |
| V142 | 1/2:PDGENSAT_3 | Adequate time is provided for professional development. | 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree |
| V143 | 1/2:PDGENSAT_4 | Teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology. | 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree |
| V144 | 1/2:PDGENSAT_5 | Professional development provides teachers with the knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively. | 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree |
| V145 | 1/2:PDMSTNED_1 | In which of the following areas, if any, do you believe teachers (in general) at your school need the most professional development to effectively teach students? | Select one |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V146</th>
<th>1/2:PDMSTNED_2</th>
<th>Content of the subject(s) you teach</th>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V147</td>
<td>1/2:PDMSTNED_3</td>
<td>Student discipline and classroom management</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V148</td>
<td>1/2:PDMSTNED_4</td>
<td>Teaching special education students</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V149</td>
<td>1/2:PDMSTNED_5</td>
<td>Teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V150</td>
<td>1/2:PDSRMSTN_1</td>
<td>In which of the following areas, if any, do you feel that you need additional professional development to effectively teach your students?</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V151</td>
<td>1/2:PDSRMSTN_2</td>
<td>Content of the subject(s) you teach</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V152</td>
<td>1/2:PDSRMSTN_3</td>
<td>Student discipline and classroom management</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V153</td>
<td>1/2:PDSRMSTN_4</td>
<td>Teaching special education students</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V154</td>
<td>1/2:PDSRMSTN_5</td>
<td>Teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V155</td>
<td>1/2:PDcntPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities specific to and concentrating on the content of the subject(s)</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V156</td>
<td>1/2:PDcntHRS</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V157</td>
<td>1/2:PDcntSTR</td>
<td>Did the professional development you received in the content of the subject(s) you teach provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V158</td>
<td>1/2:PDcntUSE</td>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V159</td>
<td>1/2:PDrdgPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on reading instruction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V160</td>
<td>1/2:PDrdgHRS</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V161</td>
<td>1/2:PDrdgSTR</td>
<td>Did the professional development you received in reading instruction provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SPSS originally had this coded as a string variable, so I've now recoded as a numeric variable known as V162n)</td>
<td>V162</td>
<td>1/2:PDrdgUSE</td>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SPSS originally had this coded as a string variable, so I've now recoded as a numeric variable known as V163n)</td>
<td>V163</td>
<td>1/2:PDmgtPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on student discipline and classroom management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SPSS originally had this coded as a string variable, so I've now recoded as a numeric variable known as V164n)</td>
<td>V164</td>
<td>1/2:PDmgtHRS</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V165</td>
<td>1/2:PDmgtSTR</td>
<td>Did the professional development you received in student discipline and classroom management provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V166</td>
<td>1/2:PDmgtUSE</td>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td>1=Very useful 2=Useful 3=Somewhat useful 4=Not useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V167</td>
<td>1/2:PDspecPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on teaching</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V168</td>
<td>1/2:PDspecHR</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=8 hours or less 2=9-16 hours 3=17-32 hours 4=33 hours or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V169</td>
<td>1/2:PDspecST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td>V170</td>
<td>1/2:PDspecUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Very useful 2=Useful 3=Somewhat useful 4=Not useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V171</td>
<td>1/2:PDlepPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td>V172</td>
<td>1/2:PDlepHRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=8 hours or less 2=9-16 hours 3=17-32 hours 4=33 hours or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V173</td>
<td>1/2:PDlepSTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V174</td>
<td>1/2:PDlepUSE</td>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td>1=Very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Somewhat useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Not useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V175</td>
<td>1/2:PD12mDID_1</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, did you do any of the following? (Exclude any administrative meetings. Check all that apply.)</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V182</td>
<td>1/2:PD12mDID_8</td>
<td>Observe, or be observed by, other teachers in your classroom (for at least 10 minutes)</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V183</td>
<td>1/2:PD12mDID_9</td>
<td>Act as a coach or mentor to other teachers or staff in your school, or receive coaching or mentoring</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V184</td>
<td>1/2:PD12mDID_10</td>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V185</td>
<td>1B:WCNOLGRT</td>
<td>Indicate which aspect, if any, of your last school's work environment most affected your decision to no longer work at that school.</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day 2=School facilities and resources 3=School leadership 4=Teacher empowerment 5=Professional Development 6=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V186</td>
<td>1B:OTRFTNOTC</td>
<td>What factors, other than work environment, affected your decision to no longer work at the school you were working at last year?</td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V187</td>
<td>1B:WCMSTCON</td>
<td>Which aspect of your current school's work environment most affects teachers' willingness to continue working at your school?</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day 2=School facilities and resources 3=School leadership 4=Teacher empowerment 5=Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V188</td>
<td>1B:WCMST2TCH</td>
<td>Which aspect of your work environment most affects your willingness to keep working at your current school?</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day 2=School facilities and resources 3=School leadership 4=Teacher empowerment 5=Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V189</td>
<td>1B:FTR INT</td>
<td>Which best describes</td>
<td>1=Continue teaching at my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>your future intentions for your professional career?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>current school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Continue teaching at my current school until a better opportunity comes along.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Continue teaching but leave this school as soon as I can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Continue teaching but leave this district as soon as I can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Leave the profession all together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Certainly would become a teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Probably would become a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Chances about even for and against</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Probably would not become a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which of the following statements best describes how long you plan to remain in teaching?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=As long as I am able</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Until I am eligible for retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Will probably continue unless something better comes along</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Undecided at this time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V193</td>
<td>State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V194</td>
<td>The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren't really worth it.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V195</td>
<td>The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe us as a satisfied group.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V196</td>
<td>If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave teaching as soon as possible.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V197</td>
<td>I like the way things are run at this school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V198</td>
<td>I think about transferring to another school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V199</td>
<td>Overall, my school is a</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V200</td>
<td>1B:GEN SATIS_9 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V201</td>
<td>1B:GEN SATIS_10</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my teaching salary.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V202</td>
<td>1B:GEN SATIS_11 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired to go.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V203</td>
<td>1B:GEN SATIS_12</td>
<td>Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V204</td>
<td>1B:GEN SATIS_13 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V205</td>
<td>1B:GEN SATIS_14</td>
<td>I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Response Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V206</td>
<td>I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as a teacher.</td>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree, 4=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 2=Agree, 1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V207</td>
<td>I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with that of other teachers.</td>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree, 4=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 2=Agree, 1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V208</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my class size.</td>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree, 4=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 2=Agree, 1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V209</td>
<td>I am generally satisfied with being a teacher at this school.</td>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree, 4=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 2=Agree, 1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V210</td>
<td>In the last 12 months, have you applied for a job in an attempt to leave the teaching profession?</td>
<td>1=Yes, 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V211</td>
<td>Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?</td>
<td>1=Yes, 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V212</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?</td>
<td>1=Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate), 2=Vocational certificate program, 3=Bachelor’s degree granting, 4=Master’s degree granting, 5=Doctoral degree granting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V213</td>
<td>1B:GOAL ENRO</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K-12 teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=To obtain or for use in a position outside of the outside the field of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V214</th>
<th>2:YRS IN EDU</th>
<th>How many years (including this one) have you been employed as an educator?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=First year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Second year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Third year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Fourth year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=Fifth year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6=Sixth year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7=Seventh year or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V215</th>
<th>2:YRSCRTSCH</th>
<th>How many years have you been employed in the school in which you are currently working?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=First year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=Second year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=Third year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Fourth year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V216</td>
<td>In general, which aspect of your current school's work environment most affects teachers' willingness to continue working at your school?</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day, 2=School facilities and resources, 3=School leadership, 4=Teacher empowerment, 5=Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V217</td>
<td>Which aspect of your current work environment most affects your willingness to keep working in your current school?</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day, 2=School facilities and resources, 3=School leadership, 4=Teacher empowerment, 5=Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V218</td>
<td>Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?</td>
<td>1=Return to teaching, 2=Continue my current role, 3=Move to a new role within education, 4=Move to a new role outside of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V219</td>
<td>If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?</td>
