

The Effects of The United States Government on Educators

Jessica Zollinhofer

A Senior Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for graduation
in the Honors Program
Liberty University
Fall 2016

Acceptance of Senior Honors Thesis

This Senior Honors Thesis is accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation from the Honors Program of Liberty University.

Deanna Keith, Ed.D.
Thesis Chair

Margaret Ackerman, Ed.D.
Committee Member

Elizabeth Berry, M.S.
Committee Member

James H. Nutter, D.A.
Honors Director

Date

Abstract

This thesis is an attempt to understand the correlation between the modern day United States government and current educators. The research founded the correlation to a reason, or several reasons, behind the deficit of educators in different fields of education, which included but is not limited to: teacher salary, leaving the field, dissatisfaction. The history of governmental involvement in education was pertinent in explaining where different responsibilities on educators originated from, such as Least Restrictive Environment, standardized testing, etc. The relationship between these two establishments reaches a critical point at teachers and directly affects teacher efficacy and turnover. In conclusion, based off the deficits in different aspects of educators, several problems will be identified and some resolutions as well.

The Effects Of The United States Government On Educators

Since the establishment of the American educational system, the discipline of education has diversified, specialized, and grown exponentially. The changing and shifting of the educational establishment has had varying effects on students, educators, and the system as a whole. In more recent years, the recruitment and retention of educators has become increasingly significant. The rate at which educators are leaving the educational field is disproportionate to the number of qualified teachers entering into it. The present-day United States school system and governmental standards have had an effect on the recruitment and retention of educators.

The Federal Government

The present effects of systems and standards on educators are most clearly understood by establishing a guideline to which these systems and standards can be compared. An analysis of the history of education, including the contributions of the government and its standards to education over the past several decades, can help to determine this premise. The historical analysis will specifically address key components of national governmental systems standards, their implementation at local school systems, and their effect on local educators.

During America's founding years, the original colonies were still establishing how to survive in the new land. The colonists' main focus was on food, shelter, and surviving the winter. The colonies were isolated and focused on their own community; therefore, any schooling that took place was not centralized amongst all 13 colonies, but the individual homes and potential small community (Goldin, 1999). As the colonies grew, and eventually became states, education shifted to one-room schoolhouses in the

midst of the small communities and then grew into “common schools” that were operated by the local government or community but generally not funded through them (Goldin, 1999). The great shift in education occurred following the American Civil War where education expanded. Many adopted the New England township model; however, new rural states were too dispersed to create such a centralized model (Goldin, 1999). Most schools in this model were fiscally independent, as their state, and the federal government, were not centralized enough to handle the large capacity of schools throughout all the different states (Goldin, 1999). As a result, schools, or their local governing bodies, were completely independent and able to govern their schools based on their local communities and populations.

The United States government has one of the greatest impacts on national education as it is funded through taxpayer dollars (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Within the government there are two sections that have an abundant influence on education: laws and policies, and standards (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). While standards are put in place either through state or federal government, there are numerous facets of federal law and policy that derive from three major components of government: the Department of Education, the Supreme Court, and Congressional Acts. The summation of these parts of government, and the decisions they make, all come together and affect the local school systems, specifically the educators.

The history of the Department of Education and the congressional acts passed as a result of this department is necessary in order to identify the framework through which the current federal education Department has come to be and their current level of influence. The Department of Education was created in 1867 when it was signed into

legislation by President Johnson as a data collection department to help the states gain new information to improve their local school systems (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). In 1890 Congress passed the Second Morrill Act in order to provide support for college and university preparation, and in 1917 the Smith-Hughes Act was passed to support vocational education (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Then the George-Barden Act was passed in 1946 to provide training in agricultural, industrial, and home economics for high-school students (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). As a result of communities having an extra military presence in World War II, The Lanham Act and Impact Aid Laws were passed to assist local schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). In 1958, Congress countered Soviet's creation of Sputnik by passing the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in order to assure that there were highly trained individuals in scientific and technical fields (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). During the 1960s and 1970s civil rights and anti-poverty movements, the Department of Education's mission of equality became vibrant. Laws such as Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1971, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 established the prohibition of discrimination based off of any sex, race, or disability (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Also, in 1965 the Title I program was created in order to provide Federal assistance to disadvantaged children (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). The Department of Education became part of the Cabinet level in 1980 and currently has influence on "18,200 school districts and over 50 million students attending roughly 98,000 public schools and 32,000 private school" (Federal Role in Education, 2016).

The Department of Education, with congressional support, has expanded their influence through several acts and policies (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). In a similar sense, the Supreme Court has also had major influence through several major court cases and determining their constitutionality. The Supreme Court has had an equal impact on school systems, if not a greater, than the Department of Education. Several major court cases established the great impact the Supreme Court has had on educational systems. The Supreme Court case that was the catalyst for the prominent impact occurred in 1896 with *Plessy v. Ferguson* (Plessy vs. Ferguson, n.d.). The Supreme Court established that separate but equal facilities were within constitutional bounds, resulting in segregated school systems (Plessy vs. Ferguson, n.d.). In 1954, the Supreme Court overturned their own decision by stating that segregation of public facilities is inherently unequal in the case *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka* (Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, n.d.). As a result, schools became integrated, and that was one of the most expansive changes that occurred to the United States educational system (Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, n.d.). The Supreme Court has also ruled on a plethora of other cases, which impacted school policies and federal laws. *Tinker v. Des Moines* established that a student has a right to free speech unless the school can prove that the behavior interferes with school operations (Stahl, 2015). The Supreme Court also decided in *New Jersey v. TLO* that the fourth amendment does not restrain the actions of school officials and that students have a right to a certain level of privacy, but that if the search is reasonable it does not violate the fourth amendment (Stahl, 2015). In 2007, a Supreme Court case *Parents Involved In Community Schools v. Seattle* established that affirmative action does not apply to public schools and that racial diversity is not a compelling

