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Abstract

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) has placed a great responsibility on the classroom teacher to increase student performance. The pressures associated with the reforms necessary to improve student achievement have taken a toll on the morale of teachers. The purpose of this quantitative research was to explore the association between the morale of teachers in public middle schools in New York State and federal accountability designations in the age of accountability under NCLB. This study utilized the Teacher Outlook and Perception Survey (Anderson, 1999) to collect survey data from 226 respondents grouped by federal designations as defined by New York State Education Department (NYSED). A comparison of teacher morale by differing accountability designations was conducted using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and a post hoc Tukey test. The findings indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in teacher morale by accountability designation. Supporting research findings indicated that there was a difference in teacher retention by accountability designation.

Additionally, regression analysis established that specific leadership behaviors were related to teacher morale. A regression analysis and t-test showed that gender did not interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designations at a statistically significant level. Recommendations for future research include exploring the relationship among teacher morale, socioeconomic status of schools, school size, teacher expectations and whether the negative identification diminishes morale contributing to poor student achievement and the beginning of an accountability cycle.

Suggested Keywords: Teacher morale, morale, accountability, high stakes tests, NCLB, teacher satisfaction, teacher efficacy, accountability influences diagram, organizational climate, leadership, transformational leadership, teacher retention, gender.
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Chapter I: Introduction

This study had the primary intention of exploring the relationship between teacher morale and school accountability designations. The participants answered 47 questions from the *Teacher Outlook and Perception Survey* (Anderson, 1999) and 10 additional demographic questions. The analyses for this quantitative research included ANOVA, t-test, and stepwise regression. The primary finding for this research was that the relationship between teacher morale and school accountability designation was statistically significant.

The data for this research were collected from a sample for this study consisting of three groups that included a total of nine middle schools purposively selected according to federal accountability designations for the 2007-2008 school year from schools in New York State other than New York City and Buffalo. The characteristics of the sample closely approximated the general characteristics of the New York State teaching population as a whole, such as median age, years of experience and gender. The data collected were sorted into three groups: “Schools in Good Standing”, “Schools in Need of Improvement-Year 1 and Year 2/Schools Requiring Academic Progress-Year 1” and “Schools in Restructuring-Year 1 and Year 2” as defined by New York State.

*NCLB*

According to the New York State Department of Education website, the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) “was a reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), the main federal law affecting education from kindergarten through high school. NCLB is based on four principles: accountability for results, more choices for parents, greater freedom for states and communities for more local control
and flexibility, and an emphasis on using proven education methods based on scientific research” (http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nclb/).

New York State Accountability Systems

The schools in all districts, including public, private and charter schools are responsible for the academic achievement of their students according to NCLB and New York State accountability guidelines. A “status” is designated for both individual schools and districts based on their state assessment performance. Both schools and districts are subject to penalties if students underperform. The designation can range from being designated as a School in” Good Standing” to closing the school.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this quantitative research was to explore the association between the morale of teachers in public middle schools and federal accountability designations. Using the proposed conceptual framework, the study sought solutions to the following four research questions which specifically address the interactions among accountability designations, leadership, teacher retention, and gender with morale of teachers in identified middle schools:

Research Questions

Primary Research Question

Question #1 - Are there any differences in teacher morale associated with school accountability designations?

Supporting Research Questions

Question #2 - Are there any differences in teacher retention associated with school accountability system designations?
Question #3 - How do teacher perceptions of their leader’s behavior interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designation?

Question #4 - How does gender interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designations?

Definitions of Key Terms

Accountability Designations: A status designated to a school or a district based on student performance.

AYP: Adequate Yearly Progress.

In Good Standing: A school is considered to be in “Good Standing” if it has not been identified as a School in Need of Improvement, in Corrective Action, Planning for Restructuring, Restructuring, Requiring Academic Progress, or as a School Under Registration Review.

Morale: For the purposes of this study, morale is defined as an individual’s opinion on a variety of factors that affect the way a teacher feels about the teaching profession.


NRC: Need to resource capacity designation for New York State schools.

Restructuring –Year 1: A School Planning for Restructuring that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 1) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds. Schools that were required to develop a restructuring plan during the previous school year and that failed to make AYP last year must now implement their restructuring plans at the beginning of the school year.

Restructuring-Year 2: A School Restructuring (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the
accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School Restructuring (Year 2) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds. Schools that were required to develop a restructuring plan during the previous school year and that failed to make AYP the previous year must now implement their restructuring plans at the beginning of the school year.

