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ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to advance knowledge by examining the reasons that motivate teachers to participate in professional development and the relationship to teacher job satisfaction and retention in Christian-based K-12 Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) member schools. The study contributes to the literature in the field because of very limited research on Christian-based schools, especially with regards to professional development, job satisfaction and retention. The study was a quantitative, non-experimental, correlational research design using two instruments, i.e., the Participation Reasons Scale (PRS) and the Job Satisfaction/Retention/Demographic Survey. The PRS scores indicated that the motivating factors for teachers to participate in professional development in rank order were: (a) professional commitment and reflection; (b) professional improvement; (c) personal benefits; (d) professional service; and (e) collegial learning. However, the PRS results did not reveal a significant correlation to job satisfaction or retention. In addition, the data related to on-line versus face-to-face delivery format, gender, marital status, age, level of education, years in education, and years in K-12 do not predict teacher participation in professional development opportunities.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Empirical literature reviews indicate that a great number of professional development studies relate to the teaching profession (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Capps, Crawford, & Constas, 2012; Ehrich, Kimber, Cranston, & Starr, 2011; Hardy & Ronnerman, 2011; Scheeler, 2008; Snyder, Hemmeter, Meeker, Kinder, Pasia, & McLaughlin, 2012). However, there is limited research on Christian schools and teacher professional development from a conceptual framework and in particular the study of Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) member schools. The purpose of this study was to address the lack of research and fill the gap in literature. The researcher investigated the factors that motivate teachers to participate in professional development and examined the relationship between teacher professional development participation, job satisfaction and retention in K-12 Mid-Atlantic, ACSI member schools.

Teachers join the field of education with visions, goals, and expectations that impact their level of job satisfaction (Santoro, 2011). Job satisfaction is dependent upon various elements, e.g., availability of professional development, student achievement and characteristics, the relationship between the staff and school leadership, and school climate (Jimmieson, Hannam & Yeo, 2010; Wong & Wong, 2009). Teachers who are not satisfied may leave their school in search of a different work environment, while others may leave the profession altogether, which negatively impacts the teacher turnover rate (Torres, 2012).

Attracting, recruiting and retaining high quality teachers is a huge problem for schools (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008; Torres, 2012), especially for private schools where teachers are more apt to leave the school and/or profession. According to the
survey results of the 2007-2008 National Center for Education Statistics’ Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the Teacher Follow-Up Survey, public schools retained approximately 85% of their teachers, while 8% were movers and 8% were leavers. However, Catholic school teachers with one to three years of experience left at a rate of 21% (Torres, 2012). Small private schools, by definition have less than 300 students, but experience high attrition rates (Ingersoll, 2002). Teacher turnover rates are highest in urban schools, schools with low income and/or minority students (Donaldson, 2009; Torres, 2012). Teacher retention is a critical element of school improvement and student academic achievement (Fall, 2010; Lynch, 2012; Torres, 2012).

Educational improvement is the focus of the United States education system; therefore, teacher quality and effectiveness are targeted to ensure accountability and help to improve academic achievement (Phillips, 2010). The purpose of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is to ensure equity and develop a highly qualified teaching force. The literature contains many studies that have targeted the impact that teachers have on student academic achievement and found that teachers are one of the most important elements of education (Gujarati, 2012). NCLB fails to list those qualities that are consistently found to be inherent in a highly qualified teacher; however, studies on this topic do indicate that quality professional development is required to maintain and enhance teacher quality and knowledge (Phillips, 2010).

The teaching profession is very complex and continues to evolve thereby creating obstacles and challenges for the experienced as well as first year teachers (Wong & Wong, 2009). Achieving the status of highly qualified does not guarantee student academic success, nor does it mean that teachers should stop seeking professional
development opportunities. On the contrary, teachers need good pedagogical skills, experience, and to be involved in professional development (Karelitz, Fields, Levy, Martinez-Gudapakkam, & Jablonski, 2011).

**Background**

In 1994, the U.S. Department of Education forecasted a need to hire two million teachers over the next decade. The school systems went beyond the forecasted need by employing 2.25 million teachers. However, 2.7 million teachers left teaching over the decade 1994-2004 (Carroll, 2007). Of the 2.7 million teachers who left during this time, over 2.1 million of the teachers retired (Carroll, 2007). Teachers are entering the classroom, but a greater number of teachers, especially qualified teachers, are leaving the profession (The Education Digest, 2008).

Lynch (2012) found that teachers depart because of their lack of involvement in school policy decision making, collegiality (Day, 2012), poor condition of the school (Donaldson, 2009), and the behavior of students (Fall, 2010). In general, the more students who receive free lunches in a school, the more deplorable are the working conditions (Fall, 2010; Lynch, 2012). When students perform well teachers are more likely to stay, as in New York City where 27% of first year teachers left from low performing schools while only 15% from high performing schools left. Another reason teachers leave their schools is because they perceive that the administration is not supportive (Fall, 2010; Lynch, 2012). In addition, teachers leave at a very high rate when administrators do not provide adequate professional development opportunities (Fall, 2010; Gujarati, 2012; Lynch, 2012; Prather-Jones, 2011).
The United States is experiencing a teacher shortage that will continue over the upcoming years (Swanson, 2011). The shortage will occur because of the increasing number of students enrolling, the increasing number of teachers retiring (attrition), the high rate of teachers moving from school to school (movers), the high rate of teachers leaving the profession altogether (leavers), and fewer qualified teachers entering or remaining in the profession (Kelley, 2004; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). Kukla-Acevedo (2009) explored the effects of administrator support, classroom management, and students’ behavior on the teachers’ decisions to remain in the school, switch schools or leave the profession. In general, teachers need five years of experience to become effective in the classroom and impact academic achievement (Stronge, Tucker, & Hindman, 2004; Wong & Wong, 2009). The 2010 Metlife Survey of the American Teacher reported that most classroom teachers are of the baby boomer generation and are close to retiring; therefore, new approaches to encouraging teachers to remain on the job are critical (Pirkle, 2011).

Previous studies have shown that few highly qualified college graduates enter the teaching profession, those who decide to enter the profession do not stay for more than five years (Kukla-Avecedo, 2009), and are more likely to switch to another career (Barnes, Crowe & Schaefer, 2007; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Gujarati, 2012). Some college graduates use teaching as a back-up profession for the future in the event their employer releases them from a job, others choose to leave, while another group uses the opportunity for general career preparation; not a lifelong profession, but just one of many occupations they will pursue during their work career (Brill & McCartney, 2008; Chapman & Green, 1986; Inman & Marlow, 2004; Karelitz, et al., 2011). The findings of
one study indicate that teacher attrition is due to job dissatisfaction and teachers attempting to improve their careers (Brill & McCartney, 2008). Ingersoll (2003) reported that low salaries, lack of administrative support, student misbehavior, and the inability to participate in decision making are reasons for teacher dissatisfaction, while Buchanan’s (2012) research indicated that loss of ideals, disillusionment, lack of support, and apathy impact job satisfaction and are predictors of teacher attrition.

Approximately one million teachers move into, out of, or between schools in any given year (Ingersoll, 2004). Kelley (2004) concluded that meaningful assimilation and a quality induction program will help to retain teachers. Formalized orientation causes increased job satisfaction and retention (Baker, 2010). In addition, enhancing teacher retention requires effective strategies that identify potential leavers and identify methods to meet their needs (Kersaint, Lewis, Potter & Meisels, 2007). Rather than attempting to meet the needs of all teachers, Kersaint’s strategy calls for implementing interventions that target specific teachers, especially those who are highly qualified and successful (Strunk & Zechandelaar, 2011) in an effort to achieve academic excellence.

Teachers are essential to achieving excellence; consequently, attracting and retaining highly qualified instructors require an awareness of their needs and environmental changes (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008; Lynn, 2002). There are six factors that impact a teacher’s decision to remain in teaching. They are (a) teacher’s personal characteristics, (b) educational preparation, (c) initial commitment to teaching, (d) quality of first teaching experience, (e) professional and social integration into teaching and (f) external influences, which include climate and culture (Chapman & Green, 1986). A teacher’s early attitudes, work experiences and the way administrators
treat them are also influencers on the decision to remain in the teaching profession (Prather-Jones, 2011; Thornton, Perreault & Jennings, 2008). Research literature suggests that the first year teacher’s experiences have a major impact on their effectiveness, student achievement, and the different strategies the teacher will implement over time. New teachers are overwhelmed, affected by student behavior, have problems with time management, lack administrator support, and have insufficient resources (Billingsley, 2010). When administrators invest in their new teachers by affording them a rich job experience, providing professional development opportunities, and high quality school culture and school climate, then new teachers are more apt to remain in the school (Anderson, 2008; Brill & McCartney, 2008). However, many school systems place their newest teachers in undesirable situations, such as an assignment in a high crime, high drop-out, and poverty-ridden community school (Brill & McCartney, 2008; Fall, 2010).

Teachers from high poverty schools generally lack full certification (30%); hold an emergency certificate (24%); hold master’s degrees less often than teachers from more affluent school districts (36.6%), take the certification exams more than one time to pass, complete less hours of student teaching, and graduate from less discriminating schools (Fall, 2010).

High poverty and low performing schools are heavily impacted when teachers are not retained for a substantial amount of time (Brill & McCartney, 2008; Strunk & Zeehandelaar, 2011; The Education Digest, 2008). Fall (2010) found that teachers from schools in low-income areas are movers, who most often transfer to more affluent schools. School administrators from high poverty and low performing schools are forced to focus their efforts on re-staffing rather than closing the student achievement gap.
The cycle begins when schools continue to hire and replace
teachers who leave the profession with new, inexperienced teachers who lack
commitment (Fall, 2010). The new teachers stay a few years, but leave the students
before a thriving learning environment is created. Consequently, a new teacher, who is
potentially less qualified, is hired to replace the more experienced teacher, and the cycle
continues (Berry et al., 2011; Bradley & Loadman, 2005; Brill & McCartney, 2008;
Courtade, Servilio, Ludlow, & Anderson, 2010).

The teacher turnover rate affects public, private and Christian-based schools. Each
of these subgroups is impacted fiscally. The education system is negatively impacted as a
result of teacher turnover, i.e., time, resources, community cohesion, and students’
academic achievement are impacted (Fall, 2010; Ingersoll, 2003). In addition, turnover
also causes instability, wherein new teachers may be hired at the last minute, are under-
qualified, and lack the benefit of sufficient orientation and induction training (Brill &
McCartney, 2008). First year teachers experience isolation, self-doubt, stress and anxiety
(Lynn, 2002). Stress impacts the health, well-being, recruitment and retention of teachers
(Gold, Smith, Hopper, Herne, Tansey & Hulland, 2010). Consequently, teachers
experience stress, burnout, loss of confidence, and isolation when they lack training and
support (Buchanan, 2012; Kaufman & Ring, 2011), which can cause job dissatisfaction
and create higher teacher turnover rates (Simunović & Turk, 2012).

To combat isolation and job dissatisfaction it is critical that new teachers receive
induction and on-site support as they battle against apprehension and build relationships
with teachers and students (Tatto, 2008; Wong & Wong, 2009). The offering of
professional development opportunities is also important because professional
development increases teacher confidence (Berry et al., 2011; Fall, 2010). The teacher turnover rate is especially high in the United States and Canada where schools are experiencing high rates of second/foreign language teacher turnover because these teachers lack confidence in their classroom management skills and ability to teach cultural subject matter. A clear understanding of this problem is especially important for professional development organizers to recognize (Swanson, 2012).

Schmidt and Robbins (2011) conducted research on music teachers and found that professional development should center more on the teachers being able to participate in curriculum development, develop a culture of inclusiveness, foster growth in critical dispositions and develop the capability to incorporate social, racial and gendered perspectives in the classroom. Professional development should be linked to evaluation, assessment and curriculum development so that the very essence of professional development becomes fully integrated into the school culture. Professional communities should consist of teachers who interact and participate in continued learning while avoiding isolation, which will result in improving retention rates and productivity (Frid, Smith, Sparrow, & Trinidad, 2008; Schmidt & Robbins, 2011).

The social network perspective emphasizes the social elements that are related to teachers’ working conditions: exchange of information, resources, support, and trust (Drolet & Arcand, 2013). This approach focuses on teacher recruitment and retention which impacts teacher quality and attrition. Baker-Doyle (2010) noted that in order to address the teacher recruiting retention problem administrators must focus on teachers’ professional communities, professional development, and relationships.
Mentoring helps to decrease the feelings of isolation experienced by new teachers. Mentors keep the vision, mission and goals of the school at the forefront (Moir, 2003). Faculty of color especially benefit from mentoring opportunities (Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011). Diversity is needed on college campuses to provide mentoring and role models for faculty of color, who bring many benefits and social change to transform campuses (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Modica, 2010).

Diversity in the student population has increased, but the teaching profession continues to be dominated by White teachers (Renzulli, Parrott, Beattie, 2011). The racial mismatch leads to job dissatisfaction and turnover, which in turn impacts student outcomes and causes disciplinary problems. Schools with a high proportion of Black and Latino students have high teacher turnover and dissatisfaction (Renzulli, et al., 2011). The group that is the most heavily impacted by teacher turnover is the students, especially those who attend low-income, low performing schools (Guarino et al., 2006; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). Schools that experience language barriers, racial and cultural differences have the highest teacher turnover rates (Shen, 1997).

A California Berkeley research team developed a program that incorporated induction support for teachers placed in high poverty, low performing schools in urban Berkeley, California (Freedman & Appleman, 2008). The program objectives, goals, and purpose were made clear in order to attract new pre-service students to urban schools. The teachers were pursuing their masters’ degree and worked in cohorts, thus providing support and feedback to one another. Reflection and practice were important elements of the program’s success. The purpose of the program was to equip the teachers and impact them so that they would remain in their school and surpass the national statistics for
teacher retention. Being actively trained in this environment will hopefully create
stability for the students and teachers where academic achievement and the condition of
the schools are improved. An equipped and committed cadre of devoted educators
charged with educating poor students from low performing schools will turn the tide
(Freedman & Appleman, 2008).

School administrators have the responsibility of providing sound leadership and
professional development (Wong & Wong, 2009). Many teachers leave the profession
and share at their exit interviews that a lack of support is the main reason they leave the
profession (Gujarati, 2012; Kaufman & Ring, 2011). Other reasons given for leaving the
classroom include lack of mentoring, few if any professional development opportunities,
lack of collegiality and support, poor student behavior, heavy workloads, and low salaries
(Buchanan, 2012; Day, 2012; Fall, 2010; Gujarati, 2012; Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). In
Marston’s (2010) study, teachers at all levels cite collegial relationships as the reason that
they remain in the classroom. Consequently, professional development opportunities that
incorporate collegial collaboration increase job satisfaction, which then causes one to
desire to stay in the classroom (Day, 2012; Marston, 2010).

Another retention technique suggested by Kaufman and Ring (2011) was to have
teachers read. They suggest reading as a way to inspire teachers to remain in their
positions because the reading material would minister to their needs at the various stages
of their careers. Requiring teachers to read and discuss suggested books as a component
of professional development provide them the opportunity to explore educational issues,
examine skills, share perspectives and cause them to grow. Book clubs are used to
enhance professional development (Kaufman & Ring, 2011).
Professional development, coupled with self-reflection and changing classroom techniques can lead to better job performance, job satisfaction and an increase in growth (Education Week Online, 2011). The challenge to the field of education is to incorporate both techne and praxis into the classroom (Fitzmaurice, 2008). Techne is favored today because of the emphasis on technique, which enhances skills and understanding, while causing one to become more effective. The goal of praxis is to develop ethical goals and moral values as one reflects on one’s actions and the knowledge gained (Willsher & Penman, 2011). Techne and praxis must be integrated into teacher professional development resulting in ethical, effective and responsible teachers. Mastering methods and techniques is admirable; however, a successful satisfied teacher must blend the two (Fitzmaurice, 2008).

Teacher development requires commitment and resilience and is a career long process (Tait, 2008). However, Richards and Renandaya (2002) found that teachers’ professional development interests and needs change over time from subject matter to delivery methods (i.e., in-service, seminars, classroom research, etc.). Therefore, professional development is a long-term investment that schools and individuals pursue to improve, grow, change and expand teachers’ skills and knowledge base (Fall, 2010; Shumack & Forde, 2011). Diaz-Maggioli (2004) wrote that professional development “should be understood as a job embedded commitment that teachers make in order to further the purposes of the profession while addressing their own particular needs” (p. 5).

Researchers are finding that administrators should encourage teachers to collaborate more in professional development activities to help develop a learning culture and community (Chou, 2011; Gujarati, 2012). Action research is an important component
of teachers’ in-service professional development because it allows them to observe and critique their own teaching strategies; connect observation, theory and application in the classroom and causes them to reflect on their efforts. Setting aside the time and receiving administrative support are necessary for effective teacher professional development and to enhance effectiveness (Chou, 2011).