<td>1=Certainly would become a teacher, 2=Probably would become a teacher, 3=Chances about even for and against, 4=Probably would not become a teacher, 5=Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V220</td>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In this school, staff members are recognized for a job well done.</strong></td>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V221</strong></td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State or district content standards have had a positive influence on my satisfaction with current job.</strong></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V222</strong></td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_3 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at this school aren’t really worth it.</strong></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V223</strong></td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The teachers at this school like being here; I would describe teachers here as a satisfied group.</strong></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V224</strong></td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_5 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If I could get a higher paying job I’d leave education as soon as possible.</strong></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V225</strong></td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I like the way things are run at this school.</strong></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V226</strong></td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_7 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I think about transferring to another school.</strong></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V227</td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_8</td>
<td>Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V228</td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_9 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I don’t seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V229</td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_10</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V230</td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_11 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I think about staying home from school because I’m just too tired to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V231</td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_12</td>
<td>Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V232</td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_13 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I worry about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V233</td>
<td>2:GEN SATIS_14</td>
<td>I receive a great deal of support from parents for the work I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V234</td>
<td>I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to try to do my best as an educator.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V235</td>
<td>I make a conscious effort to coordinate my work with that of other teachers.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V236</td>
<td>I am satisfied with class sizes at this school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V237</td>
<td>I am generally satisfied with being a educator at this school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V238</td>
<td>Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V239</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?</td>
<td>1=Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate) 2=Vocational certificate program 3=Bachelor’s degree granting program 4=Master’s degree granting program 5=Education specialist or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V240</th>
<th>2:GOAL ENROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K–12 teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=To obtain or for use in a position OUTSIDE the field of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V241</th>
<th>2:TIMGENSATI_1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (as in most teachers at your school) have reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V242</th>
<th>2:TIMGENSATI_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have time available to collaborate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V243</td>
<td>2:TIMGENSATI_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V244</td>
<td>2:TIMGENSATI_4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V245</td>
<td>2:TIMGENSATI_5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V246</td>
<td>2:TIMTTL#HRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V247 | 2:TIMA#TNONI | In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally have available | 1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V248</td>
<td>Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for individual planning?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V249</td>
<td>Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for structured, collaborative planning?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V250</td>
<td>In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V251</td>
<td>In an average week at your school, how many hours do you generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V252</td>
<td>During this school year, do you or will you:</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V253</td>
<td>Sponsor any student groups, clubs, or organizations</td>
<td>2:TIMWILLU?_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V254</td>
<td>Serve as a department lead or chair</td>
<td>2:TIMWILLU?_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V255</td>
<td>Serve as a lead curriculum specialist</td>
<td>2:TIMWILLU?_4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V256</td>
<td>Serve on a school-wide or district-wide committee or task force</td>
<td>2:TIMWILLU?_5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V257</td>
<td>During the current school year, do you, or will you, earn additional</td>
<td>2:TIMJOBOUTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compensation from working in any job outside this school system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V258</td>
<td>Which of these best describes this job outside this school system?</td>
<td>2:TIMJOOUDES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V259</td>
<td>How many years (including this one) have you been employed as an educator?</td>
<td>3:YRS IN EDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V260</td>
<td>How many years have you been employed in your current role?</td>
<td>3:YRSCRTSCHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V261</td>
<td>Indicate which aspect, if any, of your last school's work environment most affected your decision to no longer work at that school.</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day, 2=School facilities and resources, 3=School leadership, 4=Teacher empowerment, 5=Professional Development, 6=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V262</td>
<td>What factors, other than work environment, affected your decision to no longer work at the school you worked at previously?</td>
<td>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V263</td>
<td>In general, which aspect of a school's work environment do you think most affects teachers' willingness to keep working there?</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day, 2=School facilities and resources, 3=School leadership, 4=Teacher empowerment, 5=Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V264</td>
<td>Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?</td>
<td>1=Return to teaching at my last school, 2=Return to teaching but at a different school, 3=Continue my current role, 4=Move to new role, 5=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V265</td>
<td>If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?</td>
<td>1=Certainly would become a teacher, 2=Probably would become a teacher, 3=Chances about even for and against, 4=Probably would not become a teacher, 5=Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V266</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_1</td>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the last school where I worked, staff members were recognized for a job well done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V267</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_2</td>
<td>State or district content standards had a positive influence on my satisfaction with teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V268</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_3</td>
<td>The stress and disappointments involved in teaching at my last school weren't really worth it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V269</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_4</td>
<td>The teachers at my last school liked being there; I would describe them as a satisfied group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V270</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_5</td>
<td>I left education because I got a higher paying job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V271</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_6</td>
<td>I liked the way things were run at my last school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V272</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_7 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I thought about transferring to another school from my last school before I finally left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V273</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_8</td>
<td>Overall, my last school was a good place to teach and learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V274</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_9 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I didn't seem to have as much enthusiasm at my last school as I did when I began teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V275</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_10</td>
<td>I was satisfied with my salary at my last school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V276</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_11 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I thought about staying home from school because I was just too tired to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V277</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_12</td>
<td>Most of my colleagues at my last school shared my beliefs and values about what defined the central mission of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V278</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_13 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I worried about the security of my job because of the performance of my students on state and/or local tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V279</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_14</td>
<td>I received a great deal of support from parents for the work I did at my last school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V280</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_15 (recoded to same variable on SPSS so that 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1)</td>
<td>I sometimes felt it was a waste of time to try to do my best as an educator at my last school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V281</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_16</td>
<td>I made a conscious effort to coordinate my work with that of other teachers at my last school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V282</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_17</td>
<td>I was satisfied with class sizes at my last school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V283</td>
<td>3/4:GEN SATI_18</td>
<td>I was generally satisfied with being an educator at my last school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V284</td>
<td>3/4:ENROLLE</td>
<td>Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of last school year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V285</td>
<td>3/4:ENROLDES</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Vocational certificate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Bachelor’s degree granting program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Master’s degree granting program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Education specialist or professional diploma program (at least one year beyond Master’s level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Doctorate or professional degree granting program (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Some other certificate or degree of advanced graduate studies program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V286</th>
<th>3/4:GOALENRO</th>
<th>Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K–12 teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=To obtain or for use in a position OUTSIDE the field of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V287</th>
<th>3/4:TIMGENSA_1</th>
<th>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in the last school in which you worked.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (as in most teachers at the last school in which you worked) had reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students.</td>
<td>V288 3/4:TIMGENSA_2 Teachers had time available to collaborate with their colleagues.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers were protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.</td>
<td>V289 3/4:TIMGENSA_3</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leadership tried to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers.</td>
<td>V290 3/4:TIMGENSA_4</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The non-instructional time (any structured time during the work day to work individually or collaboratively on instructional issues) provided for teachers in my school was sufficient.</td>
<td>V291 3/4:TIMGENSA_5</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the last school in which you worked, how many total hours did teachers at your school spend on ALL teaching and other school-related activities during a typical full week at this school? (Include hours spent working during the school day, before school, after school, and on weekends.)</td>