**SINI-Year 1:** A school that has not made annual yearly progress (AYP) on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years while receiving Title I funds is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) for the following year. Among other requirements, these schools are required to offer public school choice.

**SINI-Year 2:** A School in Need of Improvement (Year 1) that does not make AYP on the accountability measure for which it was identified is considered a School in Need of Improvement (Year 2) for the following year, if it continues to receive Title I funds. Once identified, schools that continue to receive Title I funds and that did not make AYP the next year are required to continue to provide public school choice and must also offer eligible students supplemental educational services. These services are provided outside of regular school hours by an organization selected by the parent from a list of qualified providers approved by the State Education Department.

**School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP):** Some schools did not receive Title I funds and therefore do not fall under the provisions of NCLB school accountability. However, they fall under State regulations set by the Board of Regents. These schools are required to develop improvement plans in the area for which they are identified. However, Schools Requiring Academic Progress are not required to offer public school choice or supplemental educational services.
SRAP- Year 1: A school that has not made AYP on the same accountability measure for two consecutive years is considered a School Requiring Academic Progress (Year 1) for the following year.

Schools in New York and throughout the United States have endured major reform initiatives under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 for almost a decade. The reforms have dramatically altered how teachers measure the worth of the work they do and the quality of the schools in which they teach (Moblo, 2005; Smith, 1991; Mathers and King, 2001). Teachers are no longer able to teach in the isolation of their classrooms. Instead they are required to collaborate with their colleagues to reach an ever increasing goal of all students reaching proficiency. These changes in expectations and execution of teaching have led to stresses on teachers that have been well documented (Tawil, 2008; Jackson, 2008; Berger, 2006; Moore & Waltman, 2006). These stresses are known to stifle job performance and lead to teacher retention issues (Darling-Hammond, 2007; Jarnagin, 2004; Huston, Norman, & Ambrose, 2007). These issues may have a deleterious impact on the organizational culture and hold potential to further thwart professional and organizational growth needed to meet the expectations of state and federal accountability expectations (Berg, 2009; Smith, P, 2008; Wiley, 2008).

A federal accountability designation other than “School in Good Standing” publicly announces that a school is underperforming. The research methodology for this study was selected to explore the relationship between a school’s federal accountability designation and the morale of the teachers who work in that building. Previous research on morale in schools points to several factors, such as high stakes testing and leadership, which can influence teacher morale (Smith, 1991; Wiley, 2008; Rowland, 2008;
Anderson, 1999; Berg, 2009). As the student and teacher performance expectations under

*No Child Left Behind* continue to increase, teacher morale and positive organizational
climate will become an essential component of a leader’s ability to lead systemic reform
needed to increase student achievement.
Chapter II: Literature Review

Federal efforts to improve American students’ achievement through high-stakes testing have led to significant concerns about the efficacy of our schools and the quality of our teachers. Education reform initiatives at the state and federal level have used standardized test results in an attempt to improve the basic academic skills of students. Unfortunately, the data can be perceived as an effort to celebrate or shame our schools and their teachers. These accountability measures and reform initiatives have teachers and school leaders grasping for a sense of worth in their school and in their profession (Nichols and Berlinger, 2005; Wiley, 2008).

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, (NCLB), is the most recent federal legislation to mandate standards-based educational reform (NCLB, 2001). The NCLB act reauthorized several federal programs with the goal of improving the overall academic performance of students in the United States. The NCLB act increases the responsibility of individual states to develop and enforce accountability measures based on measurable academic goals. Compliance with NCLB results in federal funding for schools (NCLB, 2001).

One of the new accountability requirements of NCLB is the publication of school report cards. In New York State, the schools are required to report on school and district progress on state assessments annually. On New York State school report cards, test data are organized into subgroups of race, gender, ethnicity, English language proficiency, students with disabilities, migrant status and socioeconomic status. The report cards present the student performance on state assessment by three levels: basic, proficient and advanced (New York State Department of Education, 2008).
Under NCLB guidelines, schools have the responsibility to demonstrate that the students’ make *adequate yearly progress* (AYP). To be eligible for making AYP, schools must have met annual measurable objectives, 95% student participation in the assessments and student success in each of the subgroups (NCLB, 2001).