Wichadee (2010) presented six ways for teachers to enhance their effectiveness, which are to attend seminars, enroll in classes, observe classroom instruction, conduct action research and sessions, self-monitor, and read individually and as a group. Because teachers feel guilty about being away from their class for any length of time, Kaufman and Ring (2011) suggest that administrators provide qualified substitute teachers to allow teachers the opportunity to engage in professional development that includes equipping them with theory, curriculum design, methods, materials, classroom management, activities, curriculum and evaluation techniques, etc.

School administrators also play a vital role in the decision making process for teachers to stay or leave their schools (The Education Digest, 2008). Professional development opportunities, advanced study, peer collaborations, job sharing, long-term sabbaticals and support systems are just a few of the methods that school administrators can implement to assist teachers throughout their careers to help ensure teacher job satisfaction (Fall, 2010; Lynn, 2002). When addressing the teacher retention problem in the United States, administrators and policymakers are encouraged to address (a) teacher recruitment and entry requirements, (b) teacher preparation, (c) professional development, (d) cultures and conditions of schools, (e) the rewards and incentives of teaching, (f) the definition of teaching career paths, and (g) the balance between teacher
autonomy and teacher accountability (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Fall, 2010). The factors are closely associated with the variables in the current study, which are teacher participation in professional development, retention and job satisfaction.

Extensive data are available on beginning teachers with less than three years of experience who have a turnover rate of 33% (Fall, 2010). At the other end of the spectrum there are many studies that have examined teachers with over five years of experience who have a 46% turnover rate (Boe, Cook, & Sunderland, 2008). Data were gathered in the current study from teachers with zero to 30 plus years of experience and used to determine differences between the groups based on years of teaching experience.

The results of the current study contribute to the literature in the field because there is very limited research on Christian-based schools, especially with regards to the relationship between participation in professional development, job satisfaction and retention. There have been numerous studies conducted in public schools and school districts, e.g., Washington State (Theobald, 1990), North Carolina (Perrachione, Petersen, & Rosser, 2008), Virginia (Ross, 2009) and Arkansas (The Education Week, 2008). The current study investigated an entire geographic region with approximately 200 teachers from Christian schools participating.

**Problem Statement**

Recent research results have shown that in order to improve U.S. schools continuing development and learning for teachers is essential (Desimone, 2009). Professional development is a costly expense for schools and school districts; however, it is a necessary expense because it is one way to provide the tools to maintain or improve upon teaching standards, quality of education, and attract, train, motivate and retain
highly qualified teachers (Ferguson-Patrick, 2011). Over the 2004-2005 school year the federal government spent over $1.5 billion on teacher professional development. When the training is not used in the classroom and when teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs and leave their schools, the invested resources are lost which costs school systems approximately $8,000-$48,000 per teacher (Gujarati, 2012).

The American education system is facing a crisis. Over the next 10 years experts predict there will continue to be a shortage of highly qualified teachers due to the retirement of baby boomers, the stricter teacher requirements detailed in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the Race to the Top initiative, the economy, and change of occupations of others (Trunnell, 2010). The purpose of the NCLB Act was to increase student achievement in public schools in the United States. The Act included a requirement that teachers meet the ‘highly qualified’ status meaning that teachers satisfy the state’s certification and licensure standards. New teachers were required to possess at a minimum a bachelor’s degree while elementary school teachers were to pass a state test. Middle and high school teachers were required to pass a subject area test and complete coursework in the subject area they planned to teach, which may be a part of their undergraduate major, graduate degree, or certification.

Other criteria were established for those teachers not new to the teaching profession, i.e., they must possess a bachelor’s degree and pass a test proving their knowledge of the subject and teaching abilities. Teachers in rural systems find it difficult to meet these requirements as many teach multiple grade levels and different subject areas requiring them to pass multiple tests (Huysman, 2008).
Public and private schools are attempting to uphold the standards of state and local school districts, the NCLB Act and the Race to the Top criteria. Even though the NCLB Act and the Race to the Top initiative do not directly affect children in private schools, adhering to the basic standards set forth may enhance the education experience with the intention of improving student achievement. NCLB requires that a highly qualified teacher be present in every classroom following a narrower, scripted curriculum, and sometimes working in schools that need improvement or are failing (Santoro, 2011).

The No Child Left Behind Act provided the definition of a highly qualified teacher. A highly qualified teacher is one who earned a bachelor’s degree after completing a teacher education program, received state certification and is subsequently placed in a position that aligns with the certification (Courtade et al., 2010; Karelitz et al., 2011). Highly qualified teachers are also not entitled to any waivers or provisional acceptances into the teaching position. However, in 2005 the federal government modified the definition of a highly qualified teacher to include those who were pursuing an alternate-route-to-certification program (Marszalek, Odom, LaNasa, & Adler, 2010). Over the past few decades there have been many initiatives put in place to attract and retain qualified teachers, which include Teach for America, Troops to Teachers, and alternative licensure options (Borman & Dowling, 2008).

Stanley and Martin (2009) examined the relationship between alternate certification for teaching and whether the program resulted in more teachers remaining in the profession than those who entered in the traditional manner. They found that teachers
who participated in the alternate certificate were well prepared and appeared to remain in
the profession longer.

NCLB also described in detail the four key parts of the alternate route to
certification: quality professional development opportunities throughout a teacher’s
tenure; mentoring and or close supervision and guidance; is detailed in a teaching
position for no longer than three years; and a teacher stays on pace with achieving his/her
full certification. Teachers are now expected to come to the classroom better prepared.

The definition of a highly qualified teacher includes those who prove competency
in a core subject area. Subject matter knowledge is good; however, it should be
supplemented with an understanding and knowledge of pedagogy and the
teaching/learning process (Stronge, 2007). Securing a teacher’s license by participating in
a teacher preparation program can be very expensive and a deterrent to those who have
the passion and desire to commit to educating our students (Esch & Cox, 2011).

Mentoring programs and strong professional development programs provide ways for
teachers to become more competent, self-confident and knowledgeable as they become
better professionals and the students demonstrate improved academic achievement.

Public schools have an advantage over Christian-based schools in that they
receive state and federal funding that can be used to hire new teachers, improve salaries,
develop teacher training and implement professional development (Paulauskas, 2008).
The NCLB initiative allowed schools to increase their professional development budget,
thereby creating higher quality professional development that was available to more
teachers who were then capable of providing quality instruction.
The teacher turnover crisis is not limited to public school systems, but all areas of education, i.e., public, private and Christian-based. In order to minimize the potential effects, policy makers and education leaders must determine the retention factors that most heavily impact teachers in their decision to remain in their current positions (Borman & Dowling, 2008). There are numerous reasons as to why the shortage continues to increase and the retention rate decreases. Each year thousands of new teachers enter the education profession. Teaching in the U.S. is a profession that attracts those who desire to do good even though the pay and status are lower than other professions (Santoro, 2011). Yet, at the end of the school year many teachers leave the school system, transfer to another school, retire (12%), or seek a new occupation (Ingersoll, 2003). Teachers leave their profession at a rate between 14-17% (Guarino, 2006) to seek higher salaries and job satisfaction. Research findings on the teaching profession indicate that it is a profession that has an inordinate occurrence of stress, burnout, job dissatisfaction, and turnover (Scheib, 2006; Simunović & Turk, 2012). Approximately 50% leave because they are dissatisfied and desire to secure better jobs within and outside the field of education (Ingersoll, 2003). The U.S. Department of Education estimated that schools would need approximately 2.2 million teachers over the decade 2004-2014 because of the rising teacher attrition rate, which is an average of more than 200,000 new teachers annually (Collier, Weinburgh, & Rivera, 2004).

The teacher turnover rate continues to increase, which makes it a challenge to retain knowledgeable teachers (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). The personal characteristics of teachers are predictors of teacher turnover, which include background and qualifications (Borman & Dowling, 2008). According to Borman and Dowling’s (2008) meta-analysis
of 34 studies, they found that attrition is more prevalent among those who possess the
following characteristics: female, White, young, married, parents, have no graduate
degree, hold degrees in math or science, have standard teacher certifications, have more
years of experience and do not have high Praxis test scores (Francis, et al., 2011).

Greiner and Smith (2009) investigated the relationship between attrition and
standardized reading scores, GPA, gender and ethnicity. The findings were that there is
no significant relationship between the variables and attrition. Also, women tend to leave
the profession more often than men, but return more often as well (Montgomery, 2009).

The teacher turnover rate impacts the quality of instruction; causes school systems
to focus on hiring replacements; affects employee morale, and is costly (Borman &
Dowling, 2008; Brill & McCartney, 2008; Buchanan, 2009; Ingersoll, 2003). Locating
and retaining qualified teachers has become more difficult in recent years because of
increased student cultural diversity, national and local economic crises, teacher
dissatisfaction, and ill preparedness of new hires (Buchanan, 2012; Dagenhart, O’Connor,
Petty, & Day, 2005). The Fontaine (Fontaine, Kane, Duquette, & Savoie-Zajc, 2012)
study revealed that new teachers who entered the profession ill-prepared in the areas of
classroom management and assessing students consider leaving the profession in the first
year. The reasons they leave are burnout, classroom discipline, lack of support, and heavy
workloads (Paul & Phua, 2011).

There are three developmental stages that teachers experience as they assimilate
into the teaching profession. They are concern for survival, concern for self-adequacy,
and concern for teaching impact (Pirkle, 2011). Mentoring and professional development
incentives help to curb the tide for new teachers leaving and experienced teachers motivated to stay in the classroom (Fall, 2010; Pirkle, 2011).

Dagenhart, et al., (2005) conducted surveys of 748 teachers who overwhelmingly responded that their top five professional needs are time and financial support for professional development and study, more planning time, support and respect as a professional, adequate materials and supplies, and administrative support and leadership. Administrative support involves helping teachers with student discipline, curriculum selection, assimilation, and teaching methodologies (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Although survey participants were from public schools located in North Carolina, the results were used as a point of reference for this study where teachers were employed at private, Christian based schools located in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. In addition, approximately 48% of the teachers in the Dagenhart, et al., (2005), study were not state certified, which is noteworthy because ACSI does not require teachers from member schools to hold state certification.

The majority of public school teachers who leave their current school transfer to another public school and approximately 2% transfer to a private school. Private school teachers are more likely to leave the teaching profession than teachers in the public school system. Over 50% of private school teachers transfer to public schools (USDE, NCES, 2005). The statistics clearly reveal why public, private and Christian based schools throughout the United States must address the teacher turnover problem, professional development offerings, and discover the most effective strategies needed to hire and retain the best performing teachers (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Pirkle, 2011).
Purpose Statement

The purpose of this quantitative, correlational research study was to advance knowledge by examining the factors that motivate teachers to participate in professional development and examine the relationship between professional development and job satisfaction and retention in Christian-based K-12 ACSI member schools. There are many reasons teachers give for leaving the teaching profession that include organizational factors (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Theobald, 1990). However, Brill and McCartney (2008) found that professional development and training play key roles in job satisfaction and teacher retention. This research study investigated professional development and its impact on job satisfaction and their decision to remain at their current school.

Quantitative research results on professional development are limited (Education Week Online, 2009). Desimone (2009) noted that more than 1,300 studies on professional development have been conducted; however, only nine of the studies satisfied the standards established by the What Works Clearinghouse. Table 1 summarizes the Education Research Complete and ERIC database information on the number of times the following key terms were found in scholarly peer-reviewed journals. Clearly, Table 1 indicates a serious lack of research in the area of teacher professional development in Christian-based schools. Therefore, the results of this quantitative study will add to the literature.
Table 1

*Key Word Search*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Word</th>
<th>ERIC and Education Research Complete Databases Results</th>
<th>Database Results Dated 2008-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>449,968</td>
<td>124,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>19,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, professional development</td>
<td>26,420</td>
<td>11,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>16,476</td>
<td>5,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, teacher</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, professional development, Christian</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the study is that it contributes to the literature in the field because there is very limited research on Christian-based schools, especially with regards to professional development, job satisfaction, and retention. There have been numerous studies conducted in public schools and school districts; however, this study was more expansive and investigated an entire geographic region with close to 200 teachers from Christian schools participating. The research results contribute to the field of education and inform school leaders on how to better prepare, satisfy and retain teachers. Teachers who are satisfied have a positive impact on student performance and self-esteem, and
because teachers are on the front line their success is directly related to the student’s academic achievement (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Ferguson-Patrick, 2011).

Extensive data are available on beginning teachers with less than three years of experience; however, this study investigated all teachers, regardless of their years of teaching experience. The information gained from this study will inform and influence school administration and ACSI decision makers on the creation and implementation of school policies and strategies necessary to increase teacher job satisfaction and retention rates in Christian-based schools.

**Identification of Variables**

The predictor variables in this study were the five factors that motivate one to participate in professional development, which are professional improvement and development, professional service, collegial learning and interaction, personal benefits and job security, and professional commitment and reflection. The outcomes are job satisfaction and retention.

The Participation Reasons Scale (PRS) used in this study measured the five factors for participating in professional development. Created by Grotelueschen, Harnisch, and Kenny (1979) and influenced by Houle’s theory (Boshier, 1971; Houle, 1961), the PRS was adapted to create the Teachers Participation Reasons Scale. The PRS is a 30-item instrument that the researcher disseminated to teachers used to rank the importance of sub-factors on a scale from one to seven, where 1-2 is ‘not important’; 3-5 is ‘moderately important’; and 6-7 is ‘extremely important’. The survey respondents also completed a demographic, job satisfaction, and retention survey developed by Perrachione, Peterson and Rosser (2008).
Definitions

Professional development. The National Staff Development Council has developed a new definition of professional development, which is “a comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to improving teachers’ and principals’ effectiveness in raising student achievement” (National Staff Development Council – Learning Forward, 2011, p. 2). Maskit (2011) defines teacher professional development as “a combination of personal and professional events that teachers experience during their time at work and as a key to reforms in teaching and learning” (p. 852). The purpose for professional development is to improve teachers’ knowledge, skills and abilities (Shumack & Forde, 2011) and to increase their confidence and commitment (Berry et al., 2011).

Learning. The process of gaining knowledge and/or expertise (Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 1998).

Professional improvement and development. Teacher’s focus on performance, concern for quality, knowledge, skills and abilities required for their profession.

Professional service. Teacher’s ability to teach students by keeping current on research and development in the field.

Collegial learning and interaction. Teacher’s desire to fulfill their need of belonging to a group that challenges them intellectually.

Personal benefits and job security. Benefits received as a result of participating in professional development, for example, promotion, salary increase or job security.

Professional commitment and reflection. Teachers provide professional direction to the field of teaching. This factor does not necessarily relate to technical or research and development aspects of the teaching profession, but has more to do with
integrity, political, and economic disposition of the teaching profession. Teachers reflect on the value of their contribution to teaching.

**Job satisfaction.** Job satisfaction is one of the variables of the study and is defined as the balance between work stressors (Adera & Bullock, 2010) and work rewards (Corey-Lisle, Tarzian, Cohen, & Trinkoff, 1999).

**Attrition.** Voluntary quits, retirements, and transfers to other schools (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Attrition is a significant factor undermining program stability and quality. Teacher attrition – who is leaving and why (Fontaine, et al., 2012).

**Retention.** Teachers are leaving the profession at an alarming rate. Researchers are attempting to discover methods and practices that will keep teachers in their current positions. Teacher retention – who is staying and why (Fontaine et al., 2012).

**Research Questions**

The study investigated professional development and its relationship to job satisfaction and teacher retention. The following research questions guided the study:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development?

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development?

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development?

4. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development?
5. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development?

6. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

7. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

**Hypotheses**

H$_1$: There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H$_0$: There is not a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H$_2$: There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H$_0$: There is not a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H$_3$: There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development.
H₀: There is not a statistically significant positive relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H₄: There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H₀: There is not a statistically significant positive relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H₅: There is a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H₀: There is not a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development.

H₆: There is a statistically significant negative relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction for teachers in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states.

H₀: There is not a statistically significant negative relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction for teachers in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states.

H₇: There is a statistically significant negative relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention for teachers in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states.
H₀: There is not a statistically significant negative relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention for teachers in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states.