<td>Open-ended text response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many hours did most teachers generally have available for non-instructional time?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many were available for individual planning?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many were available for structured, collaborative planning?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V296</td>
<td>In an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many hours did most teachers generally spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V297</td>
<td>In an average week of teaching at the last school in which you worked, how many hours did you spend on school related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on the weekend)?</td>
<td>1=None 2=Less than 3 hours 3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours 4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours 5=More than 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V298</td>
<td>During the last year in which you worked in a school, did you do any of the following:</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coach a sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V299</td>
<td>Sponsor any student groups, clubs, or organizations</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V300</td>
<td>Serve as a department lead or chair</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V301</td>
<td>Serve as a lead curriculum specialist</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V302</td>
<td>Serve on a school-wide or district-wide committee or task force</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V303</td>
<td>During the last year in which you worked in a school, did you earn</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional compensation from working in any job outside the school system?</td>
<td>V304</td>
<td>Which of these best describes the job you performed outside the school system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V305 3/4:TIMJOOUD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in the last school that you worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V306 3/4:LDGENSAT_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The faculty were committed to helping every student learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V307 3/4:LDGENSAT_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The school leadership communicated clear expectations to students and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V308 3/4:LDGENSAT_3</td>
<td></td>
<td>The school leadership shielded teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V309</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_5</td>
<td>The school leadership consistently enforced rules for student conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V310</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_6</td>
<td>The school leadership supported teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V311</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_7</td>
<td>Opportunities were available for members of the community to actively contribute to this school's success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V312</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_8</td>
<td>The school leadership consistently supported teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V313</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_9</td>
<td>The school improvement team provided effective leadership at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V314</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_10</td>
<td>The faculty and staff had a shared vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V315</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_11</td>
<td>Teachers were held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V316</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_12</td>
<td>Teacher performance evaluations were handled in an appropriate manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V317</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_13</td>
<td>The procedures for teacher performance evaluations were consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V318</td>
<td>3/4:LDGENSAT_14</td>
<td>Teachers received feedback that can help them improve teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V319</td>
<td>3/4:LDADCCRN_1</td>
<td>The leadership at the last school that I worked made a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: facilities and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V320</td>
<td>3/4:LDADCCRN_2</td>
<td>the use of time in my school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V321</td>
<td>3/4:LDADCCRN_3</td>
<td>professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question ID</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V322</td>
<td>3/4:LDADCCRN_4</td>
<td>empowering teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V323</td>
<td>3/4:LDADCCRN_5</td>
<td>leadership issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V324</td>
<td>3/4:LDADCCRN_6</td>
<td>new teacher support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V325</td>
<td>3/4:LDUSEFUL</td>
<td>Overall, the leadership of the last school that I worked in was effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V326</td>
<td>3/4:LDINSTLR</td>
<td>At the last school you worked in, which position best describes the person who most often provides instructional leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V327</td>
<td>3/4:EMPGENSA_1</td>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>statements about teacher empowerment in the last school that you worked. Teachers were centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V328</td>
<td>3/4:EMPGENSA_2</td>
<td>Teachers were trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V329</td>
<td>3/4:EMPGENSA_3</td>
<td>The faculty had an effective process for making group decisions and solving problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V330</td>
<td>3/4:EMPGENSA_4</td>
<td>In the last school I worked, we took steps to solve problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V331</td>
<td>3/4:EMPGENSA_5</td>
<td>Opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession (other than administration) were available to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V332</td>
<td>3/4:EMPROLES_1</td>
<td>At the last school in which you worked, please indicate how large a role teachers had in each of the following areas: Selecting instructional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V333 | 3/4:EMPROLES_2 | Devising teaching techniques | 1=Primary role  
2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
| V334 | 3/4:EMPROLES_3 | Setting grading and student assessment practices | 1=Primary role  
2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
| V335 | 3/4:EMPROLES_4 | Determining the content of in-service professional development programs | 1=Primary role  
2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
| V336 | 3/4:EMPROLES_5 | Hiring new teachers | 1=Primary role  
2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
| V337 | 3/4:EMPROLES_6 | Evaluating teachers | 1=Primary role  
2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
| V338 | 3/4:EMPROLES_7 | Establishing and implementing policies about student discipline | 1=Primary role  
2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
| V339 | 3/4:EMPROLES_8 | Deciding how the school | 1=Primary role |
| V340 | 3/4:EMPROLES_9 | budget will be spent | 2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
|------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| V341 | 3/4:FRGENSAT_1 | School improvement planning | 1=Primary role  
2=Large role  
3=Moderate role  
4=Small role  
5=No role at all |
| V342 | 3/4:FRGENSAT_2 | Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about facilities and resources at the last school in which you worked. Teachers had sufficient access to appropriate resources and instructional materials (e.g. items such as textbooks, curriculum materials, content references, etc.). | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| V343 | 3/4:FRGENSAT_3 | Teachers had sufficient access to communications technology, including phones, faxes, email, and network drives. | 1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **V344** | 3/4:FRGENSAT_4 | Teachers had sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.  
1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| **V345** | 3/4:FRGENSAT_5 | The reliability and speed of Internet connections in my last school were sufficient to support instructional practices.  
1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| **V346** | 3/4:FRGENSAT_6 | Teachers had adequate professional space to work productively.  
1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| **V347** | 3/4:FRGENSAT_7 | Teachers and staff work in a school environment that was clean and well maintained.  
1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| **V348** | 3/4:FRGENSAT_8 | Teachers and staff work in a school environment that was safe.  
1=Strongly Agree  
2=Agree  
3=Neutral  
4=Disagree  
5=Strongly Disagree |
| **V349** | 3/4:FRPRBLSO_1 | To the best of your knowledge, how often did the following types of problems occur with students at the last school in which you worked?  
1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V350</th>
<th>3/4:FRPRBLSO_2</th>
<th>Physical conflicts among students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V351</td>
<td>3/4:FRPRBLSO_3</td>
<td>Robbery or theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Never happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Happens on occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Happens at least once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Happens at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V352</td>
<td>3/4:FRPRBLSO_4</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Never happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Happens on occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Happens at least once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Happens at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V353</td>
<td>3/4:FRPRBLSO_5</td>
<td>Use of alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Never happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Happens on occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Happens at least once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Happens at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V354</td>
<td>3/4:FRPRBLSO_6</td>
<td>Use of illegal drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Never happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Happens on occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Happens at least once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Happens at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V354</td>
<td>3/4:FRPRBLSO_6</td>
<td>Possession of weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Never happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Happens on occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Happens at least once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Happens at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Happens daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V355     | 3/4:FRPRBLSO_7 | Physical abuse of teachers | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V356     | 3/4:FRPRBLSO_8 | Student racial tensions | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V357     | 3/4:FRPRBLSO_9 | Student bullying | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V358     | 3/4:FRPRBLSO_10 | Student verbal abuse of teachers | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |
| V359     | 3/4:FRPRBLSO_11 | Widespread disorder in classrooms | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V360 | Student acts of disrespect for teachers                                      | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |                                                                      |
| V361 | Gang activities                                                               | 1=Never happens  
2=Happens on occasion  
3=Happens at least once a month  
4=Happens at least once a week  
5=Happens daily |                                                                      |
| V362 | To what extent was each of the following a problem in the last school in which you worked?  
Student tardiness | 1=Not a problem  
2=Minor problem  
3=Moderate problem  
4=Serious problem |                                                                      |
| V363 | Student absenteeism                                                           | 1=Not a problem  
2=Minor problem  
3=Moderate problem  
4=Serious problem |                                                                      |
| V364 | Student class cutting                                                        | 1=Not a problem  
2=Minor problem  
3=Moderate problem  
4=Serious problem |                                                                      |
| V365 | Teacher absenteeism                                                           | 1=Not a problem  
2=Minor problem |                                                                      |
| V366  | 3/4:FRPRBLEX_5 | Student pregnancy | 1=Not a problem  
2=Minor problem  
3=Moderate problem  
4=Serious problem |
|-------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| V367  | 3/4:FRPRBLEX_6 | Students dropping out | 1=Not a problem 
2=Minor problem 
3=Moderate problem 
4=Serious problem |
| V368  | 3/4:FRPRBLEX_7 | Student apathy | 1=Not a problem 
2=Minor problem 
3=Moderate problem 
4=Serious problem |
| V369  | 3/4:FRPRBLEX_8 | Lack of parental involvement | 1=Not a problem 
2=Minor problem 
3=Moderate problem 
4=Serious problem |
| V370  | 3/4:FRPRBLEX_9 | Poverty | 1=Not a problem 
2=Minor problem 
3=Moderate problem 
4=Serious problem |
| V371  | 3/4:FRPRBLEX_10 | Students come to school unprepared to learn | 1=Not a problem 
2=Minor problem 
3=Moderate problem 
4=Serious problem |
| V372  | 3/4:FRPRBLEX_11 | Poor student health | 1=Not a problem 
2=Minor problem 
3=Moderate problem 
4=Serious problem |
| V373 | 3/4:PDGENSAT_1 | Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your own professional development and professional development in the last school in which you worked.