Schools in New York unable to make AYP will be assigned the status of *School in Need of Improvement (SINI)*. To be identified for “Improvement” status, a school must fail to make AYP for two consecutive years on the same measure, such as English Language Arts. A school may fail to make AYP for those two years for failing to demonstrate adequate progress in two different accountability subgroups. The penalty of failing to make AYP for Title I Schools is identification for school “Improvement”. In New York State, schools failing to make AYP will be identified according to the length of failure to make AYP. The levels of school improvement in New York State are: Year 1: No Identification, Year 2: School in Need of Improvement (Year 1), Year 3: School in Need of Improvement (Year 2), Year 4: Corrective Action (Year 1), Year 5: Planning for Restructuring, Year 6: Restructuring (Musser, 2008). Persistently underperforming schools, schools unable to meet or exceed AYP for six years, are subject to being restructured which includes removal of the school board and administrators (NCLB, 2001).

The *No Child Left Behind Act* is not without controversy. Many teachers feel conflicted about the changes to their teaching as a result of NCLB. Smyth (2008) stated “much of the debate surrounding standardized testing is focused on the effects the testing atmosphere has on teachers and students” (p.133). Peterson (2005) stated that “teach-to–the test instruction and prescribed curricula for the purpose of test-score boosting pose a
critical dilemma for teacher education programs throughout the country” (Peterson, 2005).

Recent studies have shown that unintended effects of the NCLB legislation have impacted teachers adversely (McCartney, 2008; Smyth, 2008; Valli & Buese, 2007; Afflerbach, 2005). In a study of Indiana’s accountability system, Gilman and Reynolds (1991) found 16 side effects of statewide testing, including lowering of faculty morale. Mehrens (1998) concluded that high stakes assessments increase teacher anxiety and significantly lower teacher morale. Valli & Buese (2007) found that teaching responsibilities increased both in volume and scope as a result of current accountability policies. Afflerbach (2005) further identified alienating teachers as one of the many problems associated with high stakes testing. Weiqi found that “normative commitment”, the pressures of internalized organizational standards to behave in a manner consistent with the goals of the organization, does not raise teacher morale (Weiqi, 2007, p. 20).

Recent research on accountability and high stakes testing as it relates to teacher morale often explores emotions such as “pressure,” “anxiety,” and “motivation” (Mehrens, 1998; Weiqi, 2007; McCartney, 2008). These terms are often associated as contributing factors to a teacher’s overall morale. For the purposes of this research, the psychological concept, “Yerkes-Dodson Law,” is being recognized as related to the term teacher morale. The Yerkes-Dodson Law operates on the premise that “the level of task complexity interacts with the arousal properties in determining the final level of performance” (Fisher, 1986, p.96). The level of arousal, negative for anxiety and pressure or positive for intrinsic or extrinsic motivation will contribute to the teacher’s morale, as well as his/her opinion on a variety of factors that affect the way a teacher feels about the
teaching profession.

School accountability systems typically include three basic components: standardized testing of students, public reporting of school performance, and rewards or sanctions based on various measures of school or district performance. Consequences of failure to meet accountability standards can be devastating to a school. The strain from failure to meet mandated accountability measures can and often does affect the school climate and teacher motivation and morale.

The Importance of Teacher Morale

Teacher morale is an extremely important dynamic in the efficacy of a school (Nichols and Berlinger, 2005). There have been many studies about the significance of teacher morale, especially in the era of accountability (Mathers and King, 2001; Finnegan and Gross, 2007; Tawil, 2008). Additionally, there are many definitions of the morale of teachers, including Evans (1992), who states that morale is an “individual needs fulfillment” (p. 18) and Mendel (1987) who defined morale as a feeling, a state of mind, a mental attitude, and an emotional attitude. Bentley and Rempel (1980) describe morale as the “professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual or group goals” (p. 2). Teacher morale is a gauge of a variety of factors that affect the way teachers feel about their profession: student performance, job satisfaction, teacher perceptions, and intention to leave the profession.

Teacher morale has become an area of renewed interest in an era of accountability. There is a growing body of research that reveals how teacher morale is affected by mandated accountability measures. Smith (1991) found that teachers experience negative feelings as a result of the public nature of test scores. Nichols and
Berlinger (2005) found that high stakes testing has negative repercussions for schools, such as declining teacher morale. Smith (1991) states that teachers often experience negative feelings such as anxiety, shame, embarrassment, guilt and anger as a consequence of the publication of assessment results. Most importantly, low teacher morale has been associated with poor student achievement. Moblo (2005) found that low teacher morale has a negative effect on student achievement scores.