**Research Summary**

The study was a quantitative, non-experimental, correlational research design using two instruments, i.e., the PRS and the Job Satisfaction and Retention Survey. A correlational research design was appropriate because it would be unethical to withhold professional development opportunities; therefore, the independent variable or predictor was not manipulated because of the numerous factors to be investigated. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicates the probability of the null hypothesis being correct (Howell, 2011) by comparing two or more means. ANOVA helped to determine how well motivating factors for participating in professional development predicted the outcomes, which were job satisfaction and retention. ANOVA rather than t-test analysis was used because of the multiple independent and dependent variables, i.e., predictors and outcomes (Campbell & Stanley, 1966; Gall, Gall & Borg, 2010). The interval, ordinal and categorical data were analyzed.

The findings increased the knowledge base related to retaining teachers in Christian-based schools. The results of this study will assist in bridging the gap between past studies that have focused on public schools and the very limited research regarding Christian-based schools.
Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions. The following assumptions apply to this study:

Two surveys, the PRS and the Job Satisfaction and Retention Survey were used for this study. Both surveys are valid and reliable because they have been field tested and used in many research studies, thereby limiting or negating the threat to internal content validity within the instrument. Because this study included an entire geographic area with approximately 200 respondents, the external validity of the study was not affected.

The selected schools and teachers in this study represented the population of Christian-based schools and teachers. It was also assumed that the teachers responded truthfully to the questions on the survey. The teachers were willing participants who were interested in improving job satisfaction and the retention rate in Christian-based schools.

Limitations. The following limitations apply:

This study was limited to Christian-based schools. The data were collected from the sample population located in the Mid-Atlantic region. The research results may not be generalized to public or non-Christian-based schools (Bradley & Loadman, 2005). Studies conducted on teacher retention in a specific geographic area may be considered a limitation because of the dire need for national research on teacher retention (Ingersoll, 2002); however, there is a great need for research data on Christian-based schools on a local as well as a national level.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The study examined the relationship between teachers’ motivation factors for participating in professional development opportunities and their job satisfaction and retention. The teachers were employed in Christian-based K-12 schools located in the Mid-Atlantic states of the United States.

This chapter will provide a discussion of teachers’ motivation to participate in professional development substantiated by Knowles’ adult learning theory, Herzberg’s motivation theory, Locke’s goal setting theory, Vroom’s expectancy theory, and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory. The next major section covers the history, definition and possible outcomes (i.e., experienced faculty development and implementation or change in behavior), of professional development education. The chapter concludes with a discussion of job satisfaction, retention, and the financial implications of teacher turnover. A discussion of the financial implications provides insight into the return on investment and a cost-benefit analysis. The relationship between professional development and job satisfaction and retention was measured by the Participation Reasons Scale (Harnisch, 1980) and the Job Satisfaction/Retention/Demographics Survey (Perrachione, et al., 2008).

Theoretical Framework

The research for this study is based upon several theories that pertain to job satisfaction and professional development. The theories include Knowles’ adult learning theory, Herzberg’s motivation and hygiene theory, Locke’s goal setting theory, Vroom’s expectancy theory and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory. The researcher studied the aforementioned theories and extracted the information most pertinent to this study.
**Adult Learning Theory**

Houle (1961) conducted interviews where he investigated the process of adult learning and the reasons why adults participate in continuing education. The subjects were divided into three groups according to their views on the purposes and value of continuing education in their lives. The three groups were the goal oriented learners (learners who participate in continuing education as they seek to achieve clear objectives); the activity oriented (learners who seek social opportunities via continuing education); and the learning oriented (participate in continuing education as they seek knowledge for the pure joy of it).

Malcolm Knowles is the author of adult learning principles, which are the center of andragogy (how and why adults learn) (Harper & Ross, 2011) and expound upon Houle’s research. Andragogy is the study of (a) the learner’s need to know; (b) self-concept of the learner; (c) prior experience of the learner; (d) readiness to learn; (e) orientation, and (f) motivation to learn (Knowles, et al., 1998). Adult learners need to know why they should participate in a learning activity prior to starting it. Learners desire to know: the method for learning, what learning will actually take place, and the importance of the learning activity. The learner self-concept is where adult learners are held responsible for their decisions and consequences and are recognized as being able to self-direct, which is to take responsibility for teaching themselves.

Autonomy is where one takes responsibility for the goals and reasons for learning the subject matter (McCombs, 2010). An adult learner may exhibit a combination of both learning experiences, i.e., self-direction and autonomy or teacher/facilitator direction and autonomy. Adult learners arrive at a learning activity with many rich life experiences that
influence their thoughts and actions. Adults desire to succeed and are prepared to confront the issues and roadblocks of life by learning what they need to know.

Participation in professional development and learning activities motivates adults to learn those things that will assist them in confronting life’s challenges (George & Mensa, 2010). Knowles’ philosophy was that internal payoffs have a greater impact on the reasons or motivation for learning rather than external reasons.

Wlodowski’s (1985) research aligns with Knowles in that he found that the motivation to learn is dependent upon adults: desiring to be successful; wanting to make decisions regarding their continuing education; learning something of value to them, and enjoying the learning process (as cited in Cooper, 2009, p. 502-507). Motivation is defined as the input that moves one toward certain behaviors and one’s willingness to push hard towards reaching the goals of the organization (Worthley, MacNab, Brislin, Ito & Ross, 2009).

**Motivation Hygiene Theory**

The purpose of Herzberg’s research (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) was not only to discover the factors that motivate people in the workplace and how these factors enhance performance of the organization, but also to provide an explanation as to how best to supervise people appropriately (Behling, Labovitz & Kosmo, 1968). Herzberg concluded that workers seek satisfaction through the achievement of hygiene needs, e.g., school climate, salary, relationships on the job, working conditions, etc. (Chandra, Cooper, Cornick, & Malone 2011; Roby, 2012).

However, hygiene needs are not long lasting so workers need motivators, e.g., professional development, personal growth, recognition, achievement, advancement,
responsibility, and the work itself (Behling, et al., 1968; Chandra, et al., 2011). Herzberg defined satisfiers as motivators that increase job satisfaction and dissatisfiers as hygienes that decrease job satisfaction. Dissatisfiers or hygienes are salary, interpersonal relationships, supervision, company policy, working conditions, factors in personal life, status and job security (Chandra, et al., 2011).

Stolovitch and Keeps (1999) found that a person who is motivated to work will find in their job sources of variety and curiosity, meaning, fulfillment of goals and challenges (George & Mensa, 2010). The worker will gain feelings of satisfaction and respect in addition to extrinsic rewards. Teachers want to feel good about themselves and what they have accomplished by obtaining extrinsic rewards, typically monetary (Stolovitch & Keeps, 1999). Teachers expect to receive monetary rewards based on their seniority, status, education or performance. Intrinsic rewards can cause a teacher to feel valued and satisfied, while costing a school little or no money, e.g., compliments and positive recognition (Leibowitz, Schalkwyk, Ruiters, Farmer, & Adendorff, 2012). However, Marlow, Inman and Betancourt-Smith (1996) pointed out that teachers who seek intrinsic rewards and do not overemphasize promotions and extrinsic rewards are more satisfied in the teaching profession. Because resources are limited, especially in Christian-based schools, administrators must limit their use of money as a motivator or retention factor.

**Locke’s Goal Setting Theory**

Locke’s goal setting theory is based on studies that demonstrate that the more difficult the goal the higher the level of performance; specific measurable goals result in higher output than when one is merely told to do one’s best; and man’s conscious goals
influence his behavior and choices (Locke, 1968). Locke’s theory relates to the current study because teachers have specific reasons as to why they participate in professional development. The more difficult and specific the goals set by the teacher or principal, the higher level of teacher performance will result. Money, praise, reproof, and participation are indirect methods that principals use to manipulate teachers’ goals (Locke, 1968). Goal achievement impacts job satisfaction and is based upon the gap between the set goal and the achievement of the goal (Schroeder, 2008). Intrinsic rewards, i.e., feedback and personal ownership, are also keys to success, increase job satisfaction, morale and reduce the teacher turnover rate. However, the teacher’s commitment to goals impacts the ease at which a teacher may give up when faced with difficulty or adversity. Administrators should monitor teachers’ organizational commitment to gauge their propensity for leaving the profession.

**Vroom’s Expectancy Theory**

According to Vroom (1964), when one believes that one will experience a desirable outcome then one is motivated to behave in a certain way in expectation of the outcome (Ramdhani & Nkoane, 2010). Vroom concluded that job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers are factors that could possibly impact teachers’ attitudes either positively or negatively. Vroom’s theory deals with motivation and management and the three expectancy theory beliefs, which are valence, expectancy and instrumentality. The equation $\text{Motivation} = \text{Expectancy (instrumentality)} \times \text{Valance}$ can be used to calculate job satisfaction, retention and the amount of effort that one is willing to put forth. Valence refers to the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards that teachers want and seek. Teachers have different levels of expectations and confidence regarding their knowledge, skills and
abilities. It is management’s responsibility to determine what professional development or training courses employees need to reach their optimal level of performance. Instrumentality is when teachers receive what has been promised to them upon completion of the task; for example, professional development opportunities.

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory**

Maslow (1954) ranked human needs starting with the most basic, which are physiological to the highest ranking need self-actualization. The hierarchy of needs theory is represented by a pyramid as illustrated in Figure 1. There are five levels of need from the bottom to the top of the pyramid: physiological, safety, love/belonging, esteem and self-actualization. Healthy individuals are satisfied with their basic needs. Job security (safety) is impacted by threats of layoffs, retirement, benefits, seniority and having tenure. When in place and not a threat, job satisfaction may increase because teachers can concentrate on the job rather than the job security that may be in jeopardy (Knox & Anfara, 2013). These healthy individuals are motivated to achieve the level of self-actualization where they fulfill their mission, calling or vocation as they gain wisdom and become aware of their intrinsic nature, which is a lifelong process. Teachers join schools to satisfy their human needs and reach their goals (Harper & Ross, 2011).

![Figure 1. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs pyramid. Source: Sadri & Bowen, p. 45 (2011).](image-url)
Maslow and Herzberg’s theories are regarded as very instrumental in understanding the reasons why it is important to study colleagues when investigating job satisfaction (Knox & Anfara, 2013; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Collegiality increases one’s self confidence, sense of belonging and job satisfaction. Teachers who are a part of a team experience greater job satisfaction. School administrators must be aware of situations where the basic needs of teachers are not being met; otherwise, achieving job satisfaction, retention and professionalism may be difficult in some situations and unattainable in others (Lynch, 2012; Waltman, 2012).

Once a person, and in this case, a teacher achieves a desired need they will begin to progress to the next level of need on the pyramid. When they reach a particular level they experience satisfaction and are motivated to work towards the next need level. Maslow’s theory is the basis for organizations to develop personal motivation programs that are aimed at recruiting the most highly qualified individuals, increasing retention, productivity, and income as workers climb the ladder of hierarchy of needs.

Motivation causes an individual to set, pursue, and achieve goals. Sadri and Bowen (2011) found that motivated employees work harder and better, abide by the rules, and are likely to remain on the job (George & Mensa, 2010). In 2004 the Employee Benefit Research Institute conducted research on extrinsic and intrinsic incentives used to attract and retain employees and found that the percentage of employer spending on compensation continued to decrease as intrinsic rewards increased (e.g., insurance, retirement, concierge services, and employee assistance plans). According to Sadri and Bowen (2011) the best way to assist employees in reaching the self-actualization level is
to provide tuition reimbursement and professional development, persuade them to enroll in college courses/classes, and take a sabbatical.

There is a relationship between the five Participation Reasons Scale factors and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs categories (Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Table 2 details the PRS factors and corresponding Maslow needs. The premise of Maslow’s theory is that a sizeable salary does not guarantee employee motivation, but that encouraging professional development and providing intrinsic rewards will benefit both the employee and the organization.

Table 2

*Participation Reasons Scale and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Reasons Scale</th>
<th>Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 Professional Improvement</td>
<td>Esteem and Self-Actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 Professional Service</td>
<td>Belongingness and Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 Collegial Learning</td>
<td>Belongingness, Esteem, Self-Actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 Personal Benefits &amp; Job Security</td>
<td>Physiological, Safety/Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5 Professional Commitment &amp; Reflection</td>
<td>Esteem, Self-Actualization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of the Literature

**Professional Development**

The teaching profession is in desperate need of highly qualified teachers who make up the most influential factor impacting student achievement (Gujarati, 2012). Consequently, the goal of every school administrator should be to place highly qualified teachers in every classroom. Recruiting and hiring teachers are only the first steps toward
success; school systems must put processes and systems in place with the objective of identifying and retaining highly qualified teachers (Gujarati, 2012).

U.S school systems are facing continued competition and pressure to institute new programs and processes in an attempt to improve upon teacher efficiency and effectiveness (Desimone, 2009; Fullan, 1999). Effective school reform depends on the teachers’ and school administration’s participation in professional development and their experiences, while taking into consideration the varying seasons of a teacher’s professional career (Maskit, 2011).

Learning Forward, formerly known as The National Staff Development Council (NSDC), has developed a new definition of professional development, which is “a comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to improving teachers’ and principals’ effectiveness in raising student achievement” (National Staff Development Council – Learning Forward, 2011, p.2). Research shows a direct correlation between a teacher’s content knowledge/skills to student achievement (Sass et al., 2012; Shumack & Desimone, 2011). One way to obtain content knowledge is through participating in professional development. High quality professional development or professional learning is executed over time; creates a community of learning, and occurs during the regular work day. It also allows time and opportunities for teachers to practice and research the topic and techniques they have learned and reflect on the process (Opfer & Pedder, 2011). Research indicates that teachers should be allowed the time and opportunity to develop, discuss, and practice the knowledge obtained during professional development (Opfer & Pedder, 2011) and be afforded the opportunity to direct their attention to the context and necessary skills required.
Teacher identity is another strategy that may influence a teacher’s decision to remain in a school and/or teaching profession. Teachers are encouraged to reflect and understand the reasons why they entered the profession, the professional development processes necessary to enhance the experience, and the overall impact on who they are as teachers (Olsen, 2008).

Two important characteristics of professional development are the amount of time one spends in professional development activities and the subject matter content (Desimone, 2011). A highly qualified teacher knows the content and also possesses classroom management skills, student counseling techniques, instructional strategies, and pedagogical knowledge (Courtade, et al., 2010; Moch, 2004). One who has content knowledge may be able to demonstrate the subject, but lack the skills necessary to teach the subject; therefore, professional development (pedagogical knowledge) is required to enhance the skills.

Desimone (2011) concluded from her research that there are five key elements associated with professional development: content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation. The professional development framework as suggested by Desimone (2011) suggests that teachers participate in professional development to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Improved knowledge, skills, and abilities improve teaching methods, which ultimately increase academic achievement.

Wagner and French (2010) conducted research involving early childhood education teachers and their motivation for professional development resulting in teachers changing their behaviors. Their research indicated that three areas of job
satisfaction were predictors of interest and participation in professional development. These are peer relations, the work, and administrative support. Wagner and French (2010) concluded there is a positive correlation between professional commitment, job satisfaction, work climate, quality of the program, and retention.

Scholarly teaching that encourages student learning through professional development empowers teachers, creates a climate conducive to learning and collaboration (Fullan, 1999). Effective professional development must incorporate several components including: curriculum, instruction, and assessment; the practice of including pedagogical activities based on learning theory, motivation and classroom management; and capacity building for learners (Balan, Marko, & Phillips, 2011). Professional development programs provide opportunities for teachers to meet and plan in a supportive environment where collaboration and the discussion of current trends are emphasized.

The various stages of teacher professional development are initial training, entering the profession, continuity and development of a full career (Eros, 2011). Consequently, teachers are to receive training on a regular basis with depth in an effort to stay abreast of the latest theories, strategies and methods to enhance instruction and ultimately increase the teacher retention rate (Opfer & Pedder, 2011).

Teachers learn better when they are involved with the materials of practice, rather than just viewing presentations and memorizing new information. Teacher professional development is also more effective when colleagues collaborate, resulting in changes in student achievement and teacher practice, attitudes and beliefs. However, too much
collaborating can cause conformity and may inhibit teacher growth (Opfer & Pedder, 2011).

Another option for professional development is to participate in online coursework, which provides professional development opportunities that may help to overcome teachers’ feelings of isolation. To be competitive in today’s world teachers must be technologically savvy to research, discover, analyze, manage, evaluate and incorporate information into the learning environment. Online learning provides flexibility and convenience while creating a platform for communicating, sharing and providing support towards the goals of others, especially in rural and high need areas. As a result, this process prepares both students and teachers for global competition (Cady, Aydeniz, & Rearden, 2011).