government interest for public school admission (Stahl, 2015). As a result, they held that denying a student based off of their race for the interest of achieving diversity is unconstitutional. As the Supreme Court is the highest Court in our governmental system, their decisions carry a lot of influence and as a result, their decisions are a major catalyst for an innumerable amount of changes within the education system.

The third major facet of the government that causes the greatest changes within education is Congress, specifically Congressional laws. Currently, Congress has several current and major national laws in place regarding education. Every Student Succeeds Act is currently replacing the No Child Left Behind and is a reauthorization of the original 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was the first Act to expand the role of federal government in public education (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) is the Act that gives the right to “inspect and review education records within 45 days of a request; seek to amend education records believed to be inaccurate; and consent to the disclosure of personally identifiable information from education records, except as specified by law” (Family Policy Compliance Office, n.d.). Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is the law that preserves the rights of students with disabilities and has a great impact on education through the mandate of LRE (least restrictive environment) (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). This states that all students with disabilities need to be placed in an environment that is as integrated with the typical student population as appropriate (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA) was enacted in 2014 in order to help get Americans into occupations and help employers preserve skilled personnel (U.S. Department of

Education, n.d.). The Higher Education Act was enacted in 2008 to provide federal student aid to help students pursue Higher Education (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). In addition, there are also smaller laws that have the same level of influence on school systems such as Section 504 of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). These Acts were written in order to protect rights of students from discrimination against race, sex, or disability within the educational system. In order to protect those rights and obey the laws, the schools submit to the regulations and stipulations placed on them (Laws and Guidance, n.d.).

The influence of the government systems on education through these laws is more clearly shown through their effect on the everyday classroom. The connection between a federal law created by Congress and an elementary school teacher is necessary to understand the true effect that the government has on the recruitment and retention of educators. As an example, IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) protects the rights of students with disabilities and ensures that the atypical students have access to an equal education in the Least Restrictive Environment (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). The Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is defined in IDEA as follows:

To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in

regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (U.S. Department of Education, 2005)

As a result, students are placed in general education classroom with general education teachers. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, 94.8% of all students with disabilities spend some time in a general education classroom (2016). This adds responsibilities to the general education teachers, most of whom only have degrees in Elementary Education, and therefore do not have an extensive special education background. IDEA also established that the students have access to whatever resources necessary in order for them to receive a quality education; this could include therapy, an aid, different technology, a different activity, extra time, etc. (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). IDEA clearly and strictly protects the rights of the students. When the law was enacted, the responsibilities to abide by this law were delegated to the educators. This delegation changed the educator's methods, curriculum, responsibility, classroom function, morale, etc. IDEA was one law that was created in the last fifty years that has completely rewritten the teacher's job description.

A second example would be the Supreme Court decision made in *Brown vs. The Board of Education* to desegregate public schools. The decision was made to uphold the rights of the students in public schools; however, the impact of the law fell greatly on the local teachers: "In 1954, the year of the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, approximately 82,000 African American teachers were responsible for the education of the nation's two million African American public school students" (Hawkins, 1994 as cited in Hudson, & Holmes, 1994). The affects of integration continued it's great impact as: "A decade later, over 38,000 Black teachers

and administrators had lost their positions in 17 southern and border states” (Ethridge, 1979, & Holmes, 1990, as cited in Hudson, & Holmes, 1994). The remaining educators had to adjust to new students, new social change, new classroom dynamics, new methods, new demographics, etc. Similar to IDEA, this was a single decision that had an enormous impact on education. Over the last fifty years, the government has written numerous new laws, standards, etc. Each of these laws, policies, decisions, and standards, elicited their own unique change on the school system, the students, and specifically the educators.

Within the governmental system, the Department of Education, Supreme Court, and Congress creates laws and enforces policies that are mandatory for schools to participate in. These policies are influential because if the schools either intentionally, or unintentionally break the law; then there are direct legal repercussions. However, within the governmental system there are standards put in place alongside laws and policies. These standards, such as Common Core standards, however, are not laws and therefore school systems are not required to follow them (Common Core, 2016). Common Core standards are standards created to bring uniformity to the goals students in the United States need to meet in order to be ready for college and career (Common Core, 2016). These standards are different than many of the standards each state had in place, causing another prominent change within the local school systems if the state chooses to implement the standards. However, states that choose to adopt Common Core Standards were eligible to compete for federal funding, while those states that opted out, were ineligible to apply for additional funding (Common Core, 2016). As a result, schools that

opted out of using the Common Core Standards place themselves under financial repercussions.