Teacher morale is a much larger issue in education than unhappy teachers. Calling on previous research, Woods and Weasmer (2004) maintain that a teacher with high job satisfaction improves job performance which can positively impact student achievement. Brock and Grady (2000) contend, "The greatest predictor of student success is teacher attitude. Although curriculum, pedagogy, and teacher talent are important, teacher morale is key" (p. 56). Brock and Grady argue that student learning cannot occur in a school where the instructors are not happy. With student achievement continuing to be the foundation of accountability standards, improving teacher morale must be considered as an integral component to reforming schools.

Recent research points to declining teacher morale. Corwin (2001) reports on a study by Baylor Associate Professor of Economics John Pisciotta that Texas public school teachers noted a significant decline in teacher morale at their schools during their employment. In a survey of teacher satisfaction and morale in 1999, 22 % of the public school teachers reported little change while 17% were seeing an improvement in the morale of teachers. The majority of teachers in this study, 61%, maintained that their schools were experiencing a decline in teacher morale. Milne (2007) reported that in a survey of thousands of teachers in Great Britain suffering from diminished teacher
morale, the respondents indicated that they had improved teacher morale due to the reported increase from 54\textsuperscript{th} to 11\textsuperscript{th} in the job satisfaction ranking of professional occupations. This increase is a result of increased compensation and greater job security.

Research has shown that efficacy of leadership can influence on teacher morale. In a study of teacher job satisfaction and organizational climate, Bledsoe (2008) and Xiaofu and Qiwen (2007) concluded that leadership behavior can both positively or negatively affect teacher morale. Specifically, positive school administrative climate is likely to raise teachers’ morale while poor work conditions, such as low compensation and poor leadership, are negatively correlated with teacher morale. Ma and MacMillan (1999) determined that workplace conditions such as favorable administrative management positively affected teacher satisfaction, a contributing factor of morale. Zembylas & Papanastasious (2005) found that educators’ job satisfaction is related to their empowerment in their schools. Bogler (2001) found that transformational leadership behavior, such as attentiveness to the needs and well being of the teachers, will foster an environment where teachers view their profession as more satisfying. Weiss (1999) found a correlation between a school culture that supports collaboration and shared decision-making and higher morale for teachers. Rowland (2008) also found a significant positive correlation between the leadership practice of enabling others and teacher morale.

Teacher morale is also associated with teacher retention. Traditionally, urban and rural schools struggle with teacher retention, especially in high needs certification areas such as math and science. Teacher attrition is a great concern for underperforming schools. In New York, school report cards report “teacher turnover rates” for individual schools. The school report card also indicates the percentage of attrition for teachers with
fewer than five years experience (New York State Report Cards, 2008). A high teacher attrition rate in a school could be indicative of systemic problems, such as poor organizational health and low teacher morale.

Current research shows that many teachers leave within the first few years of beginning their teaching careers. Kopkowski (2008) cites research from The National Education Association (NEA) that estimates one-third of all new teachers leave after three years, and a startling 46% of new teachers will exit the profession within five years. Wiley (2008) found that the morale and teacher attrition of African-American teachers has been greatly affected by the requirements under NCLB because they were likely to teach in underperforming schools that are greatly impacted by the pressures of NCLB.

In their research on teacher motivation and accountability policies, Finnigan and Gross (2007) found that 27% of teachers in schools on probation would consider leaving the teaching profession. In his research on mandated school efforts, Tawil (2008) found evidence that mandated tests have contributed to teachers leaving the profession. Ingersoll (2001) found that teachers working in high poverty public schools have higher rates of teacher attrition. Darling-Hammond (2007) found that educators who have little experience and minimal preparation are disproportionately assigned to teach in high needs schools. Losing teachers is more than a loss of investment; high teacher turnover may greatly stifle the momentum of change and further contribute to lower teacher morale.

With the teaching profession predominately female, the relationship between gender and morale is important to explore. The research to date on the morale of teachers by gender is inconsistent. For example, where Ma and McMillian (1999) found that
females more than males were satisfied with their chosen profession, Everton, Turner, Hargreaves, and Pell (2007) found that men view their career in teaching more favorably than women. Brockington (2003) found significant differences in the morale of female high school teachers as compared to the morale of their elementary and middle school colleagues. In related research, Ofoegbu (2004) found that males and females equally view teacher motivation as an essential factor in school efficacy. There doesn’t appear to be any trend of teacher morale by gender.