The digital revolution is effective for those who cannot travel to distant or remote areas they can access on-line training or content. A hybrid professional development delivery format, face-to-face along with on-line learning, was found to be preferred over the solely on-line format (Broadley, 2010; Kitchenham & Chasteauneuf, 2010). Professional development delivered in the blended learning format was preferred by teachers in Canada where they were asked what strategies would keep them in their current rural school. The top three responses were professional development opportunities, induction/mentorship programs, and financial incentives. The teachers from the Canadian schools in the study suggested that administrators’ recruiting strategies included many extrinsic rewards/incentives. The incentives include bonuses, salary increases, moving allowances, professional development funds, and paying off a portion of their student loans to attract them to teach in remote areas (Kitchenham &
Many school administrators are successful in attracting and hiring teachers, but are often unsuccessful in retaining them (Hahs-Vaughn & Scherff, 2008). They may fail to acknowledge the teachers’ career stages.

**Stages of the Career Cycle Model.** The eight stages of the career cycle model (Fessler, 1992) are preservice, induction, competency building, enthusiasm and growth, career frustration, career stability, career wind down, and career exit. The preservice stage of the career cycle model is when one is preparing to embark upon a particular profession (Lynn, 2002), whether altogether new or a reassignment. Preservice teacher policies include the requirement that teachers be licensed; however, the licensure process causes a reduction in the number of minority students who finish education programs (Lynch, 2012). Consequently, there are fewer potential minority applicants for teaching positions. Another policy of the preservice career stage is that administrators should note the difference between those who finish traditional versus those who finish alternative route teacher education programs (Lynch, 2012; Therrien & Wasburn-Moses, 2009).

When analyzing teacher retention strategies, one must be cognizant of the research that suggests that those who finish alternative route teacher education programs are usually older, more diverse, and have higher teacher retention rates (Lynch, 2012). Administrators who desire to retain their most highly qualified teachers should create mentoring and induction programs (Tatto, 2008), limit class size, allow teacher autonomy, and offer and provide support.

The next stage of the career cycle model is induction, where a teacher experiences the first few years of teaching. During this time teachers assimilate into the school culture and seek approval from their students, coworkers, and supervisors (Lynn, 2002). A
comprehensive induction system may include a basic orientation model (BOM). The model is structured to introduce teachers to their responsibilities, provide classroom management techniques, and familiarize them with school policies. The BOM is necessary, but insufficient for teachers in their initial year in providing adequate support to teachers (Gujarati, 2012). Induction programs are an essential part of a school’s professional development system that provide acculturation to the teaching profession (Tatto, 2008). An effective induction system as suggested by Gujarati (2012), will last for at least two years. Research indicates that the success and retention of quality teachers is dependent upon an effective induction system that incorporates mentoring opportunities (Tatto, 2008). Mentors and formative assessments are also key elements of an induction program (Gujarati, 2012).

The third stage of the career cycle model is competency building, where one enhances his skills and abilities by continually evolving as a result of discovering new methods, procedures, resources and strategies (Lynn, 2002). Teachers are willing participants who attend workshops and college courses as they improve their skills and abilities. The competency building stage occurs during the time when most teachers leave the profession as a result of frustration and job dissatisfaction (Lynn, 2002).

The fourth stage of the cycle, known as the enthusiasm and growth stage, is when teachers are satisfied with their jobs. They desire to improve their teaching by consistently striving for new approaches to teaching and positively impact the school climate (Lynn, 2002).
Career frustration, the fifth stage of the career cycle model, occurs when a teacher experiences job dissatisfaction, burnout, and uncertainty as to why s/he entered the profession (Lynn, 2002).

The career stability stage is the stage of the cycle where teachers may feel compelled to go in several different directions. One possible direction is where a teacher may have lost the ‘fire’ for teaching and therefore does the minimum – stagnation. Another direction may involve maintaining competency, and a third direction could include a sense of renewed growth. Because of the various degrees of needs, schools should offer and teachers should seek different professional development opportunities to satisfy the uncertainty of the career stability stage of the career cycle model.

The career wind-down stage of the cycle is when teachers prepare to leave the profession and some may experience joy as they reflect on their career. However, another teacher may experience forced retirement, relocation, or dissatisfaction with their current job during this stage.

The final stage of the career cycle model is known as the career exit stage, which is the period of time after a teacher leaves his teaching position. This is a time for professional growth and satisfaction. Teachers experiencing the different phases of the career cycle require “personalized and individualized support systems” (Lynn, 2002, p. 182) that address different needs and problems.

**No Child Left Behind.** Professional development is a critical element of the NLCB, Race to the Top, and state requirements for teachers to become highly qualified and capable of improving student achievement (Benton & Benton, 2008). A highly qualified teacher is one who has full certification, a minimum of a bachelor’s degree and
subject matter knowledge of courses taught. Quality professional development improves
teacher and student performance (Benton & Benton, 2008); therefore, administrators
must make professional development accessible to provide teachers the opportunity to
become highly qualified via coursework, delivered in multiple formats to attract, retain,
and develop teachers from various backgrounds including rural, special education and
urban schools (Bozonelos, 2008; Mollenkopf, 2009).

Rural schools are required to follow NCLB just as urban schools; however, rural
schools typically lack the personnel and resources that urban schools possess. Rural
schools face the reality of low teacher pay and little to no professional development
opportunities (Courtade, et al., 2010). In addition, administrators in rural schools have
difficulty attracting and retaining highly qualified science, technology, engineering, and
math (STEM) teachers (Goodpaster, Adedokun, & Weaver, 2012). The teacher retention
crisis requires school administrators to discover how to retain high quality teachers
especially in rural and low-income schools with a high minority presence (Courtade, et
al., 2010; Gujarati, 2012; Huysman, 2008; Sass, 2012).

The NCLB Act mandates that teachers, including special education teachers, must
be certified in their content areas to be categorized as highly qualified. A major challenge
is preparing special education teachers to earn the status of highly qualified for their
potentially many subject areas (Leko & Smith, 2010). McLeskey and Billingsley
(Therrien & Wasburn-Moses, 2009) found that between 82-99% of special education
teachers were not highly qualified. The next issue is that schools in rural areas have
problems attracting and retaining teachers, and in particular qualified special education
teachers (Bozonelos, 2008; Huysman, 2008; Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette & Benson,
Another problem is that administrators are looking for teachers; however, the demand for teachers exceeds the supply of teachers. Consequently, administrators are forced to hire teachers who have not followed the traditional teacher education track and who enter the field upon completion of alternative licensure programs. This mandate impacts special education and rural teachers where again special education teachers are required to earn a special education degree and pass tests in all of the content areas that they teach. Rural teachers are at a disadvantage as well because they too in many cases have to teach multiple subjects, and/or grade levels. The licensure process, the expense related to securing licenses, and alternative paths to obtaining licenses may negatively impact the quality of education. School superintendents in Ohio were surveyed in a study and 87% reported that they experienced challenges in fulfilling the requirements for professional development and noted there was a need for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities to strengthen their content knowledge and/or skills in classroom management and differentiated instruction (Therrien & Wasburn-Moses, 2009).

The need for professional development has become more prominent because of NCLB and other federal, state, and local education reforms (Guskey, 2003; Imig, 2011); however, there is no one list that itemizes the characteristics or outcomes of high quality, effective professional development. Guskey’s (2003) research unveiled common characteristics of effective professional development between several lists designed by various individuals and organizations, in particular Learning Forward. The top characteristics researched by Guskey included enhancing teachers’ content and pedagogic knowledge; providing sufficient time and resources to enhance comprehension, analyzing
and evaluating students’ performance, and creating new instructional designs; and
promoting collegiality and collaboration (Guskey, 2003; Knox & Anfara, 2013).

The factors that motivate a teacher to participate in professional development
were explored in this study using the Participations Reasons Scale to collect data. The
factors measured by the scale are aligned with Guskey’s findings as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

*Guskey’s Findings and the Participation Reasons Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guskey</th>
<th>Participation Reasons Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing teachers’ content and pedagogic knowledge</td>
<td>Professional improvement and development (questions 1, 3, 5, 16, 17, 18, 21, 27, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing sufficient time and resources</td>
<td>Professional commitment (questions 8, 20, 20, 24, 26, 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting collegiality and collaboration</td>
<td>Collegial learning and interaction (questions 2, 7, 12, 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vertical Teaming.** Vertical teaming is a specific method that promotes
collegiality and collaboration. The goals of vertical teaming are to meet, discuss and
transfer information between different grade levels to attain collegiality, professional
development, school improvement and transition (Gilmer, 2010). These goals include
aligning curriculum, mentoring or tutoring, participating in long term professional
development, identifying resources, feeling connected, and identifying resources, which
will potentially lead to improved teacher job satisfaction (Knox & Anfara, 2013).
**Creating a Research Culture.** Administrators should share with their staff that good researching is good teaching. Research projects and discussions are very important elements when creating a research culture in the schools (Ebbeck, Chan, & Yim, 2011). Differences in communities that are at or near the poverty line versus middle to upper class neighborhood schools may very well require different professional development offerings (Fall, 2010; Guskey, 2003). Professional development includes providing teachers with on-line e-journals and peer reviewed journals that will assist in keeping them current on delivery methods, curriculum design and instruction, classroom management, etc. This research culture method assists teachers in developing confidence and a strong knowledge base (Ebbeck, Chan, & Yim, 2011).

The creation of a research culture calls for administrators to encourage staff members to collaborate and work on a research project, provide advisers to guide staff during the project completion, conduct seminars and in-house training sessions led by staff where they present their projects to the school body, and visit other schools to observe how they implement the strategies and research practices (Ebbeck et al., 2011). Change is not easy, so in order to move a school to a culture of research requires the administrators to make relevant, helpful, and significant changes (Angelle, 2010).

Professional development is used by public, private, charter, and Christian-based schools to enhance school performance and academic achievement as they attempt to retain their students and teachers. Fall’s (2010) research results implied that highly qualified or capable teachers impacted student achievement by a full grade level in the classroom. A study conducted by Stronge, Ward, and Grant (2011) showed that teacher quality had long term effects upon student achievement, whether positive or negative.
The Nursing Profession. The nursing profession is facing a problem similar to the teaching profession – employee turnover. Establishing professional development as a fundamental element of the health care culture has increased the retention rate and level of job satisfaction. To ensure that nurses maintain their skills, knowledge and abilities professional development is necessary for nurses to remain current and safe. In a study of professional development, a survey was administered to nurses where 64% of those who planned to leave their jobs in three years responded that they would stay at their current job if more professional development opportunities were made available. Just as K-12 teachers have to stay current with technology and science, so do nurses, which requires professional development. Effective professional development leads to a good work environment, job satisfaction, and retention. Just as teachers face many barriers to professional development, nurses do as well, where hospital administrators must be creative and provide professional development in a unique and specialized manner and create a personalized professional development plan (Baker, 2010; Cooper, 2009).

Staff nurses were investigated in a study to determine the effect of a clinical ladder program. The purpose of a clinical ladder program is to encourage professional development, improve the recruiting and retaining of highly qualified staff, and identify those staff nurses who are role models. The essential factors to a successful clinical ladder program are education, professional development (personal and professional growth), experience, management style, and relationships (Pierson, Liggett, & Moore, 2010). The clinical ladder program used in nursing is a program that school administrators may desire to emulate.
Job Satisfaction

Many researchers have studied the term job satisfaction, resulting in several definitions. Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as “circumstances that converge that cause one to state that they are satisfied with their job as a result of psychological, physiological, and environmental factors” (p. 37). Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying. Locke (1968) described job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience. In 1999, job satisfaction was defined as the balance between work stressors and work rewards (Corey-Lisle, Tarzian, Cohen, & Trinkoff, 1999). Statt’s (2004) definition of job satisfaction has to do with a worker’s degree of contentment gained from his job, especially intrinsic motivation. Job satisfaction impacts productivity and personal welfare and leads to recognition, income, promotion, and achievement (Kaliski, 2007). Aziri (2011) defined job satisfaction as an employee’s feelings with regards to his gains and successes in the work environment.

Satisfaction results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one’s own important job values, providing that those values are congruent with one’s needs (Turkdogan & Duru, 2012). Teacher job satisfaction is dependent upon a fair workload (Paul & Phua, 2011), small class size, sufficient amount of time to plan and prepare, reasonable expectations regarding pressure to perform, and students’ performance on tests (Fall, 2010; Kersaint, et al., 2007; & Smethem, 2007). Researchers have found that inexperienced, uncertified teachers report to be dissatisfied in their positions (Berry et al., 2011); however, new teachers who had mentors and orientation
programs experience job satisfaction (Hanuscin & Lee, 2008). A greater degree of job satisfaction results in more stability, cooperation with peers and superiors, and overall better quality of life – physical and mental health (Hanuscin & Lee, 2008). According to Foor and Cano (2011) professional development activities should focus on personal growth and satisfaction, which are good predictors of a worker’s overall level of job satisfaction.

Teachers report job dissatisfaction as a reason for leaving the profession (Rhodes, Nevill, & Allan, 2004; Tait, 2008). Most teachers are required to sign in/out, go to lunch at a set time, serve lunch, playground and hall duty, and are not granted what they believe to be sufficient time to meet or collaborate with their colleagues (Bradley & Loadman, 2005). Teachers discuss these negative aspects of their profession as the reasons for leaving the profession (Inman & Marlow, 2004).

According to Borman & Dowling (2008), the reasons teachers give for leaving schools include their salary and benefits, school climate, work environment and career stage. Guarino et al., (2006) found that teachers preferred higher salaries, better working conditions, and greater intrinsic rewards. Their research suggests that movers will transfer to other schools or positions in education or occupations beyond teaching that will provide the aforementioned personal preferences. However, professional development opportunities, advanced study, peer collaboration, job sharing, long-term sabbaticals, and support systems are just a few of the methods that school administrators can implement to assist teachers throughout their careers to help ensure teacher job satisfaction (Lynn, 2002).
Teachers who experience stress on the job for long periods of time experience job dissatisfaction, which leads to poor relationships with students and ineffective classroom management (Knox & Anfara, 2013). However, those who are satisfied with their job desire to improve upon their skills and knowledge base and get involved in professional development and continuing education. Knowing this administrators need to get more involved in measuring and understanding teacher job satisfaction to ensure that they have an effective, efficient, productive and satisfied staff. As a result, the retention rate will increase and prospective employees will strongly desire to join the ranks (Knox & Anfara, 2013).

Maslow and Herzberg’s theories are regarded as very instrumental in understanding the reasons why colleagues are important in studying job satisfaction (as cited in Knox & Anfara, 2013, p. 60-61). Collegiality increases one’s self confidence, sense of belonging and job satisfaction. Teachers who are part of a team experience greater job satisfaction.

Work conditions also influence teacher job satisfaction (Knox & Anfara, 2013), i.e., inadequate, run down, overcrowded facilities will cause job dissatisfaction and negatively impact student achievement. Responsibility is another component that impacts teacher job satisfaction, which is defined as “(1) accountability for one’s work; (2) the responsibility of the teacher to create and nurture appropriate working relationships with the students, and (3) the teacher’s participation in creating and upholding school policies” (Knox & Anfara, 2013, p.61). Teachers are motivated, respected, encouraged and satisfied with their jobs when they are given responsibility (George & Mensa, 2010).
**Attrition**

Teacher attrition is the main reason for the teacher shortage, in particular in the subject areas of math, science, and special education (Pirkle, 2011; Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette & Benson, 2010). Higher attrition rates are associated with younger and older teachers (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). Older teachers retire from teaching and younger teachers leave for a variety of reasons (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). Minority teachers are leaving the profession and cite lack of diversity and feelings of isolation as the reasons (Buchanan, 2012; Sass, 2012). Science teachers report that they experience job dissatisfaction, isolation, boredom, and inability to participate in the school decision making process as potential causes for leaving the profession (Pirkle, 2011).

School based management is an attempt to have those closest to the students involved in the decision making process (Keung, 2008). School administrators first outline the boundaries and the areas of decision making involvement so that teachers can contribute appropriately and implement effectively. Teacher job satisfaction is directly related to their shared decision making and involvement. Once teachers become involved in decision making then they become more committed and willing to accept change. Two areas in particular are instructional and curricular issues (Keung, 2008).

Teachers also mention that the higher degree of accountability and stress associated with testing leads to teacher dissatisfaction and turnover (i.e., coaching students on test taking strategies and test curriculum rather than on the content) (Day, 2012; Fall, 2010; Sass, 2012).

Demoralization and burnout are also causes of attrition (Santoro, 2011). Demoralization occurs when the school conditions change drastically and the teacher no
longer experiences moral rewards. Santoro’s (2011) research suggested that burnout occurs when teachers’ wherewithal and resources are insufficient and fail to meet the challenges of the workplace.

Attrition renders schools unable to plan properly, causes instability in schools, negatively impacts student achievement, teacher morale, and financial well-being. Teachers who leave the classroom take with them knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience (Buchanan, 2012).