Another major change the government is creating, through laws, policies, and standards, is uniformity across all fifty states. In order to receive funding and abide by the laws, the school systems must attempt and succeed at applying the standards and policies stated (Common Core, 2016). With an increase of requirements, the government needed a way to measure if the school systems were abiding by their laws and meeting their standards. As a result, the government started creating different methods of accountability. Over the last several decades, the accountability method that has been most prominently used has been standardized testing (Dodson, 2007). In order to receive funding, or even avoid legal repercussions, the school districts require their students to achieve a specified benchmark score (Dodson, 2007). If the students are unable to meet their score, their teachers, their individual schools, and their school systems are held accountable (Dodson, 2007). The term “high-stakes testing” derived from these standardized tests, as well as the correlation of the increasing pressures placed on the students and teachers (Dodson, 2017). High-stakes testing has had one of the greatest impacts throughout educational history on teacher efficacy. The fairness associated with placing a teacher’s success or failure on a student’s ability to test to a specific score has been consistently at the spotlight of controversial topics (Ballard & Bates, 2008).

The federal government has established uniformity as the goal of the educational system through Common Core Standards. Uniformity amongst 50 states, with several hundreds and thousands of schools in each state, it is statistically impossible to reach total

uniformity. Therefore, even amongst the 42 states that elected to adopt Common Core, there are variables that affect their school systems (Standards in Your State, 2016).

Decisions on how to implement the standards, including the right supports to put in place, are made at the state and local levels. As such, states and localities are taking different approaches to implementing the standards and providing their teachers with the supports they need to help students successfully reach the standards. (Frequently Asked Questions, 2016)

The states' educational boards and state governments are given the flexibility to implement the standards and assessments how they prefer; however, by choosing to implement Common Core standards, they are simultaneously choosing to assess using a Common Core approved assessment (Common Core, 2016). Only two assessments are currently available: Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (Smart Balanced) (Common Core, 2016). Both assessments were state-led consortia: PARCC has Colorado, District of Columbia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Rhode Island using their assessment system fully, while Smarter Balance has Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Michigan, West Virginia, Vermont, New Hampshire, Delaware and Connecticut fully participating in their assessment (Parcc) (Members and Governance, n.d.). Even amongst those who opted to implement Common Core, there is discrepancy. Therefore, if every state is analyzed, the impossibility of uniformity amongst their policies, procedures, will be even more prominent.

The State And Local Government

The correlation between government and teacher efficacy is a complex relationship with many varying factors. The impact of the government on education is obviously prominent; however, the demographics of the educators as shown through, empirical and statistical data is needed to explain the other impacts of the correlation between the two establishments. The State and Local Government is the direct link between the two establishments and through understanding the impact of the local government, the correlation between government implementations and teacher efficacy will become apparent.

The role of the state government is to directly oversee education at all levels within their state (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). The state government is in charge of the political, fiscal and administrative systems, as well as ensuring their schools systems follow the national laws and regulations (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). Each state has their own specific policies regarding their school systems but every state must perform the following duties:

- Providing funding for public education at all levels;
- Licensing or chartering private schools and public and private institutions of higher education;
- Providing oversight and guidance to local school boards;
- Setting broad policies for school-level curricula, texts, standards, and assessments (but not higher education);
- Licensing school teachers and other educational personnel;

- Overseeing the provision of educational services for persons living with disabilities, adults needing basic education services, and other special needs populations;
- Setting the standards for examining and licensing persons seeking to work in any regulated professional occupation; and
- Electing or appointing some or all of the members of the governing boards of public higher education institutions and state boards of education. (U.S. Department of Education, 2008)

Every state is responsible for ensuring that the preceding duties are satisfied, however, their methods for accomplishing their responsibilities differentiate from state to state (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). One aspect that is consistent among all states however, is their high rate of turnover and their shortage of teachers (Cross, 2016).

The shortage of teachers is something every state has in common. According to U.S. Department of Education's report "Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing 1990–1991 through 2016–2017" every state for the 2016-2017 has shortages in specific educational positions (Cross, 2016). A Teacher Shortage Area is defined as "an area of specific grade, subject matter or discipline classification, or a geographic area in which the Secretary determines that there is an inadequate supply of elementary or secondary school teachers" (Cross, 2016). Each state has their own shortage demographic and their own need for specific educators, but the shortage is prominent across the board. In order to have a valid Teacher Shortage Area placed into the national report, every state has to bring their proposed Teacher Shortage areas to the Department of Education (Cross, 2016). Once the proposal is given to the Department of Education, they verify that the

data for that area of education in that specific state is accurate and falls within the specifications given by the Department (Cross, 2016).

In addition to the national shortage of educators in specific fields, another major area of concern is the lack of college students entering the field of education and ultimately filling those shortages. In 2015 UCLA's Cooperative Institutional Research Program released a survey completed amongst college freshman. This survey has been completed since 1971 and asked a variety of different questions spanning from diversity to college choice (Backgrounds and Beliefs of College Freshmen, 2016). They specifically posed the question, "What is your probable field of study?" and according to the results given only 4.2% of college freshmen gave Education as their field of study (Backgrounds and Beliefs of College Freshmen, 2016). This is the lowest recorded percentage of college freshman choosing education as their major since the survey began in 1971 (Backgrounds and Beliefs of College Freshmen, 2016), in comparison to 9.9% in 2005, 10% in 1995, 6.8% in 1985, and 11.2% in 1975 (Backgrounds and Beliefs of College Freshmen, 2016). The number of teachers leaving the field entirely in 2013 was 259,400 while the number of college students graduating with education degrees in the same year was 98,854 (National Center for Education Statistics). Based off of the data this leaves a deficit of 160,546 educational positions open to be filled for the year 2013 alone. If the rate of teachers leaving the field remains unequal to the number of college students receiving degrees in education, the deficit will only increase, potentially by 160,000 educators per year. Within six years, that could potentially reach a deficit of over one million educators across the United States.