Teacher morale is one of many factors that contribute to the overall impact of accountability measures on educational organizations. The results of this study will be considered with other research data on accountability and assessment to formulate generalizable conclusions about the influence of accountability measures on educational organizations. This research is relevant in that it illustrates how the impact on teacher morale may be one of many unintended consequences of accountability measures in increasingly regulated school systems.

The results of this research are timely, as there is limited research on the effects of accountability systems on schools, as schools are still adjusting to the changes associated with NCLB.

The Relationship between Teacher Morale and Accountability

Glickman states that "standards and assessment are essential to the idea of equity for, and the capacity of, virtually all students" (Glickman, 2003, p.261). Accordingly, accountability standards have forced leaders to initiate change within their schools. Previous research indicates that low morale is a result of a variety of feelings, and may be an obstacle to change. In an era of accountability-based reform, leaders need to recognize
and improve low morale within the staff in order to embark upon successful second order change initiatives.

Looking to explore the experience of New York teachers, Tawil (2008) conducted a phenomenological study on the morale and motivation of teachers as they perform mandated school efforts. The researcher conducted observations and interviews of six elementary and middle school teachers with experience ranging from 3.5 to 30 years of experience in a rural school district from upstate New York. The researchers utilized the Van Kaam Method of Phenomenological Data Analysis to analyze the themes of the data. The researcher found that teachers felt both local and state pressure in addition to district and building administrative pressure to perform. Tawil further concluded that this pressure was even greater for new teachers, who are beginning to learn their craft. Although this study found a decline in teacher morale, there was no decline in motivation.

Tawil first recommended that the morale of the administrators be studied, as they are vital in the school climate and for implementing mandated reform. A second recommendation is that improving teacher morale is integral in invigorating the teaching profession (Tawil, 2008). Supporting research on teacher morale by Anderson (1999) found that a teacher’s success in teaching endeavors is one of the most predictable measures of teacher morale. The research is further substantiated by research conducted by Tucker (2003) who found that environmental robustness, where teachers collaborated in a professionally stimulating environment, had a strong relationship with morale, satisfaction with the work and professional efficacy. Cimricz (2002) adds that state mandated testing alone will not initiate change; instead a teacher’s feeling and work setting will contribute collectively to changing practices for teachers.
In an effort to explore the impact of No Child Left Behind on writing instruction, McCartney (2008) employed the Foucault framework of governmentality, or control techniques, to qualitatively analyze teacher attitudes on writing instruction in both high and low income schools. The interview and observation data collected from 18 teachers were analyzed and organized into four themes. The research suggests that the NCLB legislation has inequitably impacted schools, with lower income schools bearing the brunt of the repercussions, which has been also been noted in research by Wiley (2008) and Darling-Hammond (2007).

McCartney found that the NCLB has forced teachers to narrow the curriculum and has increased the pressure or level or arousal placed on teachers to perform. Furthermore, the researchers found that although teachers from high and low income schools are critics of NCLB, educators employed in lower income schools experienced the impact of NCLB to a “greater extent” than educators from higher income schools (p. 498).

Urban schools have historically struggled to find and retain teachers. In an era of NCLB, the pressures placed upon teachers to increase student achievement among the highest needs students is greater than ever. These pressures are greater in urban schools where inexperienced teachers work with more challenging students for “20% less pay” (Kozol, 1991, p. 30). In a qualitative phenomenological study on the impact of NCLB on the morale of African-American teachers, Wiley (2008) interviewed nine African-American teachers of schools in Mississippi identified as “low performing.” Analysis of this research suggests that NCLB has negatively affected the morale of African-American teachers. The research found that African American teachers were more likely employed in high needs districts, where NCLB pressures to increase student achievement is the
Mathers and King (2001) sought to examine Colorado teachers’ perceptions of teachers about internal (personal) and external (organizational) accountability in small, medium and large districts. The data from this research indicate that teachers are more accountable to themselves than any external factors such as accountability and also that perceptions of teachers did not vary with differing demographics. The implications for this study are that teachers continue to feel isolated and more accountable to themselves which may serve as a barrier to accountability reform initiatives. The results of this research concur with the definition of morale given by Evans (1992) which states that morale is an “individual needs fulfillment” (p.18).