Sufficient funds and resources were available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development activities. |
<p>| V374 | 3/4:PDGENSAT_2 | Teachers were provided opportunities to learn from one another. |
| V375 | 3/4:PDGENSAT_3 | Adequate time was provided for professional development. |
| V376 | 3/4:PDGENSAT_4 | Teachers had sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology. |
| V377 | 3/4:PDGENSAT_5 | Professional development provided teachers with the knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V378</th>
<th>3/4:PDMSTNED_1</th>
<th>In which of the following areas, if any, do you believe teachers (at the last school in which you worked) need the most professional development to effectively teach students?</th>
<th>Content of the subject(s) you teach</th>
<th>Select one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V379</td>
<td>3/4:PDMSTNED_2</td>
<td>Reading instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V380</td>
<td>3/4:PDMSTNED_3</td>
<td>Student discipline and classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V381</td>
<td>3/4:PDMSTNED_4</td>
<td>Teaching special education students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V382</td>
<td>3/4:PDMSTNED_5</td>
<td>Teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V383</td>
<td>3/4:PDSRMSTN_1</td>
<td>In which of the following areas, if any, do you feel that you need additional professional development to effectively teach your students?</td>
<td>Content of the subject(s) you teach</td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V384</td>
<td>3/4:PDSRMSTN_2</td>
<td>Reading instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V385</td>
<td>3/4:PDSRMSTN_3</td>
<td>Student discipline and classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V386</td>
<td>3/4:PDSRMSTN_4</td>
<td>Teaching special</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V387</td>
<td>3/4:PDSRMSTN_5</td>
<td>Teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students</td>
<td>Select one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V388</td>
<td>3/4:PDcntPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities specific to and concentrating on the content of the subject(s) you teach?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V389</td>
<td>3/4:PDcntHRS</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td>1=8 hours or less 2=9-16 hours 3=17-32 hours 4=33 hours or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V390</td>
<td>3/4:PDcntSTR</td>
<td>Did the professional development you received in the content of the subject(s) you teach provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V391</td>
<td>3/4:PDcntUSE</td>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td>1=Very useful 2=Useful 3=Somewhat useful 4=Not useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V392</td>
<td>3/4:PDrdgPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on reading instruction?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V393</td>
<td>3/4:PDrdgHRS</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td>1=8 hours or less 2=9-16 hours 3=17-32 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the professional development you received in reading instruction provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?</td>
<td>V394</td>
<td>3/4:PDrdgSTR</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td>V395</td>
<td>3/4:PDrdgUSE</td>
<td>1=Very useful 2=Useful 3=Somewhat useful 4=Not useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on student discipline and classroom management?</td>
<td>V396</td>
<td>3/4:PDmgtPD</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td>V397</td>
<td>3/4:PDmgtHRS</td>
<td>1=8 hours or less 2=9-16 hours 3=17-32 hours 4=33 hours or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the professional development you received in student discipline and classroom management provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?</td>
<td>V398</td>
<td>3/4:PDmgtSTR</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td>V399</td>
<td>3/4:PDmgtUSE</td>
<td>1=Very useful 2=Useful 3=Somewhat useful 4=Not useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V400</td>
<td>3/4:PDspecPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on teaching special education students?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V401</td>
<td>3/4:PDspecHR</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td>1=8 hours or less  2=9-16 hours  3=17-32 hours  4=33 hours or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V402</td>
<td>3/4:PDspecST</td>
<td>Did the professional development you received in teaching special education students provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V403</td>
<td>3/4:PDspecUS</td>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td>1=Very useful 2=Useful 3=Somewhat useful 4=Not useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V404</td>
<td>3/4:PDlepPD</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities that focused on teaching limited-English proficient (LEP) students?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V405</td>
<td>3/4:PDlepHRS</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, how many hours did you spend on these activities?</td>
<td>1=8 hours or less  2=9-16 hours  3=17-32 hours  4=33 hours or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V406</td>
<td>3/4:PDlepSTR</td>
<td>Did the professional development you received in teaching limited-English proficient (LEP) students provide you with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V407</td>
<td>3/4:PDlepUSE</td>
<td>Overall, how useful were these activities to you?</td>
<td>1=Very useful 2=Useful 3=Somewhat useful 4=Not useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V408</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_1</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, did you do any of the following? (Exclude any administrative meetings. Check all that apply.) Engage in individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest to you professionally</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V409</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_2</td>
<td>Participate in university course(s) related to teaching</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V410</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_3</td>
<td>Participate in online learning opportunities</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V411</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_4</td>
<td>Make observational visits to other schools</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V412</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_5</td>
<td>Present at a workshop, conference or training session</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V413</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_6</td>
<td>Attend any other workshop, conference or training session in which you were NOT a</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presenter</td>
<td>Participate in regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers on issues of instruction</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V414</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V415</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_8</td>
<td>Observe, or be observed by, other teachers in your classroom (for at least 10 minutes)</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V416</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_9</td>
<td>Act as a coach or mentor to other teachers or staff in your school, or receive coaching or mentoring</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V417</td>
<td>3/4:PD12mDID_10</td>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>Check one/and all that apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V418</td>
<td>4:YRSCRTSCHL</td>
<td>How many years (including last year) were you employed at the school in which you taught last year?</td>
<td>1=Less than a full year 2=1 year 3=2 years 4=3 years 5=4 years 6=5 years 7=6 years 8=7 or more years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V419</td>
<td>4:YRS IN EDUa</td>
<td>How many years in total were you employed as an educator?</td>
<td>1=Less than a full year 2=1 year 3=2 years 4=3 years 5=4 years 6=5 years 7=6 years 8=7 or more years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V420</td>
<td>4:HAVEUEVR</td>
<td>Within a K-12 setting, have you ever worked in any of the following positions?</td>
<td>1=Teacher (including intervention specialist, vocational, literacy specialist, special education teacher, etc.) 2=Assistant Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V421</td>
<td>4:OTHAVEUEVR</td>
<td>What other role have you worked in, within a K-12, public education setting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V422</td>
<td>4:YRS IN EDUb</td>
<td>How many years were you ever employed as a classroom teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V423</td>
<td>4:WCNOTTCH</td>
<td>Indicate which aspect, if any, of a school's work environment most affected your decision to not teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options for role: 3=Principal 4=School Counselor 5=Library Media Specialist 6=Central Office Role 7=A role with a local education fund or other non-profit agency that supports the work of public schools 8=A role with a state, regional or national agency that supports the work of public schools 9=I have worked within a K-12, public education setting, but in some other role not listed here. 10=No, I have never worked in a K-12, public education setting. 1=Less than a full year 2=1 year 3=2 years 4=3 years 5=4 years 6=5 years 7=6 years 8=7 or more years 1=Time during the work day 2=School facilities and resources 3=School leadership 4=Teacher empowerment 5=Professional Development 6=Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V424</th>
<th>4:OTRFNOTT</th>
<th>What factors, other than a school's work environment, affected your decision to not teach?</th>
<th>OPEN-ENDED TEXT RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V425</td>
<td>4:WCMSTCON</td>
<td>In general, which aspect of a school's work environment do you think most affects teachers' willingness to keep working there?</td>
<td>1=Time during the work day 2=School facilities and resources 3=School leadership 4=Teacher empowerment 5=Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V426</td>
<td>4:FTR INT</td>
<td>Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?</td>
<td>1=Continue my current role 2=Enter the teaching profession in a K-12 public setting 3=Enter the teaching profession in a K-12 private setting 4=Enter the teaching profession in a setting other than K-12 5=Enter the education profession in some role other than teaching 6=Move to some other new role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V427</td>
<td>4:GOBCKCOL</td>
<td>If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you reconsider becoming a teacher?</td>