**Retention**

Teacher retention has become a major issue in the United States, especially within the past 12 years, since the inception of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Recruiting and retaining teachers is a problem that many countries throughout the world face. Those in the profession are experiencing a lack of respect for their occupation and usually a significant difference in pay compared to other professions with similar education requirements (Lam & Yan, 2011). In some countries the pay is low; however, in Hong Kong teachers are compensated well but continue to leave the profession. They site stress and a heavy workload as reasons for leaving. Poor working conditions rob teachers of their enthusiasm and motivation resulting in them leaving the profession. When teachers are afforded the opportunity to focus solely on teaching, then they are engaged, motivated and experience growth in their professional development and remain in their position (Lam & Yan, 2011).

The teacher retention crisis requires school administrators to discover how to retain high quality teachers, especially in rural and low-income schools with a high minority presence (Courtade et al., 2010; Gujarati, 2012; Sass, 2012). Teachers in rural
communities should be able to participate in highly qualified professional development opportunities to ensure the sustainability of schools in rural areas (Huysman, 2008). Isolation and lack of collegiality are reasons given by teachers when they leave the profession; however, an effective professional development program and administrator support can potentially impact teacher retention (Broadley, 2010).

Personal characteristics of teachers provide researchers a narrow view of the teacher decision making process, i.e., whether to stay or leave a school. Consequently, Mancuso et al., (Mancuso, Roberts, White, Yoshida, & Weston, 2011) thought it important to take a closer look at the organization as a whole. The researchers in this particular study investigated school conditions where the administrator influenced teacher retention. The seven conditions were: salary, benefits, workplace conditions, administrator support, responsibilities, autonomy, and professional development opportunities.

The results of the Mancuso (2011) study of American Overseas School Teachers found that the top four reasons teachers stay at their current school were benefits, administrator support, salary and teaching assignment; while the top four reasons for moving were better teaching assignment, dissatisfied with administrator support, better benefits and better salary. The Mancuso survey results for teachers who decided to stay at their current school listed the top four organizational conditions, which included: satisfied with salary, leadership, teaching assignment, and professional learning culture (Mancuso, 2011).

Olsen and Anderson (2008) interviewed urban teachers and discovered strategies to improve the teacher retention rate. They determined that if opportunities were availed
to teachers to take on new and different roles as career urban educators then they would remain in the teaching profession. Some strategies noted were sabbaticals, sharing teaching duties while taking on additional education work, mentoring new teachers in the schools where they taught, and working as administrators who taught part-time. Other suggested retention strategies included improving working conditions, raising salaries, changing the tenure or retirement rules, or promoting personal satisfaction through mentoring, professional development, and career advancement opportunities (Fall, 2010; Guarino et al., 2006; Shen, 1977). Schools that provide teachers with mentoring, induction programs, autonomy and support experienced less turnover (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower 2011).

The Wicomico County, Maryland public school system has discovered the value of mentoring and induction programs. The county offers summer workshops for new teachers where they learn the rules, policies, procedures, climate, and practices of their school. In addition, teachers receive assistance and guidance from their mentors who are knowledgeable and skilled. The authors’ research indicates that a major task for the mentor is to provide ongoing professional development, which coupled with one-on-one mentoring achieves the goal of retaining new teachers (Leimann, Murdock, & Waller, 2008). Teachers with three or less years of experience in Wicomico County attend monthly professional development sessions that cover such topics as testing, assessments, classroom management and communications. As a result, the school system has experienced a return on investment and has retained staff.

**Teachers of Color.** Many universities focus on recruiting rather than retaining (Mashile, 2008; Thompson, 2008), especially minorities (Thompson, 2008). Faculty of
color believe that turnover is often the result of being frustrated, discriminated against, or feeling as if they are invisible (Modica & Mamiseishvili, 2010; Thompson, 2008). The success of teacher retention strategies depends highly upon the committed school leadership; otherwise, the measures will be ineffective. Teachers of color must disprove the myths and misperceptions of incompetency and lack of qualifications, and attempt to attain tenure, promotions and job satisfaction despite a nonsupportive working environment (Modica & Mamiseishvili, 2010; Thompson, 2008). Administrators may want to consider recruiting females of color because statistically they stay at their schools longer than Whites and males (Thompson, 2008). Administrators in the K-12 environment may desire to model their program after this university approach.

Financial Implications

U.S. school systems are spending approximately $7.34 billion a year as a result of teacher turnover, i.e., to hire, recruit and train new teachers to replace those who have moved to a different school or have left the profession altogether (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007; Carroll, 2007; Fall, 2010; The Education Digest, 2008). The high turnover rate not only impacts the financial resources of school districts, but also the quality of teaching, which ultimately affects the increasingly widening student achievement gap (Barnes, et al., 2007; Sykes & Dibner, 2009). The national teacher turnover rate has risen to approximately 17%; schools in urban America are experiencing turnover rates rising beyond 20%, and 33% of beginning teachers leave the profession in a year (Sass, 2012). The cost to employers for teacher attrition based on an average teacher salary of approximately $42,000 is about $13,000. During the 1999-2000 school year the teaching profession lost about 175,000 non-retiree teachers through attrition,
which cost school systems a total of approximately $2.2 billion. This amount increases to
$4.9 billion when ‘movers’ are added (Sass, 2012).

The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future reported that urban
schools spend approximately $70,000 per year and non-urban schools $33,000 per year
on teacher transfers (The Education Digest, 2008). The urban school central offices spend
another $8,500, while non-urban school districts spend $6,250.

The teacher turnover rate has significant financial and academic implications that
impact society at large and students in particular. This dissertation addressed the
strategies and motivating factors necessary to reduce the teacher turnover rate, while also
discovering ways to attract and retain highly qualified teachers. The research included
survey respondents representing new hires through veteran teachers with over 30 years of
service.

Mashile (2008) suggested that teacher retention is the solution to the teacher
shortage. Mentoring and professional development are cost-effective alternatives to
teacher retention strategies (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). Discovering those strategies,
practices, and processes that cause one to desire to remain in the profession is difficult,
can be expensive, but is essential.

Summary

This chapter provided a discussion of teachers’ motivation to participate in
professional development substantiated by Herzberg’s motivation theory. The history,
definition and possible outcomes (i.e., experienced faculty development and
implementation or change in behavior) of professional development education were also
discussed. The chapter concluded with a discussion of job satisfaction, retention, and the financial implications.

The relationship between professional development and job satisfaction and retention was measured by the PRS (Grotelueschen, Harnisch, & Kenny, 1979) and the Job Satisfaction/Retention/ Demographics Survey (Perrachione, 2008). Chapter Three follows with a discussion of the methodology used to conduct the research. The survey results are presented in Chapter Four in the form of tables, figures, and narration. Chapter Five summarizes the findings, and also provides recommendations and suggestions for future research in the area of professional development for teachers and its relationship to job satisfaction and retention.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative, correlational research study was to advance knowledge by examining professional development and its relationship to job satisfaction and retention in Christian-based K-12 ACSI member schools. The research questions that guided this study are:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development?
2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development?
3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development?
4. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development?
5. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development?
6. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?
7. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

Figure 2 is a visual representation of the five factor structure of the Participation Reasons Scale (PRS). The PRS was then correlated to the job satisfaction survey results and the retention/intent to stay survey results. The purpose was to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the five factors individually and the PRS. The next step was to examine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the total PRS and job satisfaction and retention.

*Figure 2. Participation Reasons Scale factors and their relationship to job satisfaction and retention.*
This chapter covers the design and methodology used in the study. A discussion of the participants, setting and the two instruments (i.e., Participation Reasons Scale and the Job Satisfaction/Retention/Demographic Survey) follow.

**Participants**

The participants in the study consisted of a convenience sample of teachers and administrators from K-12 schools located in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. These schools are members of the Association of Christian Schools International. Approximately 200 teachers responded to the surveys, representing elementary, middle and high schools.

The demographic section of the survey posed questions regarding gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, highest degree earned, and number of years taught. Respondents were asked to select the best sentence that represents them, i.e., “I was trained as a teacher,” “I was state certified as a teacher,” and “I am certified by ACSI.”

**Setting**

Teachers participating in this study were employed at Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) member K-12 schools located in the Mid-Atlantic States (Maryland, the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, West Virginia, Virginia, and Delaware). ACSI member schools were selected because they share the same basic teacher certification requirements. Teachers who desire standard ACSI certification are required to have at least a bachelor’s degree having completed 24 semester hours in educational studies, including four elementary methods courses, one secondary methods course, and student teaching at the elementary and/or secondary level.
In addition, teachers are to submit a paper on their philosophy of Christian education and earn six to 10 semester hours or 10 to 18 continuing education units (CEUs) in Bible.

**Instrumentation**

The quantitative portion of the research for this study included the Participation Reasons Scale (PRS) and the Job Satisfaction and Retention Surveys. The PRS is divided into five reasons as to why professionals participate in professional development, which are professional improvement and development, personal development and job security, improvement of service to customers, professional identity/perspective, and competence and collegial interaction. Numerous researchers have used the PRS to assess the motives that influence professionals from various professions (e.g., certified public accountants, nursing, armed forces, veterinarians, business professionals, and first-line managers) to pursue professional development opportunities.

The PRS has been field tested over the past 33 years with participants representing various occupations. The alpha coefficient ranges from .78 to .92 suggesting a high reliability (Gryzb, Graham, & Donaldson, 1997) based on Cronbach’s alpha, which measures several items from a score of 0 to 1. A score of 0 suggests the measures are totally conflicting, while 1 indicates a perfect correlation.

A mean score was calculated based on a scale from 1 to 7 for each response. The PRS subscales have been determined to be uncorrelated constructs, meaning that each construct can be investigated independently of the others. For example, the correlation between the ‘professional improvement and development’ construct and job satisfaction and the ‘personal development and job security’ construct can be investigated independently rather than combining the five subscales.
The Job Satisfaction and Retention Survey measured job satisfaction by asking 27 Likert type survey questions and five questions concerning retention. Teachers completed Section A of the survey by responding to items regarding job satisfaction. The responses were based on a 7-point Likert scale that ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Section A scores range from 0 to 175 points. Section B of the survey is the intent to remain section and has three statements that range from 1 to 7, i.e., strongly agree to strongly disagree. Section B scores range from 0 to 21 points. Section C includes two questions about teachers’ level of satisfaction on a 5-point Likert scale that range from 5 to 1 – very satisfied to very dissatisfied. Section C scores range from 0 to 10 points. Section D includes two questions on retention. The responses were measured on a scale from 5 to 1 – certainly would to certainly would not. Section D scores range from 0 to 10 points. The composite score for the PRS ranges from 0 to 216 points. Using the Likert scale responses, means and standard deviations were calculated. The last section of the survey had seven questions about the teachers’ gender, age, marital status, highest degree earned, etc. Frequencies and percentages were gathered to develop the teacher profiles. Both instruments have been tested, are reliable and valid and produced strong and credible quantitative data.

**Procedures**

An application was submitted to the IRB for approval prior to contact with the potential respondents. The dissemination of the survey instrument took place after IRB approval was granted (Appendix B: IRB Application).

To pilot the study, a sample of six teachers were randomly selected and stratified by grade level to receive the cover letter and survey. Their responses helped to determine
how long it would take survey respondents to answer questions on the final survey. The pilot test directions and questions were checked for clarity. Each participant indicated the length of time needed to complete the pilot test and provided comments and advice to improve the instrument. Permission to conduct the study was sought from Christian school principals located in the Mid-Atlantic region.

ACSI member school administrators received a letter requesting their participation in the study (Appendix C). ACSI is an international organization that provides services for Protestant schools throughout the world. Some of their services are accreditation, professional development, teacher/administrator certification, and general support.

Each ACSI member school administrator received a letter describing the study, a copy of the survey, and a photocopy of the research consent letter. Administrators received instructions in the letter on how to contact the researcher with questions or concerns. The expectation was that there would be a range in years of experience, age of teachers, and school levels (e.g., K-5, 6-8, and 9-12).

Once the administrator agreed to allow their teachers to participate, the survey was made available on-line for respondents to complete. Dillman’s (2000) four-phase survey administration process was used for this study to help ensure a high response rate. School administrators received a letter of introduction that requested their cooperation and participation in the study. Once the administrator approved the study, the researcher sent a letter via e-mail to discuss the importance of the study, ensure anonymity, convey that the study was voluntary and would not impact their employment, and included the estimated length of time to complete the survey (Week 1). The researcher e-mailed the
link to the on-line survey to the ACSI member schools (Week 2). The teachers received the surveys by way of e-mail and were asked to complete and return them quickly. A reminder e-mail was sent to the administrators and teachers 10 days later (Week 3). The fourth e-mail consisted of a personalized letter, the survey, and return instructions (Week 4).

The response rate was negatively impacted because the survey was disseminated at the end of the school year, which is a time when teachers are very busy and preoccupied. Therefore, a 20-30% response rate was expected, which is equivalent to approximately 100 to 200 teachers responding. A response rate of a minimum of 26% is typical for surveys (Hamilton, 2003).

Data were collected and the researcher then used SPSS to analyze the data and interpret the findings to answer the research questions.

**Research Design**

This study was based upon quantitative research where participants completed an instrument that captured information regarding professional development, job satisfaction and retention. A correlational analysis was conducted to examine the data. The purpose of the research was to discover the reasons for participating in professional development that predict teacher job satisfaction and retention.

A statistical power analysis determined how large a sample was required to obtain statistically significant data that were accurate and reliable. Too small a sample may be insufficient while too large a sample may be a waste of resources. In addition, effect size was estimated.
Three factors were necessary to calculate the confidence interval for a confidence level. The three factors were sample size, percentage and population size. The first factor was sample size, where the larger the sample size, the greater the likelihood that the sample reflected the population. The second factor was percentage, where the worst case percentage used for this study was 50%. The third factor was population size. The population size was not an issue because the researcher was not investigating a very small group in this study.

The confidence interval is also referred to as the margin of error and is indicated by a ± and a number. For this study, the confidence interval was ±7%. The confidence level tells the reader how certain the survey respondents selected a response within the confidence level. For this study, the confidence level was 95%; the confidence interval ±7%; population 1,500 and sample size needed 173.

**Data Analysis**

The data from the surveys were organized and prepared for analysis. The data were studied to obtain a general idea as to the information collected. The researcher entered the coded data using the IBM SPSS 20 software package. The responses were analyzed and used to sort and arrange the demographic data (i.e., age of teacher, number of years in the profession, highest degree, etc.) using frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and other descriptive statistics.

The predictor (independent variable) for the study was professional development and the outcomes (dependent variables) were job satisfaction and retention. The questions with the Likert scale responses generated statistics such as the correlation coefficient. The correlational analysis provided correlation coefficients that indicate the strength and
direction of the relationship between two or more variables ranging from -1.00 to +1.00. A -1.00 indicates a perfect negative correlation; -.80 a negative correlation; +1.00 indicates a perfect positive correlation; +.70 a positive correlation, while a .00 indicates absence of correlation (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2010).

Scattergrams were used to provide a visual representation of the predictor and outcome data. The plots showed the relationship between the factors that were the reasons teachers participated in professional development and the correlation, if any, with retention and job satisfaction. A line of best fit or regression line was drawn that represented the best prediction for the outcomes. The covariance was computed to determine the extent to which predictors and outcomes varied together (Howell, 2011).

Based on Howell’s (2011) decision tree, the following tests were conducted. The data to be collected were quantitative and the research questions had to do with relationships. The number of predictors was one in the case of professional development as a whole that links to the Pearson correlation. In addition, there were multiple predictors that required multiple regression analyses.

The multiple correlation coefficient was calculated, which was the correlation between job satisfaction and the predictors for professional development. Also, the correlation between retention and the predictors for professional development were computed. The squared multiple correlation coefficient was used to determine the variability of job satisfaction and retention in relation to the predictor professional development and the five factors or reasons why teachers participate in professional development. The five factors were professional improvement and development,
professional service, collegial learning and interaction, personal benefits and job security, and professional commitment and reflection.

Power was calculated, i.e., the probability of correctly rejecting a false null hypothesis (Howell, 2011). There are several factors that impact the power of a test, including sample size and variance, difference between the null hypothesis and another hypothesis, and the probability of a Type I error. Cohen’s research concluded that effect size is divided into three categories, i.e., small .20, medium .5 and large .8 (Howell, 2011). The results of the effect size were combined with the sample size to calculate the power of the research results.

Multiple variations were used due to the greater than three variables in the study (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2010). Multivariate correlation statistics were used to determine the relationship between a set of predictors and a set of outcomes (Campbell & Stanley, 1966; Gall, et al., 2010). The results of these tests informed the researcher to either accept or reject the hypotheses.