Additionally, the results of research by Mathers and King confirm the results of three previous teacher perception studies: Lortie, 1984; Johnson, 1986; Hoy & Miskel, 1991, on which this study is based. Furthermore, Tucker (2003) found that a healthy school climate where teachers feel positively about their colleagues will promote an individual sense of accomplishment and a greater probability of improving student achievement. The greater sense of accomplishment and positive feeling about colleagues in the workplace are factors that positively contribute to teacher morale (Ma and McMillan, 1999; Weiss, 1999)

A longitudinal mixed method study was conducted by Finnigan and Gross (2007) to investigate whether teacher motivation levels changed as a result of accountability policies and policy mechanisms in ten low performing elementary schools in Chicago in their first or second year of probation. The researchers found that the quantitative data support the qualitative analysis which indicates a negative relationship between teacher
motivation and accountability measures. This research is significant because the researchers found there was a decrease in teacher motivation in schools that struggle the most. This research is significant because motivation is an important component of teacher morale (Bentley and Rempel, 1980).

In 1999, Marcellina Anderson conducted quantitative research on the morale levels of individual teachers as compared to the assessed morale levels of their colleagues. The purpose of this comparative analysis study was to investigate whether individual teacher morale is initiated by group morale and to examine predictors of individual and group morale. The researcher used data from four different studies to develop the research questions. In total, 540 teachers from six districts with varying demographics were given the Teacher Outlook and Perception Survey which contained forty seven questions with a seven point Likert-type scale.

Analysis of the survey data established that teacher morale is primarily independent of the morale exhibited by colleagues. The research concluded that although individual and group morale are correlated, school factors such as student learning and behavior have a greater impact on teacher morale than leadership. This research suggests that although leadership has a weaker influence on morale than student achievement and behavior, leaders should discover and utilize strategies to create opportunities to improve student behavior and increase student learning that could improve teacher morale. This research is further supported by the research of Mathers and King (2001).

Ofoegbu (2004) theorized that the poor organizational climate in urban and rural schools in Nigeria has contributed to teachers' low morale and lack of motivation, which in turn translated into poor student performance in external examinations. Ofoegbu
conducted research on teacher motivation as an essential factor for classroom effectiveness and school reform. The researcher defined teacher motivation as teachers' desire to partake in the education process. Data were collected in three parts using a researcher designed survey instrument labeled *Teacher Motivation Questionnaire (TMQ)*.

Examination of survey data confirmed the assumption that the majority of teachers in this sample believed that teacher motivation is an essential factor in classroom effectiveness and school improvement. Further analysis revealed that male teachers were as likely as female teachers, regardless of location or professional qualification, to believe that teacher motivation will improve the school system’s effectiveness. Anderson believes that the lack of teacher motivation may lead to stress which eventually may translate to ineffective classroom management, limited school improvement and diminished morale. Anderson further recommended that teacher motivation needs to be considered as a working resource for teachers to be adequately motivated for an effective viable school system (Anderson, 1999). Lowe (2000) contributed to the research that poor compensation may diminish teacher morale. In his qualitative research of major reform initiatives to improve teacher performance, he found that the reforms may be limited by local, state, and national policies that limit teacher compensation.

Reform initiatives from accountability standards have caused researchers to look beyond instructional strategies for factors that contribute to student achievement. Research on accountability effects on morale indicate that poor morale may inhibit willingness to change practices that are needed to reform schools and improve student achievement. A positive work environment, where teachers are supported and feel encouraged to collaborate toward an organization goal, is most effective in increasing
teacher morale. Research in this area demonstrates the importance of a positive school climate, which includes high morale, motivated teachers and job satisfaction, in the challenging times of accountability standards reform.

**The Relationship between Accountability Initiatives and Teacher Retention**

In recent years, there has been renewed interest in the turnover of teachers in the beginning of their careers. In addition to long-established factors for teacher attrition such as low pay and poor professional status, accountability measures are now considered a contributing factor to teacher loss.

Moore and Waltman (2006), conducted research on the effects of teacher pressure to increase student test scores. The researchers concluded that increased pressure impacts teacher morale and augmented levels of diminished morale may cause teachers to leave the profession. Loeb, Darling-Hammond, and Luczak (2005) adds that in addition to a school’s student demographics and high proportions of low-income students, which are often found in urban schools that are negatively impacted by high stakes tests, other workplace conditions such as teacher salary and class sizes will predict teacher turnover.