The Education Commission of the States completed a report titled *Eight Questions on Teacher Recruitment and Retention: What Does the Research Say?* in September of 2005 that is essential to debrief. The research establishes that the demographic of the “teacher workforce continues to be predominantly white (86%) and female (79%)” (Allen, 2005, v). Historically, the educational field was one of the few fields women could enter into. In the time prior to integration, the educational field was one of the incredibly limited occupations African American women could enter into (Hudson & Holmes, 1994). Succeeding *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, as stated previously, there were 38,000 African American educators who lost their job because of integrated school districts (Hudson & Holmes, 1994). As American culture is continuously changing and evolving, women have an enormous amount of job opportunities, outside of the historically traditional roles such as education, that are now available to them (Goldin, 2006). The research also supports this claim by stating that over the last 30 years a growing percentage of women decided to enter into different careers other than teaching as additional careers are available for them (Goldin, 2006). Availability and interest alone is a major factor in choosing an occupation, but another major factor that should be taken into account is financial. Based off of financial data, salary would be a motivating factor to enter into a field besides education.

The Education Commission collected data and information on the effect of compensation on the recruitment and retention of teachers: “The research provides strong support for the conclusions that compensation plays a key role in the recruitment and retention of teachers. Not surprisingly, the research indicates that increasing compensation tends to increase the rate of teacher retention” (Allen, 2005, ix). The

average national starting salary for a full-time teacher with a bachelor's degree is \$30,377 (National Education Association, 2016). Simultaneously, other college graduates with similar training and responsibilities enter fields with significantly higher salaries, generally between \$43,000 and \$46,000 (National Education Association, 2016). That is over \$10,000 more based on starting salary alone. While there are opportunities for raises within education, those are inconsistent and based off of state government and funding. Outside of a bachelor's education, the deficit in financial compensation only increases with the level of education earned. The average salary for a full-time teacher with a master's degree is \$53,800. While that is significantly higher than a teacher with a Bachelor's degree, the amount does not equate to the total given to employees in other fields who earned master's degrees (Pfeuffer, n.d.). The average median pay for an employee maintaining master's degrees fluctuates between \$83,000-110,000 (Pfeuffer, n.d.). The highest a master's degree full-time educator can earn is on average \$30,000 less than the median pay of a master's degree (Pfeuffer, n.d.). This financial deficit coincides with the conclusion drawn by Education Commission.

The Education Commission found that those college graduates with the highest intellectual proficiency are less likely to go into teaching than other college graduates (Allen, 2005, v). This conclusion, coalesced with the financial data, exemplifies the correlation between the two. If an intellectual student has the ability to pursue a Master's career, it makes more sense to pursue an occupation outside of education solely based off of financial feasibility. The summation of the evidence found in the first question researched by the Education Commission, provides a collaborative representation of

different reasons college graduates, as well as graduates with Master's degrees are choosing not to enter into the education workforce.

The logical conclusion, if based on finances alone, would be to enter into a field other than education. That supposition accounts for a partial reason for the deficit of teachers entering into the education field. However, if educators based their rationale for teaching solely on a financial basis, the turnover rate would be higher: "There is moderate evidence that working conditions may, in some cases, trump salary as a factor in teacher retention, and it is relative salary between districts that is the important consideration" (Allen, 2005, ix). The working conditions correlate to the state and local government and their decisions on how to specifically implement the laws, policies, and standards given to them by the federal government. The conglomeration of all of those decisions, in addition to school administration's implementation, amounts to a specific working condition that affects teachers on a daily basis.

A major aspect of an educator's working conditions is the demographic of the school system, or specific school they are placed in. There is evidence supporting the statement that educators educating in secondary schools have a greater attrition rate than those among elementary school teachers (Allen, 2005, vii). The research was inconclusive in regards to the claim that different grade levels within secondary education affected attrition, including the difference between middle school and high school (Allen, 2005, vii). It was found that "the research literature provides moderate evidence that teacher turnover is greater in schools with relatively higher proportions of low-income, minority and academically low-performing students" (Allen, 2005, vii). This conclusion supports the public opinion of the lack of consistent high-quality teachers in relation to

teachers in high-poverty, low-income schools. A surprising conclusion enlightened through the research is that the turnover rate is greater in smaller schools across all types of schools, regardless of whether they were private, public, secondary, elementary, etc (Allen, 2005, vii). In a public push for smaller schools, the research does not support their effectiveness in retaining effective teachers in small schools.