To begin the analysis a multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the null hypothesis that professional improvement and development, personal development and job security, improvement of service to customers, professional identity/perspective, and competence and collegial interaction do not significantly predict participation in professional development. A second multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the null hypothesis that professional development and its subscales do not significantly predict job satisfaction. Finally, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the null hypothesis that professional development and its subscales do not significantly predict retention.
A quantitative correlational design was used for this research. The survey results assisted in determining the teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and described the strength of the relationship to teacher job satisfaction and retention.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

The purpose of this quantitative, correlational research study was to examine the relationships between the variables: the factors that motivate ACSI member teachers to participate in professional development, job satisfaction, and retention. A 66-question online survey was used to gather data from 184 K-12 teachers. The survey consisted of 59 Likert items and 7 demographic multiple choice questions. The Participation Reasons Scale is comprised of 30 questions that are divided into the following five factors:

**Professional Improvement and Development (Factor 1)**

To further match my knowledge or skills with the demands of my teaching activities Q1
To help me be more productive in my professional role Q3
To maintain my current abilities Q5
To develop new professional knowledge and skills Q16
To sharpen my perspective on my professional role or practice Q17
To help me keep abreast of new developments in teaching Q18
To help me be more competent in my teaching work Q21
To develop proficiencies necessary to maintain quality performance Q27
To maintain the quality of my teaching service Q29

**Professional Service (Factor 2)**

To enable me to better meet student expectations Q4
To accommodate more effectively the needs of my students Q9
To increase my proficiency with my students Q14
To help me increase the likelihood that students are better served Q19
To improve my individual service to the public as a teacher Q25

**Collegial Learning and Interaction (Factor 3)**

To learn from the interaction with other teachers Q12
To relate my ideas to those of my professional peers Q7
To mutually exchange thoughts with my teaching colleagues Q2
To be challenged by the thinking of my teaching colleagues Q23

**Personal Benefits and Job Security (Factor 4)**

To consider changing the emphasis of my present teaching responsibilities Q15
To help me develop leadership capabilities for my profession Q13
To increase the likelihood of personal financial gain Q11
To increase the likelihood of benefits for family and friends Q6
To increase the likelihood of professional advancement Q22
To enhance my individual security in my present teaching position Q28

**Professional Commitment and Reflection (Factor 5)**

To assess the direction in which my profession is going Q20
To review my commitment to my profession Q10
To maintain my identity with my profession Q8
To enhance the image of my profession Q24
To consider the limitations of my role as a teacher Q26
To reflect on the value of my teaching responsibilities Q30
Research Questions

Research Question 1

Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development?

Research Question 1 Null Hypothesis. A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to reject because there is not a statistically significant relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development. Descriptive statistics are used in Table 4 to illustrate the relationship between teacher participation in professional development and the professional improvement factor.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics – Relationship Between Participation in Professional Development and Professional Improvement Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Professional Development</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Improvement/Development</td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td>5.336</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87
Table 5 shows a statistically significant positive relationship \((r = .831)\) between the Professional Improvement/Development factor and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development at an alpha level of \(\alpha = .000\). The Professional Improvement/Development factor is a very strong predictor for teacher’s participation in professional development. Participation in professional development predicts 69.1% of the variation in the Professional Improvement/Development factor for this particular population and is associated with teachers participating in professional development to improve their knowledge, skills and abilities. Teachers are concerned about their professional competence, performance and concern for quality teaching. This factor ranked second of the five PRS factors.

Table 5

*Correlations - Relationship Between Professional Development Factor and PRS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Professional Development</th>
<th>Professional Development Participation</th>
<th>Professional Improvement/Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(.831^{**})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Improvement/Development</td>
<td>(.831^{**})</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Figure 3 shows by way of a graph a line of fit of the relationship between professional improvement/development and participation in professional development. The line indicates a positive correlation with few outliers.

Figure 3. Relationship between professional development factor and participation in professional development.

**Research Question 2**

Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development?

**Research Question 2 Null Hypothesis.** Descriptive statistics are used in Table 6 to illustrate the relationship between teacher participation in professional development and professional service factor. A Pearson correlation coefficient (Table 7) was measured
Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics – Relationship between Professional Service Factor and PRS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>2.916</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Correlations between the Professional Service Factor and Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participation in Professional Development</th>
<th>Professional Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.776**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
by the Likert scale survey questions and used to determine that the null hypothesis should be rejected because a statistically significant relationship exists between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development. Table 7 shows a statistically significant positive relationship \((r = .776)\) between the Professional Service factor and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development at an alpha level of \(\alpha = .000\). The results indicate a high correlation between participation in professional development and professional service.

Figure 4 shows a line of fit that indicates participation in professional development predicts 60.2\% of the variation in the Professional Service factor for this particular population.

*Figure 4. Relationship between professional service and participation in professional development.*
Research Question 3

Is there a statistically significant relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development?

Research Question 3 Null Hypothesis. A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to reject because there is not a statistically significant relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development. Descriptive statistics are used in Table 8 to illustrate the relationship between collegial learning and interaction and participation in professional development.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Professional Development</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning and Interaction</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>3.043</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a statistically significant positive relationship \( (r = .700) \) between the Collegial Learning and Interaction factor and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development at an alpha level of \( \alpha = .000 \), which is shown in Table 9.
Table 9

*Correlations between Collegial Learning and Interaction Factor and Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participation in Professional Development</th>
<th>Collegial Learning and Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.700**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning and Interaction</td>
<td>.700**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Participation in professional development predicts 49.0% of the variation in the Collegial Learning and Interaction factor for this particular population. There is a high correlation between collegial learning and interaction and participation in professional development. Teachers work alone in their classrooms daily; therefore, they may desire to interact with their peers for social as well as intellectual stimulation.**Research Question 4**

Is there a statistically significant relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development?

**Research Question 4 Null Hypothesis.** A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to reject because there
is not a statistically significant relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development.

Figure 5 shows a line of fit that indicates participation in professional development and predicts 49% of the variation in the collegial learning and interaction and participation in professional development.

Figure 5. Relationship between collegial learning and interaction factor and participation in professional development.

Descriptive statistics are used in Table 10 to illustrate the relationship between personal benefits and job security and participation in professional development.
Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics – Relationship between Personal Benefits and Job Security Factor and Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Professional Development</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits and Job Security</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>5.145</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows a statistically significant positive relationship ($r = .795$) between the Personal Benefits and Job Security factor and teacher’s reasons for participating in professional development at an alpha level of $\alpha = .000$. There is a high correlation between the personal benefits and job security and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development. Teachers and in particular teachers in the Christian school environment earn less than teachers in the public school system. Therefore, participating in professional development with the intention to secure their job and receive a salary increase or promotion is expected.

Figure 6 shows that participation in professional development predicts 63.2% of the variation in the Personal Benefits and Job Security factor for this particular population.
Table 11

*Correlations between Personal Benefits and Job Security Factor and Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participation in Professional Development</th>
<th>Personal Benefits and Job Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.795**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Personal Benefits and Job Security | Pearson Correlation | .795** | 1 |
|                                   | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   |   |
|                                   | N                   | 122    | 122 |

*Note:* ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

![Figure 6. Relationship between personal benefits and job security factor and participation in professional development.](image-url)
Research Question 5

Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development?

Research Question 5 Null Hypothesis. A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to reject because there is not a statistically significant relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development. Descriptive statistics are used in Table 12 to illustrate the relationship between professional commitment and reflection and participation in professional development.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Professional Development</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment and Reflection</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>5.063</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows that there was a statistically significant positive relationship \( r = .884 \) between the Professional Commitment and Reflection factor and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development at an alpha level of \( \alpha = .000 \). There is a high
Table 13

*Correlations between Professional Commitment and Reflection Factor and Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Professional Development</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Professional Commitment and Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.884**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment and Reflection</td>
<td>.884**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

correlation between professional commitment and reflection and the reasons for participating in professional development. Survey respondents were motivated to participate in professional development for reasons that relate to their professional commitment to other teachers and to the teaching profession at large. This factor relates to the professional’s desire to contribute to the field of teaching.

Figure 7 shows that participation in professional development predicts 78.1% of the variation in the Professional Commitment and Reflection factor for this particular population.
Figure 7. Relationship between professional commitment and reflection factor and participation in professional development.

The rank order of the PRS results is:

1. Professional Commitment and Reflection (Factor 5)
2. Professional Improvement and Development (Factor 1)
3. Personal Benefits and Job Security (Factor 4)
4. Professional Service (Factor 2)
5. Collegial Learning and Interaction (Factor 3)

Research Question 6

Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?
Research Question 6 Null Hypothesis. A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to reject because there is not a statistically significant relationship between the teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states. Descriptive statistics were used in Table 14 to illustrate the relationship between job satisfaction and participation in professional development.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Professional Development</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>77.52</td>
<td>14.918</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows that there was a statistically significant negative relationship ($r = -0.267$) between the Job Satisfaction factor and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development at an alpha level of $\alpha = .003$. Pearson correlation results between 0.1 to 0.3 indicate a low correlation. This particular negative relationship indicates that the more satisfied a teacher was in their job, the less motivated the teacher would be in participating in professional development activities. An explanation for this occurrence may be that teachers may not realize a need to participate in professional development activities.
Table 15

*Correlations between Job Satisfaction and Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participation in Professional Development</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Professional Development</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>N</em></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.267**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>N</em></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

devotion once they have reached a certain level of satisfaction. Figure 8 shows that participation in professional development predicts 7.1% of the variation in the Job Satisfaction factor for this particular population.

**Research Question 7**

Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

**Research Question 7 Null Hypothesis.** A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to reject because there is not a statistically significant relationship between the teachers’ reasons for
participating in professional development and retention in ACSI K-12 member schools in 
the Mid-Atlantic states. Descriptive statistics are used in Table 16 to illustrate the 
relationship between retention and participation in professional development.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics – Relationship between Retention and Participation in Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>3.974</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Relationship between job satisfaction and participation in professional development.
Table 17 shows that there was a statistically significant negative relationship ($r = -0.182$) between the Retention factor and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development at an alpha level of $\alpha = 0.044$.

Table 17

*Correlations between Retention and Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participation in Professional Development</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 1</td>
<td>-.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$N$ 122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation -.182*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Just as the relationship between Job Satisfaction and teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development shows a negative, low correlation, so too does the Retention factor. Also, the alpha level is approaching .05, which indicates that the Retention factor does not play a major role in predicting participation in professional development. One might conclude that teachers employed at schools with a high retention rate may not see the value of professional development, but may prefer to pursue the more personal PRS factors, i.e., professional improvement, professional
service, collegial learning, personal benefits and professional commitment and reflection.

Figure 9 shows that participation in professional development predicts 3.3% of the variation in the Retention factor for this particular population.

![Figure 9. Relationship between retention and participation in professional development.]

Table 18

Face-to-Face vs. On-line Participation in Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>115.41</td>
<td>14.385</td>
<td>2.303</td>
<td>110.75 120.07</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>117.19</td>
<td>18.694</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>113.11 121.27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>113.51 119.74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

*Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

*Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.917</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance passed on a $p = 0.169$ at an alpha level of 0.10; therefore, the ANOVA requirement of homogeneity of variance was met.

Table 20

*ANOVA - Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>84.304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.304</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>36520.352</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>304.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36604.656</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no statistically significant difference between Face-to-Face or Online participation with a $p = 0.600$ at an alpha level of 0.05.
Figure 10. Face-to-face vs. on-line professional development participation.
Table 21

**Descriptive Statistics - Participation in Professional Development According to Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>112.07</td>
<td>23.799</td>
<td>4.580</td>
<td>102.66 – 121.49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>117.92</td>
<td>15.004</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td>114.86 – 120.97</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>113.51 – 119.74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances Participation in Professional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.441</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance failed on a $p = 0.004$ at an alpha level of 0.10; therefore, the ANOVA requirement of homogeneity of variance was not met.
Table 23

Robust Tests of Equality of Means
Participation in Professional Development – Male and Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic(^a)</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. Asymptotically F distributed.

Brown and Forsythe’s robust test compares the median rather than the mean. Employing Brown and Forsythe’s robust test did not provide a statistically significant difference between Male and Female participants with a \( p = 0.235 \) at an alpha level of 0.05.

Figure 11. Participation in professional development according to gender.
Table 24

*Participation in Professional Development According to Marital Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115.09</td>
<td>16.370</td>
<td>3.413</td>
<td>108.01</td>
<td>122.17</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>117.32</td>
<td>18.091</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td>113.53</td>
<td>121.11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>113.56</td>
<td>13.211</td>
<td>4.404</td>
<td>103.40</td>
<td>123.71</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>113.51</td>
<td>119.74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

*Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

*Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.248</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance passed on a $p = 0.781$ at an alpha level of 0.10
Table 26

ANOVA – Participation in Professional Development Based on Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>182.952</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.476</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>36421.704</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>306.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36604.656</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no statistically significant difference based on the marital status of the participants with a $p = 0.742$ at an alpha level of 0.05.

Figure 12. Participation in professional development according to marital status.
Table 27

*Descriptive Statistics - Participation in Professional Development Based on Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>29.698</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>-139.83 to 393.83</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>133.60</td>
<td>12.285</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>124.81 to 142.39</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>119.75</td>
<td>9.674</td>
<td>4.837</td>
<td>104.36 to 135.14</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>114.71</td>
<td>17.060</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>111.42 to 117.99</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>113.51 to 119.74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

*Test of Homogeneity of Variances
Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance passed on a $p = 0.328$ at an alpha level of 0.10
Table 29

ANOVA – Participation in Professional Development Based on Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3525.572</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1175.191</td>
<td>4.192</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33079.084</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>280.331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36604.656</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a statistically significant difference based on the ethnicity of the participants with a $p = 0.007$ at an alpha level of 0.05.

Figure 13. Participation in professional development according to ethnicity.
Table 30

*Descriptives - Participation in Professional Development Based on Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 or Under</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>109.78</td>
<td>19.454</td>
<td>6.485</td>
<td>94.82 to 124.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>121.04</td>
<td>17.751</td>
<td>3.623</td>
<td>113.55 to 128.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115.04</td>
<td>19.053</td>
<td>3.601</td>
<td>107.65 to 122.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>115.19</td>
<td>14.810</td>
<td>2.435</td>
<td>110.25 to 120.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>119.32</td>
<td>17.338</td>
<td>3.696</td>
<td>111.63 to 127.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 or Older</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113.50</td>
<td>33.234</td>
<td>23.500</td>
<td>-185.10 to 412.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>113.51 to 119.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

*Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

*Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.646</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance passed on a $p = 0.665$ at an alpha level of 0.10
Table 32

ANOVA – Participation in Professional Development Based on Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1216.229</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>243.246</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35388.427</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>305.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36604.656</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a statistically significant difference based on the age of the participants with a $p = 0.554$ at an alpha level of 0.05.

Figure 14. Participation in professional development according to age group.
Table 33

Descriptives – Participation in Professional Development According to Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117.40</td>
<td>12.681</td>
<td>5.671</td>
<td>101.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>116.21</td>
<td>17.002</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>112.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>117.28</td>
<td>19.052</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>111.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124.50</td>
<td>7.778</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>54.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>14.933</td>
<td>8.622</td>
<td>71.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>113.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Participation in Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.584</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance passed on a $p = 0.675$ at an alpha level of 0.10
Table 35

*ANOVA - Participation in Professional Development Based on Education Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>332.599</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83.150</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>36272.056</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>310.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36604.656</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a statistically significant difference based on the level of education of the participants with a $p = 0.898$ at an alpha level of 0.05.

*Figure 15.* Participation in professional development based on highest degree.
Table 36

*Descriptives – Participation in Professional Development Based on Years in Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>117.92</td>
<td>18.380</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td>110.50</td>
<td>125.35</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>116.30</td>
<td>14.646</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>109.97</td>
<td>122.64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115.60</td>
<td>17.070</td>
<td>4.408</td>
<td>106.15</td>
<td>125.05</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 Years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>115.63</td>
<td>22.455</td>
<td>5.152</td>
<td>104.81</td>
<td>126.45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 Years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>112.29</td>
<td>14.845</td>
<td>3.967</td>
<td>103.71</td>
<td>120.86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or More</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>118.63</td>
<td>16.893</td>
<td>3.448</td>
<td>111.49</td>
<td>125.76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>116.45</td>
<td>17.365</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>113.33</td>
<td>119.58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37

*Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

*Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.802</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance passed on a $p = 0.550$ at an alpha level of 0.10
Table 38

ANOVA - Participation in Professional Development Based on Years in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>436.781</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87.356</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35749.219</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>310.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36186.000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a statistically significant difference based on the years in education of the participants with a $p = 0.923$ at an alpha level of 0.05.