In research to assess how organizations can respond to the implications of high stakes tests, Gilman & Gilman (2003) suggest that professional development may be the key to increasing the morale of teachers. The authors recognize that teacher morale is often diminished by accountability reform initiatives that include high stakes testing but point out that in schools where teachers understand and value the positive role that student assessments and test scores can have on student achievement, teacher morale is higher. Research on student standardized test score and teacher morale by Jarnagin (2004) further supports this research. Jarnagin found a positive correlation among mean ACT
scores, college matriculation rates and the morale of teachers. Weiss (1999) also found that higher morale correlates with the intention to stay in the teaching profession. The conclusions from this research are valuable because the large sample was comprised of a wide variety of teachers from multiple states and the data were collected over several years.

Teacher retention has become a hot topic in the new era of NCLB. The National Education Association recently published that half of teachers quit within the first five years (Wagaman, 2009). This research is supported by Jarnagin (2004), who found that teachers leave the teaching profession at a much higher rate earlier in their careers, even though they report higher morale, than teachers with more than five years experience.

Looking to determine factors that contribute to teacher retention, Inman and Marlow (2004) administered the Professional Attitude Survey, a ten item survey instrument designed to collect information about job stability. The intention of the survey was to obtain information about the 21 characteristics related to teacher career stability. Analysis for this research used demographics, teacher background, reasons for remaining in the profession, and job satisfaction to identify retention factors. The researchers made recommendations for retention that would be useful for educational leaders and in teacher education programs.

A school’s location and student demographics have been shown to impact retention. Howard (2004) determined that rural teachers are more likely than urban or suburban to identify that teacher rapport is a predictor of retention. Additionally, Howard predicted that each district has its own set of specific issues that may impact teacher retention. Easley (2006) researched the intention to remain in or exit the profession of
teaching for teachers who obtained alternate route certifications. The 110 respondents, who represented a range of teacher certifications, age, gender, professional experience, were anonymously surveyed to measure their feelings about teacher attrition and to extract descriptive data. This research suggests the need to examine urban public school leadership in relation to teacher attrition and retention and the moral ideals, such as belief in students, which shape their work.

Rhodes, Nevill, and Allan (2002) conducted a quantitative study of faculty morale and intention to leave the teaching profession in an area that has experienced difficulty in teacher retention. The researchers used Chi-square tests of independence to determine differences in the five top-ranked factors likely to lead to retention or exodus from teaching positions by gender, area, and years of service. The study was used to recommend strategies, such as higher pay and being valued by stakeholders, to leadership that will enhance the professional experience of teachers. This research is similar to the findings of Houchard (2005) who determined that an educator’s satisfaction with his/her teaching will lead to higher levels of morale.

In a teacher satisfaction study, Johnsrud and Rosser (2004) conducted research on faculty morale and intention to leave by means of a questionnaire. Analysis of research data revealed that an individual’s perceptions of the quality of their professional experience and faculty rank had a direct influence on morale. The researchers also determined that gender, race and ethnicity were not significant causes of morale, although the relationship between intention to leave and morale was noteworthy, but varied by institution. This research indicates that understanding morale, which is both an individual and a group phenomenon, is crucial for improving faculty retention. Similarly, Howard
(2004) found that positive relationships with colleagues of similar beliefs will be a factor in higher morale and a greater probability to remain in the profession of teaching.

In 2007, Huston, Norman, and Ambrose conducted a matched cohort qualitative study to identify and examine factors impacting satisfaction and retention. This study illustrates the need for more extensive research on faculty vitality that is organization specific, a theme which is echoed by research by Bolin (2007) and Johnsrud and Rosser (2004). The researchers also highlight the importance of broadening the operational definition of faculty vitality to include faculty engagement and disengagement. The researchers suggest that it is important to develop theories of senior employee disengagement from outside of educational research that propose solutions for averting disengagement.

A teacher’s ability to participate and contribute to the organization is related to higher levels of morale and diminished teacher attrition. Liu (2007) conducted a study on first year teacher attrition and a teacher’s influence over school policy. This study used data from nationally representative data from the National Center for Education Statistics’ Schools and Staffing Survey (2000-2001) and the Teacher Follow-up Survey (1999-2000) to analyze the relationship between first year teacher influence over policy and teachers’ likelihood to leave the profession. Liu found that first year teachers are at greater jeopardy for leaving the profession. The researcher also determined that a teacher’s ability to influence school policy can diminish a new teacher’s susceptibility to leave the profession.