Outside of the placement of a specific educator, numerous working conditions affect educators. A study completed in 2012-2013 by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) surveyed teachers from varying school districts, differing in size, demographic, staffing, administration, etc. The NCES received this data through their Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the appendage, the Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS):

This is the largest and most comprehensive data source available on the staffing, occupational, and organizational aspects of elementary and secondary schools. The U.S. Census Bureau collects the SASS data for NCES from a random sample of schools stratified by state, public/private sector, and school level... Each cycle of the SASS includes separate, but linked questionnaires for school and district administrators and for a random sample of teachers in each school. In addition, after 12 months, the same schools are again contacted and all those in the original teacher sample who had moved from or left their teaching jobs are given a second questionnaire to obtain information on their departures. This latter group, along with a representative sample of those who stayed in their teaching jobs, comprise the TFS. Unlike most previous data sources on teacher turnover, the TFS is large, comprehensive, national representative; includes the reasons teachers themselves

give for their departures; and includes a wide range of information on the characteristics and conditions of the schools that employ teachers. (Ingersoll & May, 2012)

The summation of the data received during the 2012-2013 SASS cycle on teacher turnover between the 2011-2012 school year and the 2012-2013 school year will be used to establish the recent rates and causations of turnover in the education field.

The National Center for Education Statistics identified three main categories that teachers are placed in: “stayers”, “movers”, and “leavers” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). “Stayers” are teachers who taught in the same school in 2013, as they did during the base year, 2012 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). “Movers” are teachers who remained in the educational field, but taught in a different school in 2013 than they did during 2012 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). “Leavers” are teacher who left the teaching profession entirely after 2012 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). There were 3,377,900 teachers during 2012-13 SASS cycle, of those 3.1 million 84.3% were “Stayers”, 8.1% were "Movers", and 7.7% were “Leavers” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). The NCES subcategorized the data into thirteen different overarching categories: School classification, Teaching experience, Age, Base salary, Sex, Race/ethnicity, Main assignment field, Teaching Status, Certification type, Community type, School level, School enrollment, and Percent of K-12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Within the thirteen different categories, each category has at least two subsections of it’s own resulting in a plethora of data, most of which falls in close alignment with the national average . The

data that identifies potential problems or solutions in the educational system is elicited from the categories that are significantly different from the national average. Any characteristic found averaging less than 80.5% of teachers staying has a problem regarding teacher retention. Any characteristic found averaging over 88.5% of teachers staying could identify a possible solution to teacher turnover. Therefore, “significantly different” is identified as any category or subsection with an average rate of stayers that is less than or equal to 80.5% or greater than or equal to 88.5%.

Fourteen specific characteristics fall into one of the two categories. Only four of those fourteen are found averaging on or over 88.5%, the other ten characteristics fall below 80.5%. The four characteristics are teachers who have 10-19 years of teaching experiences, teachers who are 40-49 years old, teachers who identify as “Asian, non-Hispanic”, and teachers who identify as “Two or more races, non-Hispanic” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who have been teaching 10-19 years have an average of 88.5% staying, 5.6% moving, and 5.9% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who are between the ages of 40 and 49 years have an average of 90.1% staying, 5.9 moving, and 4.0% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers between the ages of 40 and 49 actually have the lowest percentage of leavers out of all of the categories and subsections (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who identify as “Asian, non-Hispanic” have an average of 95.8% staying and no data on teachers leaving or moving as it was identified as not having met the reporting standard (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who identify as “Two or more races, non-Hispanic” have an average of 88.8%

of staying and again, no data on teachers leaving or moving as it did not meet the reporting standard (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013).

The ten different characteristics of teachers whose average percentage is under 80.5% are: teachers that have 1-3 years of experience, teachers who are less than 30 years old, teachers who are 50 years old and older, teachers whose base salary is less than \$30,000, teachers who identify as “Black, non-Hispanic”, teachers who identify as “Hispanic, regardless of race”, teachers who identify as “American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic”, teachers who teach part time, teachers who have “none of the above certifications in this state”, teachers who are in a combined school (some combination of primary, middle, and high), teachers in a school that have a percent of K-12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches is 75% or more (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013).

Teachers who have 1-3 years of experience have an average of 80.4% staying, 12.5% moving, and 7.1% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who are less than 30 years old have an average of 78.8% staying, 13.7% moving, and 7.5% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who are 50 years old or older have an average of 80.4% staying, 6.6 moving, and 13.1% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who base salary is less than \$30,000 have an average of 69.4% staying, 15.7% moving, and 14.8% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). This preceding category is the highest rate of turnover, excluding part time educators. Teachers who identify as “Black, non-Hispanic” have an average of 78.2% staying, 11.7% moving, and 10.1% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who identify as “Hispanic,

regardless of race” have an average of 79.4% staying, 12.6% moving, and 8.0% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who identify as “American Indian/Alaska Native, non-Hispanic” have an average of 78.8% staying, but no data on moving or leaving as it did not meet the reporting standard (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who teach part time have an average 66.6% staying, 15.0% moving, and 18.4 leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Under the category of Certification type, there are 5 different certification types: “Regular or standard state certificate or advanced professional certificate, Certificate issued after satisfying all requirements except the completion of a probationary period, Certificate that requires some additional coursework, student teaching, or passage of a test before regular certification can be obtained, Certificate issued to persons who must complete a certification program in order to continue, and none of the above certifications in this state” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who were characterized as “none of the above certification in this state” have an average of 72.3% staying, no data for moving, and 15.2% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers who are in a combined school (some combination of primary, middle, and high) have an average of 78.1% staying, 10.3% moving, and 11.6% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Teachers in a school that have a percent of K-12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches is 75% or more have an average of 78.0% staying, 12.2% moving, and 9.8% leaving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013).