<td>1=Certainly would become a teacher 2=Probably would become a teacher 3=Chances about even for and against 4=Probably would not become a teacher 5=Certainly would not become a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V428</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_1</td>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? I believe it is important for teachers to be recognized for a job well done.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V429</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_2</td>
<td>State or district content standards had an influence on my decision to not enter into teaching.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V430</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_3</td>
<td>The stress and disappointments involved in teaching caused me to think that teaching was not really worth the effort.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V431</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_4</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V432</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_5</td>
<td>I did not go into teaching because I got a higher paying job.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V433</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_6</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V434</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_7</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V435</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_8</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V436</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_9</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V437</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_10</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V438</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_11</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V439</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_12</td>
<td>I think it's important for colleagues at the same school to share the same beliefs and values about what defines the central mission of a school.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V440</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_13</td>
<td>Worries over the security of teaching because of the performance of students on state and/or local tests influenced my decision to not teach.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V441</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_14</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V442</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_15</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V443</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_16</td>
<td>I think it's important for teachers to make a conscious effort to coordinate their work with other teachers.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V444</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_17</td>
<td>Class size influenced my decision to not teach.</td>
<td>1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3=Neutral  4=Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V445</td>
<td>4:GEN SATIS_18</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
<td>THIS QUESTION IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V446</td>
<td>4: ENROLLED</td>
<td>Have you enrolled in college or university courses since the end of</td>
<td>1=Yes  2=No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V447</th>
<th>4:ENROLDESC</th>
<th>Which of the following best describes your enrollment in these courses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Individual courses (not part of a program leading to a degree or certificate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Vocational certificate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Bachelor’s degree granting program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Master’s degree granting program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Education specialist or professional diploma program (at least one year beyond Master’s level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Doctorate or professional degree granting program (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Some other certificate or degree of advanced graduate studies program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V448</th>
<th>4:GOAL ENROL</th>
<th>Which of the following best describes the reason you enrolled in these courses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=To obtain or for use in a K–12 teaching position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=To obtain or for use in a position in the field of education but NOT as a K–12 teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=To obtain or for use in a position OUTSIDE the field of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=For reasons unrelated to obtaining or using in a job (e.g., personal fulfillment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V449</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Please indicate your ethnicity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V450</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Please indicate your gender:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Mixed or multiple ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Some other race or ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V451</th>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>What is the name of the college or university where you earned your bachelor's degree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Appalachian State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Campbell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=East Carolina University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Elizabeth City State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Elon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Lenoir-Rhyne College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Meredith College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8=NC A&amp;T State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9=NC Central University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10=NC State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11=Queens University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12=UNC Asheville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13=UNC Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14=UNC Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15=UNC Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16=UNC Pembroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17=UNC Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18=Western Carolina University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V452</th>
<th>FLDSTUDYUNDR</th>
<th>What was your major field of study during your undergraduate program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Early childhood/Pre-K, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Elementary grades, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Middle grades, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Secondary grades, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Special Education, any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Arts &amp; Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=English and Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8=English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>V453</td>
<td>Do you have a master's degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLDSUVMSTR</td>
<td>V454</td>
<td>What was your major field of study for the masters degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Curriculum or Reading Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Early childhood/Pre-K, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=Elementary grades, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5=Middle grades, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6=Secondary grades, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7=Special Education, any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8=Arts &amp; Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9=English and Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10=English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11=Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12=Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13=Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14=Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15=Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16=Vocational/Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17=Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18=Library/Information science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHR DEGREES_1</td>
<td>V455</td>
<td>Have you earned any of the degrees listed below? Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHR DEGREES_2</td>
<td>Vocational certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V456</td>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V457</td>
<td>SECOND Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V458</td>
<td>SECOND Master's degree</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V459</td>
<td>Educational specialist or professional diploma (at least one year beyond a master's level)</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V460</td>
<td>Doctorate or first professional degree (Ph. D, Ed.D, M.D., L.L.B., J.D., D.D.S.)</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V461</td>
<td>Some other certificate or degree of Advanced Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V462</td>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBPTS</td>
<td>Have you taken an exam for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V463</td>
<td></td>
<td>1=Taken and passed 2=Taken and have not yet passed 3=Not taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWARDS_1</td>
<td>Have you ever received any of the following awards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V464</td>
<td>Teacher of the Year (School, LEA, Regional or State level)</td>
<td>Check one/and any that apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V465</td>
<td>AWARDS_2</td>
<td>Sallie B. Mae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V466</td>
<td>AWARDS_3</td>
<td>Milken Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V467</td>
<td>AWARDS_4</td>
<td>Wachovia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V468</td>
<td>AWARDS_5</td>
<td>Disney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V469</td>
<td>AWARDS_6</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V470</td>
<td>AWARDS_7</td>
<td>None of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V471</td>
<td>OTHR AWARDS</td>
<td>What other awards have you received in recognition of your work within education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V472</td>
<td>EMAIL ADDRES</td>
<td>If you would like to receive a copy of the results of this study, please include your email in the field below. (Email addresses will not be viewed until after the analysis is complete. You will NOT be contacted for any reason other than to provide you a copy of the results.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E