Figure 16. Participation in professional development based on years in education.
Table 39

*Descriptives – Participation in Professional Development Based on Years in K-12 Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>118.38</td>
<td>17.326</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>112.13</td>
<td>124.62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>116.91</td>
<td>14.780</td>
<td>3.082</td>
<td>110.52</td>
<td>123.30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>116.89</td>
<td>15.882</td>
<td>3.743</td>
<td>108.99</td>
<td>124.79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>113.41</td>
<td>23.084</td>
<td>5.599</td>
<td>101.54</td>
<td>125.28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>111.50</td>
<td>15.361</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>102.63</td>
<td>120.37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or More</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119.89</td>
<td>18.432</td>
<td>4.345</td>
<td>110.72</td>
<td>129.06</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116.62</td>
<td>17.393</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>113.51</td>
<td>119.74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40

*Test of Homogeneity of Variances Participation in Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.401</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance passed on a $p = 0.847$ at an alpha level of 0.10
Table 41

ANOVA – Participation in Professional Development Based on Years in K-12 Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>836.156</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>167.231</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>35768.499</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>308.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36604.656</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a statistically significant difference based on the years in K-12 education of the participants with a $p = 0.744$ at an alpha level of 0.05.

Figure 17. Mean participation in professional development based on years in K-12.
The data related to on-line versus face-to-face delivery format, gender, marital status, age, level of education, years in education, and years in K-12 do not predict teacher participation in professional development opportunities.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Chapter Five presents the problem statement, review of the methodology, an overview of the study, a discussion of the findings, implications of the findings, study limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Problem Statement

Recent research results have shown that in order to improve U.S. schools continuing development and learning for teachers are essential (Desimone, 2009). Professional development is an expensive investment for schools and school districts. However, it is a necessary expense because it is one way to provide the tools to maintain or improve upon teaching standards, improve the quality of education, and attract, train, motivate and retain highly qualified teachers (Ferguson-Patrick, 2011). Over the 2004-2005 school year the federal government spent over $1.5 billion on teacher professional development. When the training is not used in the classroom and when teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs and leave their schools, the invested resources are lost, which costs the school systems approximately $8,000-$48,000 per teacher (Gujarati, 2012). The U.S. education system is facing a crisis. Over the next 10 years experts predict that there will continue to be a shortage of highly qualified teachers due to the retirement of baby boomers, the stricter teacher requirements detailed in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and the Race to the Top initiative, the economy, and change of occupations of others (Trunnell, 2010).

Review of the Methodology

This study was based upon quantitative research where participants completed an instrument that captured information regarding professional development, job satisfaction
and retention. A correlational analysis was conducted to examine the data. The purpose of the research was to discover the reasons for participating in professional development that predict teacher job satisfaction and retention. The researcher investigated factors that motivate teachers to participate in professional development and examined the relationship between teacher professional development participation, job satisfaction, and retention.

The participants in the study consisted of a convenience sample of teachers from K-12 schools located in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. These schools are members of the Association of Christian Schools International. Approximately 200 teachers responded to the surveys representing elementary, middle and high schools. The purpose of this study was to address the lack of research and fill the gap in literature.

The Participation Reasons Scale (PRS) (Harnisch, 1980) used in this study measured the five motivating factors for participating in professional development. The PRS was adapted to create the Teachers Participation Reasons Scale. The survey respondents also completed a demographic, job satisfaction, and retention survey developed by Perrachione, Peterson, and Rosser (2008).

**Summary of the Findings**

The research findings are based upon the research questions of the study:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development?
2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development?
3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development?

4. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development?

5. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development?

6. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

7. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

**Discussion of the Findings and the Implications**

As partners in the leadership of schools, school systems, and other education agencies, teacher leaders support students, colleagues, schools, districts, and communities beyond the walls of their classroom. When the scope of teacher leaders’ work expands, the benefits expand exponentially. Through the strong partnership between teacher leaders and school administrators, schools become learning organizations in which everyone learns and grows. (Killion, 2011, p. 14) Research participants in this study represented 184 teachers employed in ACSI member schools in the mid-Atlantic region of the U.S. The teachers were asked to
complete the Teacher Participation Reasons Scale and the Job Satisfaction/Retention/Demographics Survey.

Research Questions

**Research Question 1:** Is there a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development?

There was a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional improvement/development factor and predicting participation in professional development. The professional improvement/development factor is where the teachers focus on teacher knowledge, skills and abilities required for their profession. The correlation was very high at .831. The professional improvement factor was second in being statistically significant. When one compares the PRS factors with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs the two levels of needs are esteem and self-actualization. Teachers desire to improve upon their knowledge, skills, and abilities; therefore, they are motivated to participate in professional development offerings. As the predictor increases the outcome also increases.

**Research Question 2:** Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development?

There was a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional service factor and predicting participation in professional development. Professional service is defined as the teacher’s ability to teach students by keeping current on research and development in the field. The correlation was very high at .776. The professional service factor was fourth in being statistically significant of the five PRS factors. In this
era of constantly changing technology, teachers must keep abreast of the software, gadgets, and resources that may enhance their level of expertise and the classroom environment.

**Research Question 3:** Is there a statistically significant positive relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development?

There was a statistically significant positive relationship between the collegial learning and interaction factor and predicting participation in professional development. Collegial learning and interaction relate to a teacher’s desire to fulfill their need of belonging to a group that challenges them intellectually. The correlation was high at a .700.

The collegial learning and interaction factor was fifth in being statistically significant of the five PRS factors. When one compares the PRS factors with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs the three levels of needs are belonging, esteem, and self-actualization. The results of this correlation imply that teachers are interested in networking and meeting with their fellow teachers; however, it is not a priority when deciding whether to participate in professional development activities. The results indicate that teachers are more concerned with reaching the level of self-actualization and personal growth.

**Research Question 4:** Is there a statistically significant relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development?

There was a statistically significant positive relationship between the personal benefits and job security factor and predicting participation in professional development.
Personal benefits and job security are benefits received as a result of participating in professional development, i.e., promotion, salary increase, or job security.

The correlation was very high at .795. The personal benefits and job security factor was third in being statistically significant of the five PRS factors. When one compares the PRS factors with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs the two levels of needs are safety and security. Teachers enter the profession aware that they will not earn a salary comparable to other professions. Because Marston (2010) found that on a scale of 1-15, teacher salary ranked 13 out of 15 for elementary, high school and college teachers; it is not surprising that this factor was not one of the top two factors that predict participation in teacher professional development.

**Research Question 5**: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development?

There was a statistically significant positive relationship between the professional commitment and reflection factor and predicting participation in professional development. Professional commitment and reflection is where teachers provide professional direction to the field of teaching. A study conducted for the benefit of academic pharmaceutical programs found that job satisfaction has a positive impact on employee commitment and turnover, which leads to professional commitment and fulfillment (Desselle, 2011).

The correlation was very high at .884. The professional commitment and reflection factor was first in being statistically significant of the five PRS factors. When one compares the PRS factors with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs the two levels of needs are
esteem and self-actualization. An explanation for such a high correlation may be that teachers’ basic needs have been met so they focus on matters beyond themselves and reflect on the value of their contributions to the teaching profession.

**Research Question 6:** Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

There was a statistically significant negative relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states. The results indicate that as teachers’ job satisfaction increased the motivation to participate in professional development decreased. Teachers may have been of the opinion that because they were satisfied with their occupation, they did not need to participate in professional development activities. Another reason may be that as literature indicates, professional development opportunities are most beneficial when they are long-term, focused on students’ learning, and linked to the curricula (Nir, 2008). Perhaps the teachers in this study may not have expressed an interest in professional development because the offerings did not meet the aforementioned criteria. However, another explanation for the statistically significant negative results may be that the instruments are not compatible and do not produce in combination a credible result.

The literature suggests that the findings should have been just the opposite (Cooper, 2009; Ulrich, Buerhaus, Donelan, Norman, & Duttus, 2005). Professional development and job satisfaction should have had a statistically significant positive relationship.
Just as health care professionals seek a solution to the shortage of registered nurses, school administrators seek to discover if there is a positive relationship between professional development and job satisfaction and professional development and retention. According to the research (Cooper, 2009; Ulrich, Buerhaus, Donelan, Norman, & Duttus, 2005) professional development has the potential to increase job satisfaction and retention. Job satisfaction can predict turnover in the nursing profession. Bally’s (2007) research suggested that changing an organizational culture to value nursing professional development can increase retention and job satisfaction. Leko and Smith (2010) found that school administrators could provide professional development to retain special education teachers.

**Research Question 7**: Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states?

There was a statistically significant negative relationship between teachers’ reasons for participating in professional development and retention in ACSI K-12 member schools in the Mid-Atlantic states. The results indicate that as teachers’ intent to stay on the job or retention increased the reasons for participating in professional development decreased. Teacher retention will continue to be a problem for administrators and school districts over this century (Synar & Maden, 2012). However, schools where turnover was low in the Synar and Maiden (2012) study had several things in common, i.e., the principals were visionary leaders, teacher focused, and committed. Teachers who are employed at schools that have not experienced high turnover rates may feel secure and intend to stay at their current school. Also, we cannot ignore the
economic downturn that we have experienced over the past five to six years. Many are afraid to leave their current jobs for fear that they will be unable to find employment. They are not satisfied, do not want to stay, but cannot leave. However, the literature suggests that the findings should have been just the opposite (Cooper, 2009; Ulrich, Buerhaus, Donelan, Norman, & Duttus, 2005). Professional development and retention should have had a statistically significant positive relationship.

**Race.** The results of this study indicate that race is a predictor for participating in professional development opportunities with the order from most to least mean score being African American, Asian, Hispanic, and White. The researcher has been unable to find scholarly literature that would support this finding.

Schools located in high poverty areas are more heavily impacted by teacher turnover. Unfortunately, this occurs in districts where teachers lack formal certification and also when the schools are in dire need of repair with a predominately minority population. Less qualified teachers, poverty, and high turnover are the ingredients for a disaster in areas where there is a lack of resources (Frid, Smith, Sparrow, & Trinidad, 2008). Retention efforts in general, regardless of race, are needed to ensure stability and student academic achievement.

**Face-to-Face vs. Online.** There was not a statistically significant relationship between participating in professional development opportunities in a face-to-face format versus on-line. Professional development coordinators should note that teachers participate equally in both delivery methods; therefore, some professional development opportunities could be offered in both formats.
Gender. There was not a statistically significant relationship between participating in professional development opportunities by males versus females. There were 27 male and 95 female respondents. Their means were approximately the same, which indicates that professional development coordinators and school administrators need not focus on offering gender specific training.

Marital Status. There was not a statistically significant relationship between participating in professional development opportunities and marital status. The means of single, married, and divorced respondents were very close. Survey respondents represented the three marital categories, which indicate that professional development audiences and represented various marital statuses.

Age. There was not a statistically significant relationship between participating in professional development opportunities and age of participants. The means of the age groups and their relationship to professional development opportunities were very close. The teachers closely represented each age group.

Level of Education. There was not a statistically significant relationship between participating in professional development opportunities and level of education. No matter the level of education, teachers were interested in professional development; however, level of education is not a predictor for participating in professional development.

Years in Education. There was not a statistically significant relationship between participating in professional development opportunities and years in education. No matter the number of years employed in the teaching profession, teachers were interested in professional development; however, the years in education is not a predictor for participating in professional development.
Years in K-12. There was not a statistically significant relationship between participating in professional development opportunities and years in K-12. No matter the number of years employed in grades K-12, teachers were interested in professional development; however, the years teaching in K-12 is not a predictor for participating in professional development.

Job Satisfaction and Retention

The data collected indicated that there was a negative relationship between reasons for participating in professional development and job satisfaction and retention. The outcome was unexpected because based on Locke’s goal setting theory teachers set goals and are motivated to achieve job satisfaction. However, the results of this study may be an indication of lack of commitment, which is demonstrated by the propensity of teachers to leave their current positions and not take advantage of the professional development opportunities. Also, the findings may be as a result of the two instruments, i.e., the PRS and the job satisfaction/retention/demographic surveys, being incompatible and generating unreliable data.

School administrators may desire to offer more professional development opportunities in the on-line format rather than face-to-face. A majority of teachers (89 out of 122) indicated that their last professional development session was on-line. This is exciting news for the Association of Christian Schools International because of their new initiative. ACSI now offers fewer face-to-face professional development opportunities than they did three years ago. They have turned to worldwide satellite conferences and on-line access to training sessions.
Society in general can benefit from this study. The findings support Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Herzberg’s motivators, and Knowles’ andragogy self-motivation theories. According to Herzberg’s findings intrinsic factors lead to teacher job satisfaction, which includes growth and advancement (Roby, 2012). These two intrinsic subfactors are closely related to professional development.

Outline of the Study Limitations

1. A limitation of this study was the relatively small sample size. In the future, the survey could be disseminated earlier in the school year to possibly attract more respondents. However, teachers may have not made a decision about returning to their current school if the instrument is disseminated too early in the year.

2. A similar study may be conducted that covers a larger geographic area of ACSI member schools.

3. Nonresponse bias could have impacted the data results as well. There are two types of nonresponse bias: total nonresponse and unit nonresponse. In the case of total nonresponse the survey respondent does not respond at all to the survey. The second case, unit nonresponse, occurs when the survey respondent fails to complete the entire survey. Only fully completed surveys were used in collecting and analyzing the data for this study; however, over 60 teachers failed to complete all of the survey items.

4. The survey instruments were valid and reliable; however, the survey results may have been enhanced had qualitative data been collected to further explain teacher responses.
5. In this study a question was added as to the professional development delivery format, i.e., face-to-face versus on-line. This line of questioning could be broadened, e.g., to include group versus individual activities or hands-on versus discussions.

6. Survey respondents self-reported, which could potentially result in response bias. In the future a second source for data gathering may be implemented to minimize bias and the risk of answering questions in the manner they believe the surveyor desires them to answer.

**Implications**

New research, theory, and professional development program improvements may result from this study. School administrators are confronted with teacher turnover and teacher job dissatisfaction. The results of this study indicate that there are many implications for administrators and teachers.

School administrators, policymakers, and teacher educators must discover the support mechanisms and develop strategies necessary to retain our most highly qualified teachers. Administrators could possibly develop an assessment that measures some teacher characteristics, such as critical thinking, commitment to teaching, and coping skills that will predict success. In addition, the hiring process might be modified to gauge teacher strengths at the onset and determine if the knowledge, skills, and abilities gap can be filled.

Beginning teachers require mentors/trainers, who can assess the new hires’ strengths and weaknesses. In addition, novices are usually ill equipped to deal with the three levels of instruction that create stress, including student behavior, classroom
management, and administrative barriers (Fall, 2010). A few strategies that may prove effective are to support, mentor, train for a year, and eliminate or reduce the weight of standardized testing when evaluating teachers’ effectiveness. Instituting new teacher recruitment and entry requirements, preparation programs, ongoing professional development opportunities, rewards, autonomy, and accountability are modifications required to move from a profession that lacks respect to one that increases teacher retention and places in every classroom a highly qualified teacher. One way to reduce the teacher turnover problem is to train students in teacher preparation programs how to succeed in the urban school environment (Donaldson, 2009).

Fenwick and Weir’s (2010) study of Scottish teachers and early professional development focused on teacher recruitment and retention. Administrators should be cognizant that beginning teachers face a different set of variables that require school administrators to address policy issues, employment uncertainty, expectations and early professional learning.

The results of this study indicate that African-American teachers have a higher retention rate than White teachers; consequently, administrators may desire to increase the recruiting efforts and create retention strategies especially targeted for minorities and the general teaching population (Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011). Although the literature does not support the finding that African Americans are more likely to participate in professional development, inner city schools need minority, highly qualified teachers to rescue the students from the revolving door that so many of them experience each year.
Survey respondents favored collegial relationships, so professional development coordinators may create a collaborative teacher learning environment where teachers work on projects as a team, participate in vertical teaming, and participate in professional development by means of collegial relationships, i.e., common planning time, professional learning communities, and critical friends groups (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012).

Former teachers need to be brought back into the profession (Buchanan, 2012). Twenty-five percent of former teachers return to the teaching profession (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Experienced teachers who reenter the classroom, especially in low performing schools, will assist in stopping the cycle of administrators replacing teachers with inexperienced teachers year after year.

Opportunities and topics for professional development or service related training opportunities in which teachers are most interested should be identified (Berry et al., 2011; Dodor, et al., 2010). Build a collegial atmosphere where feelings of isolation are eliminated will likely decrease the turnover rate (Dodor, 2010; Ponjuan, Conley, & Trower, 2011).

School administrators and professional development coordinators should determine the reasons why teachers pursue professional development opportunities. Consequently, they should then incorporate appropriate activities in the design of the professional development program to match teachers’ interests.