This data shows the high-risk and low-risk demographics of teacher turnover. Specific characteristics of schools and teachers have higher rates of turnovers and

therefore a possible causation can be identified among those characteristics. For example, low salary is already an established problem in the education field, and in concordance with high turnover rates, low salary is a potential cause for an educator to leave the field (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Similarly, teachers in a school that have a percent of K-12 students who were approved for free or reduced-price lunches at 75% or higher, have a higher turnover rate; therefore, a causation could be identified as teachers who teach in schools with low SES students have higher rates of turnover (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013).

The data also shows characteristics that do not affect turnover as much, such as the field a teacher enters. All of the teachers had a normal turnover average, no matter what specific field they entered into (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). The same is identified amongst the community type. City, Suburban, Town and Rural communities types all had averages that were normal for turnover rates (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Therefore, a community type or an assignment field would not be a place of causation for turnover or for the causation or retention.

The influence of the local and state education is exemplified through the statistical data shown. Based off the completed studies, the different effects of local policy decisions are demonstrated. By understanding the effects of local policies on decisions, the connection between specific policies and teacher efficacy can be identified. When the connections are identified, the problems that caused the deficit of teachers in the system can be identified.

Teacher Efficacy

Teacher efficacy or self-efficacy is a key variable in predicting burnout and as a result, teacher turnover (Fernet, 2011). Teacher Efficacy is defined as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 202). As teacher turnover is prominent across all 50 states, the causation of the issue is incredibly important: “A recent study on teacher motivation indicated that autonomous types of motivation (intrinsic motivation and identified regulation) toward work activities are negatively related to burnout, whereas controlled types of motivation (introjected and external regulation) are positively associated with burnout” (Fernet, 2011, p. 516). These findings explain that the types of motivations teachers have are influential in explaining turnover. This connection is crucial because it creates the association between regulations and teacher efficacy, which ultimately affects teacher turnover.

The environment a person is placed in can either facilitate or hinder motivational factors, which can therefore affect self-efficacy (Fernet, 2011):

Autonomy-supportive conditions allow teachers to make certain choices and decisions about their work and develop a meaningful rationale. They also minimize pressure, provide competence feedback, and acknowledge teachers’ feelings and views (Deci, Eghrari, Patrick, & Leone, 1994). These conditions parallel job resources, because they are thought to be functional in achieving work goals (Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) and they allow the satisfaction of basic psychological needs such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Conversely, controlling factors-such as imposed

goals, time restraints, or contingent rewards-constrain and pressure how teachers think, feel, and behave. Such conditions preclude energy investment and may become job stressors. (p. 516)

This correlation is the purpose for this paper. This correlation supports the idea that the different decisions the government makes eventually affects the classroom environment. This impact can either affect teachers by motivating them or hindering them (Fernet, 2011). The impact of the United States government on their educators is one of additional responsibility. Since the creation of public education, numerous laws, regulations, and standards have been adopted (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Starting at the beginning of the Department of Education's creation in 1867, there have been at least 9 major Acts that have been passed and countless Supreme Court cases that impacted Education (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). As a result of these major acts and Supreme Court Cases, there were innumerable amounts of policies and laws put into place that affected the teachers, such as *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka Kansas* caused the integration which fell onto the local school systems and local school teachers to implement (Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, n.d.). The unintended resulting impact of these policies placed imposed goals, time restraints, and constrained and pressured how teachers think, feel, and behave; these specific conditions “preclude energy investment and may become job stressors” (Fernet, 2011). Job stressors ultimately lead to teachers leaving the field (Fernet, 2011). The conclusion is then drawn, that the unintentional impact of the United States government on educators causes low teacher-efficacy and high rates of teacher turnover.

The deficit of educators within the national system of education is increasing and growing. The number of educators entering into the field is less than one hundred thousand per year, while the number of educators leaving the field is greater than two hundred and fifty thousand (Fernet, 2011). This data gives us an estimate of the deficit of educators growing around one hundred and fifty thousand per year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013; National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). There are numerous factors that explained the cause of the deficit found within history as well as the state and local government.

Historically, numerous acts and federal laws came into effect that had major implications on educators. IDEA and *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka Kansas* established equal access to a fair education amongst all students (Brown vs. Board of Education, n.d.; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Both of these laws were needed and phenomenal to protect the rights of the students, however, both added major responsibilities and change to the teachers. Also through *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka Kansas*, thousands of African American educators lost their teaching and administrative positions (Hudson & Holmes, 1994).

Through Congressional Acts and legislature promoted by different presidents, the implementation of national educational policies, such as No Child Left Behind and Common Core, have come into effect in the past two decades (Common Core, 2016). These policies also brought additional responsibility to the classroom educator. The two pieces of legislation added high-stakes testing and placed the basis of a good teacher on how well her students achieved during said high-stakes tests. The tests alone brought their own additional responsibility to the teacher as the teachers' had to educate students

on how to take tests in this specific format, which affects the curriculum, how it is taught and pedagogy.