Distribution of Fellows by Class and by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL YR IN TCHG</th>
<th>#AWARDS</th>
<th>YEAR OF AWARD</th>
<th>CLASS CODE</th>
<th># IN DATASET SAMPLE</th>
<th>TAKEN SURVEY</th>
<th>% FROM EACH CLASS</th>
<th>Totals of Groups</th>
<th>% FROM GROUPS</th>
<th># TAKEN - FROM GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other awards have you received in recognition of your work within education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Young Educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Attendance Awards, Terrific Teacher Tuesday Award (sponsored by a local radio station)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of PROMISE Award / (recognizes a first-year teacher in the Forsyth County school system)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Charlotte College of Education Beginning Teacher Award nominee for my school (2007-2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson County Star Performer 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local award for excellence in math and science education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Warner Cable STAR Teacher Award, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initially Licensed Teacher of the Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Teacher of the Year at my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Teacher of the Year; currently in process of National Board Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher of the Month, Finalist for Excellence in Teaching Program from Corning Cable Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initially Licensed Teacher of the Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing the Achievement Gap County Recognition / Teacher of the Month / Eye of the Eagle Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Teaching Award (Principal's award)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who’s Who Among America's High School Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Jewell Teaching Excellence Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 NCCTM Outstanding Educator Award for Alexander County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who's Who Among American Teachers / Cambridge Women Educator Nomination /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was nominated for our School's &quot;Distinguished Young Educator&quot; Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Funniest&quot; and &quot;Most Memorable&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Teacher of the Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nominated several times by students to Who's Who Among America's Teachers / *Cambridge's Who's Who Among Professionals in Education / *Several school-level awards (recognition by peers and administrators)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU Latham Award (Student Teaching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ Award for Excellence in Granville County Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
Response Rates by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>% of SAMPLE</th>
<th>TAKERS</th>
<th>% of TAKERS</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELON</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEREDITH</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA&amp;T</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCU</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSU</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-A</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-C</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-CH</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-G</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-P</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-W</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCU</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1813</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the six campuses that did not have participation equal to that of their campus sample percentage, only two had less than 2% of what would have constituted a fully representative sample.
## APPENDIX H