The study results will affect the ACSI sample, the general population, and society as a whole. The principals who agreed to participate in this study requested to receive the results of the study to assist them in decision making, i.e., professional development
offerings and teacher retention strategies. The general population will benefit from this study. Although the study was based on teachers from Christian based schools the information is generalizable.

Extensive data are available on beginning teachers with less than three years of experience. However, this study investigated all teachers, regardless of their years of experience teaching. The information gained from this study will inform and influence school administrators and ACSI decision makers on the creation and implementation of school policies and strategies necessary to increase teacher job satisfaction and the retention rate in Christian-based schools.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Research

This was a correlational, quantitative research study that examined the relationship between the reasons for teachers participating in professional development and job satisfaction and retention in K-12 ACSI member schools. The research results add to the body of knowledge of existing research involving job satisfaction, retention, and participation in professional development. The data results point to a strong positive relationship between the five factors and the overall teacher PRS. The outcomes of the study indicate a negative relationship existed between job satisfaction and the overall teacher PRS, and a negative relationship between retention/intention to stay in the current school and the overall teacher PRS.

One could expand upon Fessler’s (1992) career experiences to determine if there is a correlation between the career stages and job satisfaction and retention. Also, a larger sample and a mixed methodology could possibly result differently. A sample from a
different geographic location, in non-Christian schools, and a broader representation of
ethnicities may also generate a rich study.

If schools are to recruit, hire, provide support and professional development, and
retain highly qualified teachers, then school leaders and policymakers must be willing to
implement a few changes. Some modifications would be to infuse resources and a variety
of induction, mentoring and professional development programs to retain new hires,
provide support, develop a collegial school culture, attempt to create manageable
workloads, and ensure a proper fit between the school assignment and teacher.

The PRS scores indicated that the motivating factors for teachers to participate in
professional development in rank order were: (1) Professional Commitment and
Reflection, (2) Professional Improvement, (3) Personal Benefits, (4) Professional Service,
and (5) Collegial Learning. However, the PRS results suggested a statistically significant
negative correlation to job satisfaction and retention. An explanation for this result may
be that the instruments are not compatible and cannot be used in tandem. Therefore, two
new instruments, job satisfaction and retention, should be sought. In addition, the data
related to on-line versus face-to-face delivery format, gender, marital status, age, level of
education, years in education, and years in K-12 did not predict teacher participation in
professional development opportunities.

School administrators must take the time to discover the factors that motivate
their population to actively pursue professional development. This study determined that
professional commitment and reflection, and professional improvement were the top two
motivators for teachers. These two factors indicate that teachers desire to be active
participants in the field of education. Also, ideally teachers should desire to be life-long
learners; therefore, participation in professional development and university coursework should be an integral part of their evaluation and conditions for employment. Not all teachers desire to be lifelong learners, so administrators should require teachers to meet a minimum number of required hours. Most Christian schools are not accredited; therefore, they do not have standards established by an organization such as ACSI guiding their professional development requirements.

Teachers report that problematic students, low salaries, heavy workloads, and lack of planning time were the reasons for their dissatisfaction. Dissatisfied teachers may feel obligated to stay at their current schools from a ministry perspective – they are not satisfied and do not want to stay, but dedication to the teaching ministry may determine their actions.

The findings are related to the theoretical framework where Herzberg, Vroom, Locke, Maslow, and Knowles theories were used to determine the factors required to motivate teachers to participate in professional development. The strengths of the study were the PRS instrument and receiving assistance and affirmation from ACSI member schools. The weaknesses of the study were the retention and job satisfaction instruments and a lack of dialogue, i.e., posing open ended questions and speaking with respondents face to face.

If provided the opportunity to conduct this study again, the following changes would be made: conduct a study that covers a larger geographic area of ACSI member schools; broaden the line of questioning on the survey to include group versus individual activities or hands-on versus discussions, etc. In the future a second source for data gathering may be implemented to minimize bias and the risk of answering questions in
the manner they believe the surveyor desires them to answer. Also, more research could be conducted based on a conceptual framework rather than a theoretical framework, which has been established. Some conceptual framework suggestions might be to study: a) the whole teacher approach, b) impact studies to determine teacher professional development effectiveness; and c) the five essential categories of attitude, climate, content, organization and time that make up the framework for effective professional development. Lastly, the survey could be disseminated a little earlier in the school year to attract more respondents. However, teachers may have not made a decision about returning to their current school if the instrument is disseminated too early in the year.

A change in educational practices may also result in studying this topic, i.e., many successful programs were discovered that implemented strategies and processes that increased job satisfaction and retention such as: effective induction, orientation, and mentoring of new employees; vertical teaming, and book clubs. Christian school administrators should form research teams and share experiences to strengthen Christian education as a whole rather than working in isolation. These are just a few professional development strategies that Christian schools should further investigate.
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APPENDIX A

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO:

USE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND

CONTACT ACSI MEMBER SCHOOLS
Actions
In response to the message from Harnisch, 2/21/2012
To: harnisch@unl.edu
Cc: Joy, Donna
Sent Items
Tuesday, February 21, 2012 11:21 PM

Dr. Harnisch,
Of course, I will keep you informed regarding my progress. I truly appreciate you granting me your approval to use the PRS.
Thank you so much!
Bonita

You replied on 2/21/2012 11:21 PM.
Bonita,
My apology for not getting back to you earlier on your request....I grant you my permission for use of the PRS in your dissertation research.

I am currently a Fulbright Scholar in Republic of Georgia and will be happy to be kept informed of your progress with your professional studies. I am interested in your results and the community of leaders that you are serving with this study.

Wishing you the best with your plan and professional studies.

Always in hope and peace,

Del
On Tue, Feb 21, 2012 at 9:49 PM, Bailey, Bonita <bbailey5@liberty.edu> wrote:
Good day Dr. Harnisch,

I am requesting the use of your PRS to collect data for my dissertation entitled, "PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTICIPATION IN K-12 CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO JOB SATISFACTION AND RETENTION." I am working under the direction of Dr. Donna Joy, School of Education, Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA. I will need a copy of your survey and the reliability and validity data. Once I receive your permission and IRB approval, I plan to send your instrument to K-12th grade teachers in approximately 600 Association of Christian Schools International member schools located in the mid-Atlantic states. I will include your copyright information on all forms and materials. If you are interested, I will provide you a copy of the results upon completion. I have received permission from Drs. Perrachione and Rosser to use their satisfaction, retention and demographic surveys, which will be used in conjunction with your instrument. Dr. Randy McCamey, who used your instrument in his dissertation (2003), has agreed to assist me and review the research findings.

Thank you so much for your consideration.
Best regards,

Bonita W. Bailey, Ed.D. Candidate
Liberty University School of Education
301.955.1160 (w)
301.706.7677 (c)
301.955.1169 (f)
bbailey@woodstreamacademy.com
bbailey5@liberty.edu
bonnie303@aol.com
RE: Request Permission to Use Job Satisfaction/Retention/Demographics Survey

From: Perrachione, Beverly <bevperra@truman.edu>
    To: Bonita Bailey <bonnie303@aol.com>
    Cc: Vicki.Rosser <Vicki.Rosser@unlv.edu>; Petersen, George <gjpeters@callutheran.edu>
    Date: Wed, Nov 16, 2011 2:44 pm

Bonita,

Thank you for your interest in using our survey instrument. You have permission to do so but please remember to cite all sources accordingly.

At this moment I am snowed under with, grading, defenses, student research, exit interviews, preparing for finals, etc. etc. etc. I do not have at my fingertips the information you are seeking. The article stemmed from my dissertation which you could request to be sent to you from the University of Missouri-Columbia Library. You should be able to locate it using WorldCat Dissertations and Theses Database.

Best wishes on your dissertation! I would love to hear how your study went and the results you found.

Dr. Bev Perrachione
Associate Professor of Education
Truman State University
Department of Education VH2362
Kirksville, MO 63501
Phones:
Office: 660-785-4234
Fax: 660-785-4393

-----Original Message-----
From: Bonita Bailey [mailto:bonnie303@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Perrachione, Beverly
Subject: Request Permission to Use Job Satisfaction/Retention/Demographics Survey

Good evening Dr. Perrachione,

I would like to request the use of your job satisfaction/retention/demographics survey used in the article entitled, “Why Do They Stay?” for my dissertation entitled, "THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTICIPATION IN K-12 CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS AND JOB SATISFACTION AND RETENTION." I am working under the direction of Dr. David Holder, School of Education, Liberty
University, Lynchburg, VA. I would also need the reliability and validity data associated with the instrument. Once I receive your permission and IRB approval, I plan to send your instrument to K-12th grade teachers in approximately 600 Association of Christian Schools International member schools located in the mid-Atlantic states. If you are interested, I will provide you a copy of the results upon completion.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Best regards,

Bonita W. Bailey, Ed.D. Candidate
Dean, Campus Development & Support Services
Woodstream Christian Academy
9800 Lottsford Road
Mitchellville, Maryland
301.955.1160 (w)
301.706.7677 (c)
301.955.1169 (f)
bonne303@aol.com
bbailley@woodstreamacademy.com
April 2, 2012

To Whom it May Concern:

I give permission to Bonita Bailey to contact ACSI member schools as part of her data collection pertinent to her dissertation research.

If you need additional information or have questions, please feel free to contact me at 717-285-3022.

Thank you,

John W. Storey, Ed.D.
ACSI Regional Director
IRB APPLICATION

May 7, 2012

Bonita Bailey

IRB Approval 1311.050712: An Investigation of the Relationship between Reasons for Participating In Professional Development in K-12 Christian Schools and Job Satisfaction and Retention

Dear Bonita,

We are pleased to inform you that your above study has been approved by the Liberty IRB. This approval is extended to you for one year. If data collection proceeds past one year, or if you make changes in the methodology as it pertains to human subjects, you must submit an appropriate update form to the IRB. The forms for these cases were attached to your approval email.

Thank you for your cooperation with the IRB and we wish you well with your research project.

Sincerely,

Fernando Garzon, Psy.D.

Professor, IRB Chair

Counseling (434) 592-4054

Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971
You are invited to be in a research study that will examine the factors that motivate teachers to participate in professional development and the relationship between professional development and its relationship to job satisfaction and retention. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a teacher in a Christian-based K-12 Association of Christian Schools International member school. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by: Bonita W. Bailey, EdD Candidate, School of Education, Liberty University.

Background Information
The purpose of this study is: To examine the factors that motivate teachers to participate in professional development and the relationship between professional development and its relationship to job satisfaction and retention.

If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

Complete the Participation Reasons Scale and the Job Satisfaction/Retention/Demographic Survey, which should take approximately 20 minutes to complete that can be found at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PWPP9W3

Answer Survey Question #67 with contact information only if interested in participating in a random drawing to win a Kindle Fire or a $200 Visa Card. The identifying information that you provide will be separated from the survey to provide for anonymity.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study
The study has minimal risks, which are no more than the participant would encounter in everyday life.

Participants will not be compensated and there are no direct benefits for participation. However, participation may serve to benefit society in general. In addition, a better understanding of reasons why teachers participate in professional development and the relationship to job satisfaction and retention may assist school administrators in enhancing their professional development programs.

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records. The data will be shredded in the future.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the Liberty University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting this relationship.

The researcher conducting this study is: Bonita W. Bailey. If you have questions, contact Bailey at 301.706.7677 or bbailey5@liberty.edu. Dr. Donna Joy is the advisor and can be reached at 304.876.3899 or djoy@liberty.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, Dr. Fernando Garzon, Chair, 1971 University Blvd, Suite 1582, Lynchburg, VA 24502 or email at fgarzon@liberty.edu.
#1 Letter to School Administrators from Researcher

May 21, 2012

Dear School Administrator,

My name is Bonita Bailey and I am pursuing a doctorate degree in Educational Leadership from Liberty University. I have received permission from Dr. John Storey, Northeast Regional Director, of Association of Christian Schools International, to contact you and your staff to collect data for my dissertation research. The dissertation is entitled, *An Investigation of the Relationship between Reasons for Participating in Professional Development in K-12 Christian Schools and Job Satisfaction and Retention*. Your teachers’ responses to the survey will not affect the teachers, you or your school in any way. The intent of the research is to gather and provide for you valuable information that may assist your school’s Administration in hiring and retaining personnel, offering relevant professional development courses, and making changes to better accommodate the teaching staff. As an incentive for participating, a teacher and his/her principal will be randomly selected to each receive a *Kindle Fire or a $200 Visa Card.*

The only assistance that I am requesting from you is to:

- Contact me at bbailey@woodstreamacademy.com, bbailey5@liberty.edu or call/text me at 301.706.7677 to let me know that you are interested in your teachers participating in the study.
- Inform me as to how many teachers are employed at your school.
- Give the following link to Survey Monkey to your teachers – https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PWPP9W3. The link is compatible with all mobile web browsers and devices with internet access.
- Disseminate the attached consent agreement to your teachers and encourage them to complete the survey on-line at Survey Monkey and submit it no later than June 4, 2012.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and vital to the success of this study. I encourage you to persuade your staff to contribute to this important study by completing the survey and entering their names into the random drawing for the *Kindle Fire or $200 Visa Card.* Thank you very much for your participation.

In His Service,

Bonita W. Bailey, Ed.D. Candidate
School of Education
Liberty University
#2 Letter to School Administrators from Researcher

Dear Colleague,

I need your assistance on a research project that I am conducting in fulfillment of the degree requirements for an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership from Liberty University. The survey is for teachers and will measure their:

- reasons for participating in professional development,
- degree of job satisfaction, and
- intention to stay at their current school and/or the teaching profession.

Please give your teachers the following link to complete the survey via desktop computer or mobile devices - https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PWPP9W3.

The Association of Christian Schools International (ACSI) has granted me permission to distribute these instruments; however, participation is voluntary. If there are any questions about the survey instruments, please call me on 301.706.7677 or e-mail me at bbailey5@liberty.edu or bbailey@woodstreamacademy.com. Complete the survey and submit it no later than June 11, 2012.

As an incentive for participating in this study, a teacher and their principal/administrator will be randomly selected to each receive a Kindle Fire or a $200 Visa Card.

Thank you for your time, interest, and participation.

Sincerely,

Bonita W. Bailey
Ed.D. Candidate

Please disregard this request if you have already participated in the study.
June 7, 2012

Dear Colleague,

I really need your help! On May 21, 2012 I requested your assistance on a research project that I am conducting in fulfillment of the degree requirements for an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. Attached is a survey that will measure your degree of job satisfaction and your intention to stay at your current school and/or the teaching profession. Your School Administrator has granted me permission to distribute these instruments; however, your participation is voluntary. If you have questions about the survey instruments, please call me on 301.706.7677 or e-mail me at bonita.bailey.edu@gmail.com. Complete the survey no later than June 11, 2012.

As an incentive for participating in this study, a teacher and his/her principal will be randomly selected to each receive a Kindle Fire.

Thank you for your time, interest, and participation.

Sincerely,

Bonita W. Bailey
Ed.D. Candidate
APPENDIX D

FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE TEACHER PRS (DeSilets, 1995)
FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE TEACHER PRS (DeSilets, 1995)

Professional Improvement and Development (Factor 1)

To further match my knowledge or skills with the demands of my teaching activities Q1
To help me be more productive in my professional role Q3
To maintain my current abilities Q5
To develop new professional knowledge and skills Q16
To sharpen my perspective on my professional role or practice Q17
To help me keep abreast of new developments in teaching Q18
To help me be more competent in my teaching work Q21
To develop proficiencies necessary to maintain quality performance Q27
To maintain the quality of my teaching service Q29

Professional Service (Factor 2)

To enable me to better meet student expectations Q4
To accommodate more effectively the needs of my students Q9
To increase my proficiency with my students Q14
To help me increase the likelihood that students are better served Q19
To improve my individual service to the public as a teacher Q25

Collegial Learning and Interaction (Factor 3)

To learn from the interaction with other teachers Q12
To relate my ideas to those of my professional peers Q7
To mutually exchange thoughts with my teaching colleagues Q2
To be challenged by the thinking of my teaching colleagues Q23

Personal Benefits and Job Security (Factor 4)

To consider changing the emphasis of my present teaching responsibilities Q15
To help me develop leadership capabilities for my profession Q13
To increase the likelihood of personal financial gain Q11
To increase the likelihood of benefits for family and friends Q6
To increase the likelihood of professional advancement Q22
To enhance my individual security in my present teaching position Q28

Professional Commitment and Reflection (Factor 5)

To assess the direction in which my profession is going Q20
To review my commitment to my profession Q10
To maintain my identity with my profession Q8
To enhance the image of my profession Q24
To consider the limitations of my role as a teacher Q26
To reflect on the value of my teaching responsibilities Q30