Additional responsibility and accountability is not inherently negative. Additional responsibility was created with the purpose of guaranteeing that the rights of the students were protected. Additional accountability was created in order for educators to be accountable for what they taught. However, new strategies (or responsibilities and accountabilities) affect teacher efficacy. This impact can either affect teachers by motivating them or hindering them (Fernet, 2011). As most of the impact places imposed goals, time restraints, and constrain and pressure how teacher think, feel, and behave, these conditions “preclude energy investment and may become job stressors” (Fernet, 2011, p. 516). When these additional responsibilities and accountabilities entered into the education system and started affecting educators, the educators were generally not trained with the proper skills. Furthermore, the educators also are not able to see their strategies working with high-stakes testing because it is a single exam that they will not see the results of until their students are in another grade with another teacher causing the impact to be stressful and negatively affect teacher efficacy.

Lastly, a major reason for the deficit of educators is that teachers do not get paid enough. Compared to their peers in other fields with equal levels of higher educational, there is a \$10,000 deficit between a teacher and an entry-level position of their peer. As an educator earns a higher degree, the compensation difference increases.

Over the course of several decades, the educational system has evolved into the system that we have in schools today. This system needs to evolve once again in order to fix the problems that are causing the deficit of educators that currently is a prominent

issue within the system. The government has had the greatest effect on education from the creation of the system, over the last several decades though there has been a lack of focus on the educators. Through the creation of phenomenal laws that protect the rights of the students, the teachers have received additional responsibilities and accountabilities without any increase in compensation. The government has negatively affected educators over the last several decades because of the additional requirement and lack of support and compensation. However, the government is constantly changing and could evolve again and fix the problem if they addressed the problems identified through the research and data given above.

References

- Allen, M. (2005, September 1). EIGHT QUESTIONS ON TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION: WHAT DOES THE RESEARCH SAY? Retrieved November 10, 2015. Alliance for Excellent Education. (2005). *Teacher attrition: A costly loss to the nation and to the states*. Retrieved November 10, 2015, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/TeacherAttrition.pdf>
- Angelle, P. (2006, December 4). Instructional Leadership and Monitoring: Increasing Teacher Intent to Stay Through Socialization. Retrieved November 10, 2015.
- Application to Students with Disabilities - corestandards.org. (n.d.). Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://www.corestandards.org/assets/application-to-students-with-disabilities.pdf>
- Backgrounds and Beliefs of College Freshmen. (2016, February 11). Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://www.chronicle.com/interactives/freshmen-survey>
- Ballard, K., & Bates, A. (2008). Making a Connection between Student Achievement, Teacher Accountability, and Quality Classroom Instruction . *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 560-580. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol13/iss4/3>
- Brown, E. (2015, April 30). Study: Far fewer new teachers are leaving the profession than previously thought. Retrieved November 10, 2015.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1). (n.d.). *Oyez*. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <https://www.oyez.org/cases/1940-1955/347us483>
- Common Core. (2016). *Frequently Asked Questions*. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/frequently-asked-questions/>

- Cross, F. (2016, August). Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing 1990–1991 through 2016–2017. Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing 1990–1991 through 2016–2017, 1-184. Retrieved September 8, 2016, from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.pdf>
- Dee, T., & Jacob, B. A. (2010). Evaluating NCLB. *Education Next*, 10(3) Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1237819643?accountid=12085>
- Dodson, A. P. (2007). Collateral Damage: How High-Stakes Testing Corrupts America's Schools. *Diverse: Issues In Higher Education*, 24(16), 28.
- Family Policy Compliance Office. (n.d.). Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://familypolicy.ed.gov/ferpa-school-officials?src=ferpa-s>
- Federal Role in Education. (2016, July 21). Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html>
- Fernet, C., Guay, F., Senécal, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Predicting intraindividual changes in teacher burnout: The role of perceived school environment and motivational factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(4), 514-525.
doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.013
- Futernick, K. (2007). *A possible dream: Retaining California's teachers so all students learn*. Sacramento: California State University.
- Goldin, C. (1999, August). A Brief History of Education in the United States. NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES ON HISTORICAL FACTORS IN LONG RUN GROWTH, 1-76. doi:10.3386/h0119
- Goldin, Claudia. 2006. The Quiet Revolution That Transformed Women's Employment,

Education, and Family. *American Economic Review*, 96(2): 1-21. DOI:
10.1257/000282806777212350

Goldstein, D. (2014). *The teacher wars: A history of america's most embattled profession*. New York: Doubleday.

Gulamhussein, A. (2013, September 1). Teaching the teachers. Center for public education. Retrieved January 19, 2014, from
<http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/teachingtheteachers>

Hanushek, E. (2014, April 1). We Need Better Teachers. Retrieved November 10, 2015.