Geographic Distribution of Respondents versus Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SAMPL</th>
<th>TAKERS</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NC</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>NON-NC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Map of North Carolina showing survey respondents and potential respondents](image-url)
APPENDIX I
Exploratory Factor Analysis Table
Using Varimax Rotation

Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Leadership Empowerment</th>
<th>2 Facilities and resources</th>
<th>3 Professional Development</th>
<th>4 Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V53</td>
<td>1:TIMGENSATI_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V54</td>
<td>1:TIMGENSATI_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V55</td>
<td>1:TIMGENSATI_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V56</td>
<td>1:TIMGENSATI_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V57</td>
<td>1:TIMGENSATI_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V59</td>
<td>1:TIMA#TNONI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V60</td>
<td>1:TIMSLFR#NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V61</td>
<td>1:TIM#INDVPL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V62</td>
<td>1:TIM#COLLPL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V63</td>
<td>1:TIMAV#OUTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V64</td>
<td>1:TIMSFRPTOU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V72</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_1</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V73</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_2</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V74</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_3</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V75</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_4</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V76</td>
<td>1/2:LDGENSAT_5</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V77 1/2:LDGENSAT_6 .676
V78 1/2:LDGENSAT_7 .452
V79 1/2:LDGENSAT_8 .814
V80 1/2:LDGENSAT_9 .708
V81 1/2:LDGENSAT_10 .674
V82 1/2:LDGENSAT_11 .532
V83 1/2:LDGENSAT_12 .631
V84 1/2:LDGENSAT_13 .656
V85 1/2:LDGENSAT_14 .695
V86 1/2:LDADCCRN_1 .600
V87 1/2:LDADCCRN_2 .663
V88 1/2:LDADCCRN_3 .565
V89 1/2:LDADCCRN_4 .776
V90 1/2:LDADCCRN_5 .797
V91 1/2:LDADCCRN_6 .631
V92 1/2:LDUSEFUL .845
V94 1/2:EMPGENS_1 .707
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( V )</th>
<th>( 1/2: \text{EMPGENSA}_x )</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V99</td>
<td>( 1/2: \text{EMPROLES}_1 )</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V105</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V111</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRGENSAT_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRGENSAT_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRGENSAT_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRGENSAT_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V115</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRGENSAT_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V116</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V117</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V118</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V119</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V120</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V121</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V122</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V123</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V125</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V126</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V127</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V128</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLSO_13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V131</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V132</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V133</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V134</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V135</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V137</td>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V138</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V139</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:FRPRBLEX_11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V140</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:PDGENSAT_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V141</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:PDGENSAT_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V142</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:PDGENSAT_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V143</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:PDGENSAT_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V144</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2:PDGENSAT_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J
Working Conditions Construct Variable and Retention Variable Questions