Hudson, M. J., & Holmes, B. J. (1994). Missing teachers, impaired communities: The unanticipated consequences of brown v. board of education on the african american teaching force at the precollegiate level. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 63(3), 388. Retrieved from
<http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/222063347?accountid=12085>

Ingersoll, R. (2003, September 1). Is There Really a Teacher Shortage? Retrieved November 10, 2015.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher Turnover and Teacher Shortages: An Organizational Analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
doi:10.3102/00028312038003499

Ingersoll, R., & May, H. (2012). The Magnitude, Destinations, and Determinants of Mathematics and Science Teacher Turnover. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34(4), 435-464. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23357022>

Lash, M., & Ratcliffe, M. (2014). The journey of an african american teacher before and

after brown v. board of education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 83(3), 327-337,426. Retrieved from

<http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1650131410?accountid=12085>

Laws & Guidance. (n.d.). Retrieved September 14, 2016, from

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/landing.jhtml?src=ft>

Members and Governance - Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. (n.d.). Retrieved

August 14, 2016, from <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/about/members/>

Miller, C. (2009). *The effects of positive behavioral supports in schools since the implementation of the individuals with disabilities education act of 1997 based on 2001 SLIIDEA data* (Order No. 3385802). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; ProQuest Social Sciences Premium Collection. (304962589). Retrieved from

<http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/304962589?accountid=12085>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Schools and Staffing Survey* [Data Table]. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from

https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/TFS1213_2014077_cf1n_002.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013, May). *Average salaries for full-time teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools, by selected characteristics: 2011-12* [Data Tale]. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_211.10.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015, September). *Bachelor's degrees*

- conferred by postsecondary institutions, by field of study: Selected years, 1970-71 through 2013-14* [Data Table]. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_322.10.asp?current=yes
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Fast Facts* [Data Table] Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Degrees in education conferred by postsecondary institutions, by level of degree and sex of student: Selected years, 1949-50 through 2013-14* [Data Table] Retrieved September 14, 2016, from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_325.40.asp
- National Education Association. (n.d.). *Myths and Facts about Educator Pay*. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from <http://www.nea.org/home/12661.htm>
- Nagel, D. (2013, September 10). Report: Effective Teacher Professional Development Crucial to Common Core -- THE Journal. Retrieved November 10, 2015.
- Nufeld, J. C. (2009). *No child left behind and the individuals with disabilities education acts: Their effects on the academic success of minority learning disabled students in arizona* (Order No. 3361290). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; ProQuest Social Sciences Premium Collection. (304844772). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/304844772?accountid=12085>
- Pfeuffer, P. B. (n.d.). Which master's degrees will pay you back with a big salary? Here's a look at the 10 highest-paying and five lowest-paying master's degrees. Retrieved

September 14, 2016, from <http://www.monster.com/career-advice/article/best-and-worst-paying-masters-degrees>

Plessy v. Ferguson. (n.d.). *Oyez*. Retrieved October 13, 2016, from <https://www.oyez.org/cases/1850-1900/163us537>

Research Spotlight on Recruiting & Retaining Highly Qualified Teachers. (n.d.). Retrieved November 10, 2015, from <http://www.nea.org/tools/17054.htm>

Sex Discrimination: Overview of the Law. (2015, October 15). Retrieved August 14, 2016, from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/rights/guid/ocr/sexoverview.html>

Stahl, J. (2015, October 30). 10 important Supreme Court cases about education. Retrieved August 14, 2016, from <http://blog.constitutioncenter.org/2015/10/10-important-supreme-court-cases-about-education/>

States. (n.d.). Retrieved August 14, 2016, from <http://www.parcconline.org/about/states>

Standards in Your State. (2016). Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/>

Sunderman, G. L., & Orfield, G. (2007). Do states have the capacity to meet the NCLB mandates? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(2), 137-139. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/218532810?accountid=12085>

Torres, M. S. (2004). Best interests of the students left behind? exploring the ethical and legal dimensions of united states federal involvement in public school improvement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(2), 249-269. Retrieved from

<http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/220455078?accountid=12085>

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-249.

doi:10.2307/1170754

U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *IDEA*. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from <http://idea.ed.gov/>

U.S. Department of Education. (2008, February). *Organization of U.S. Education: State Role I - Primary and Secondary Education*. Retrieved November 3, 2016, from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/usnei/us/elsec.doc>

U.S. Department of Education. (2015, October 9). *An Overview of the U.S. Department of Education*. Retrieved September 14, 2016, from http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/what_pg2.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2016, July 21). *The Federal Role in Education*. Retrieved October 10, 2016 from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html>

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*. Retrieved October 10, 2016 from <http://www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn>

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Laws and Guidance*. Retrieved October 10, 2016 from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/landing.jhtml?src=image>

Wiener, R. (2013). Teaching to the core: Integrating implementation of Common Core and teacher effectiveness policies. *The Aspen Institute*. Retrieved January 19, 2014, from <http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2013/teachingtothecore.pdf>

Wilson, S. M., Floden, R., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). Teacher preparation research:

Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations. *A research report prepared for the U. S. Department of Education*. Seattle: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Yaffe, D. (2016). Tackling the teacher shortage. *The Education Digest*, 81(8), 11-15.

Retrieved from

<http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1768622851?accountid=12085>

Zhang, D., Wang, Q., Losinski, M., & Katsiyannis, A. (2014). An examination of

preservice teachers' intentions to pursue careers in special education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(2), 156+. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login?url=http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/ps/i.do?p=ITOF&sw=w&u=vic_liberty&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CA359612784&sid=summon&asid=67796c17602bc0a3a178bc5927f407e3