As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis, the working construct variable of professional development emerged from the following sets of professional development questions.

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your own professional development and professional development in your school.

1. **Sufficient funds and resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development activities.**
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

2. **Teachers are provided opportunities to learn from one another.**
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

3. **Adequate time is provided for professional development.**
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

4. **Teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.**
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

5. **Professional development provides teachers with the knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively.**
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree
As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis, the working construct variable of *facilities and resources* emerged from the following sets of *facilities and resources* questions.

1. **Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is safe.**
   
   1=Strongly Agree  
   2=Agree  
   3=Neutral  
   4=Disagree  
   5=Strongly Disagree

To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur with students at your school?

2. **Physical conflicts among students**
   
   1=Never happens  
   2=Happens on occasion  
   3=Happens at least once a month  
   4=Happens at least once a week  
   5=Happens daily

3. **Robbery or theft**
   
   1=Never happens  
   2=Happens on occasion  
   3=Happens at least once a month  
   4=Happens at least once a week  
   5=Happens daily

4. **Vandalism**
   
   1=Never happens  
   2=Happens on occasion  
   3=Happens at least once a month  
   4=Happens at least once a week  
   5=Happens daily

5. **Use of alcohol**
   
   1=Never happens  
   2=Happens on occasion  
   3=Happens at least once a month  
   4=Happens at least once a week  
   5=Happens daily

6. **Use of illegal drugs**
   
   1=Never happens  
   2=Happens on occasion  
   3=Happens at least once a month  
   4=Happens at least once a week  
   5=Happens daily

7. **Possession of weapons**
1=Never happens
2=Happens on occasion
3=Happens at least once a month
4=Happens at least once a week
5=Happens daily

8. **Physical abuse of teachers**
   1=Never happens
   2=Happens on occasion
   3=Happens at least once a month
   4=Happens at least once a week
   5=Happens daily

9. **Student racial tensions**
   1=Never happens
   2=Happens on occasion
   3=Happens at least once a month
   4=Happens at least once a week
   5=Happens daily

10. **Student bullying**
    1=Never happens
    2=Happens on occasion
    3=Happens at least once a month
    4=Happens at least once a week
    5=Happens daily

11. **Student verbal abuse of teachers**
    1=Never happens
    2=Happens on occasion
    3=Happens at least once a month
    4=Happens at least once a week
    5=Happens daily

12. **Widespread disorder in classrooms**
    1=Never happens
    2=Happens on occasion
    3=Happens at least once a month
    4=Happens at least once a week
    5=Happens daily

13. **Student acts of disrespect for teachers**
    1=Never happens
    2=Happens on occasion
    3=Happens at least once a month
    4=Happens at least once a week
    5=Happens daily
14. Gang activities
   1=Never happens
   2=Happens on occasion
   3=Happens at least once a month
   4=Happens at least once a week
   5=Happens daily

To what extent is each of the following a problem in your school?

15. Students come to school unprepared to learn
   1=Not a problem
   2=Minor problem
   3=Moderate problem
   4=Serious problem

16. Poor student health
   1=Not a problem
   2=Minor problem
   3=Moderate problem
   4=Serious problem

As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis, the working construct variable of time emerged from the following sets of time questions.

1. In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do most teachers at your school generally have available for non-instructional time?
   1=None
   2=Less than 3 hours
   3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
   4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
   5=More than 10 hours

2. In an average week of teaching at your school, how many hours do you have available for non-instructional time?
   1=None
   2=Less than 3 hours
   3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
   4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
   5=More than 10 hours

3. Of those hours of non-instructional time during an average week of teaching at your school, how many are available for individual planning?
   1=None
   2=Less than 3 hours
   3=More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
   4=More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
   5=More than 10 hours
As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis, the working construct variable of leadership-empowerment emerged from the following sets of leadership-empowerment questions.

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in your school.

1. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

2. The faculty are committed to helping every student learn.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

3. The school leadership communicates clear expectations to students and parents.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

4. The school leadership shields teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

5. The school leadership consistently enforces rules for student conduct.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

6. The school leadership support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

7. Opportunities are available for members of the community to actively contribute to this school's success.
1=Strongly Agree
2=Agree
3=Neutral
4=Disagree
5=Strongly Disagree

8. The school leadership consistently supports teachers.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

9. The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

10. The faculty and staff have a shared vision.
    1=Strongly Agree
    2=Agree
    3=Neutral
    4=Disagree
    5=Strongly Disagree

11. Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.
    1=Strongly Agree
    2=Agree
    3=Neutral
    4=Disagree
    5=Strongly Disagree

12. Teacher performance evaluations are handled in an appropriate manner.
    1=Strongly Agree
    2=Agree
    3=Neutral
    4=Disagree
    5=Strongly Disagree

13. The procedures for teacher performance evaluations are consistent.
    1=Strongly Agree
    2=Agree
    3=Neutral
    4=Disagree
    5=Strongly Disagree

14. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.
    1=Strongly Agree
    2=Agree
    3=Neutral
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about:

15. Facilities and resources
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

16. The use of time in my school
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

17. Professional development
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

18. Empowering teachers
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

19. Leadership issues
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

20. New teacher support
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

21. Overall, the school leadership in my school is effective.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher empowerment in your school.

22. Teachers are centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

23. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

24. The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions and solving problems.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

25. In this school we take steps to solve problems.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

26. Opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession (other than administration) are available to me.
   1=Strongly Agree
   2=Agree
   3=Neutral
   4=Disagree
   5=Strongly Disagree

Please indicate how large a role teachers at your school have in each of the following areas:

27. Selecting instructional materials and resources
   1=Primary role
   2=Large role
   3=Moderate role
   4=Small role
28. **Devising teaching techniques**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role  
   3=Moderate role  
   4=Small role  
   5=No role at all

29. **Setting grading and student assessment practices**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role  
   3=Moderate role  
   4=Small role  
   5=No role at all

30. **Determining the content of in-service professional development programs**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role  
   3=Moderate role  
   4=Small role  
   5=No role at all

31. **Hiring new teachers**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role  
   3=Moderate role  
   4=Small role  
   5=No role at all

32. **Evaluating teachers**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role  
   3=Moderate role  
   4=Small role  
   5=No role at all

33. **Establishing and implementing policies about student discipline**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role  
   3=Moderate role  
   4=Small role  
   5=No role at all

34. **Deciding how the school budget will be spent**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role  
   3=Moderate role  
   4=Small role  
   5=No role at all

35. **School improvement planning**
   1=Primary role  
   2=Large role
The retention variable was a result of answers to the following retention questions.

36. Which best describes your future intentions for your professional career?
   1=Continue teaching at my current school
   2=Continue teaching at my current school until a better opportunity comes along.
   3=Continue teaching but leave this school as soon as I can.
   4=Continue teaching but leave this district as soon as I can.
   5=Leave the profession all together.

37. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, how likely is it that you would still become a teacher?
   1=Certainly would become a teacher
   2=Probably would become a teacher
   3=Chances about even for and against
   4=Probably would not become a teacher
   5=Certainly would not become a teacher

38. Which of the following statements best describes how long you plan to remain in teaching?
   1=As long as I am able
   2=Until I am eligible for retirement
   3=Will probably continue unless something better comes along
   4=Definitely plan to leave teaching as soon as I can
   5=Undecided at this time

39. In the last 12 months, have you applied for a job in an attempt to leave the teaching profession?
   1=Yes
   2=No
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