Schlichte, Yssel, and Merbler (2005) utilized a qualitative case study design to investigate the factors that contribute to the stress that many beginning special education
teachers feel that lead them to exit the profession. The analysis of case study data found that poor relationships between novice special education teachers and their school support system are predictors of new teacher attrition. The researchers concluded that multiple support systems such as mentoring and building administration will help provide the support that first year teachers need. Additionally, leaders need to be cognizant of and purposely address the emotions and stressors of a first year teacher so that he/she will stay in the teaching profession and be effective in the classroom.

Mixed methods research methodology was used by Weiqi (2007) to analyze the factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction and its effect on attrition from teaching and enthusiasm for the profession in China. The themes found in the analysis of data are consistent with other researchers’ findings in this area of study. In addition to confirming other research, this research found that secondary teachers are generally dissatisfied with their teaching profession. The teachers in this study were pleased with collegial relationships and social atmosphere of their work, but were unsatisfied with school leadership, work conditions, salaries, and workload.

Most notable in this research was that the researcher found that the teachers were extremely dissatisfied with the educational system and student quality. An additional finding of the research is that a teachers overall job satisfaction is closely connected to professional participation and organizational commitment. Weiqi also concluded that intrinsic rewards, such as work pressure and work reward, have not been able to raise morale or increase retention. It is further concluded that external rewards and commendations can motivate teachers. Weiqi recommends that job satisfaction can be improved by helping teachers meet their expectations, reforming administration and
improving work environment by lessening the teacher workload. (Weiqi, 2007).

The previous research on faculty retention indicates that teachers leave the teaching profession when they perceive they are undervalued as professionals. There is also a strong correlation between morale and intentions to leave. Although morale can be a group or an individual dynamic, an individual’s low morale can contribute to attrition from teaching. This research is important because reform necessitated by accountability measures can often be very challenging and can be a factor in low morale that causes teachers to leave the profession in a time where schools need stability. More research is needed to understand how individual morale relates to the organization’s group morale so that leaders can create and sustain a productive learning environment.

The Relationship between Teacher Morale and Leadership

Educational leaders are an integral component to a healthy school organization. Many researchers have attempted to determine the extent to which leaders influence the health of the organization and whether there are specific leadership dispositions that contribute to a successful school with high student achievement. More recently, NCLB has forced leaders to initiate change within their schools which has had an effect on teacher morale.

In a study about the effect of leadership styles on organizational health, Korkmaz (2007) directed research to determine the extent to which the variations in the organizational health of the school can be correlated with leadership style and the teacher job satisfaction in Turkish schools. Analysis of data from this study led the researcher to conclude that there is a strong relationship between leadership style, specifically the leadership of the principal and the health of an organization. It was further concluded that
the positive organizational health will improve student achievement. This study highlights the importance of the school principal in maintaining a positive school climate that supports teachers. This study calls for more research in the area of transformational leadership as it relates to organizational health.

Bolin (2007) conducted mixed methods research to explore the factors that comprise teacher job satisfaction and factors that affect job satisfaction with 434 teachers in secondary schools in Beijing’s Xicheng, Xuanwu, Haidian, and Chaoyang districts in China. Analysis of the data on leadership behaviors acquired through questionnaires and interviews, led the researcher to determine that teacher stress resulting from exams and leadership dispositions are principal factors affecting overall job satisfaction. This research suggests that leaders should minimize the pressure on teachers to promote greater job satisfaction and that resulting increased job satisfaction will enable the teachers to enhance the quality of instruction.

Bolin used the Leadership Ability Evaluation (LAE) questionnaire and the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) to collect data to measure leadership efficacy and teacher morale respectively. The researcher found a relationship between the leadership style of the building principal and the morale of the teachers in his or her charge. Bolin confirmed previous research that the least effective leadership style is a hands-off approach. This study further highlights the importance of high morale for teachers. High morale is associated with a positive work environment, higher attendance rates and lower teacher attrition (Bolin, 2007).

Cowin (2001) indicates that leadership is an important factor in teacher morale and retention. Teachers were also asked to indicate the main reason for morale problems
in their schools. While 30% of private school teachers pointed to financial compensation, only 14.4% of their public school counterparts saw compensation as the main morale problem. More important for public school teachers were treatment by administrators at 32% and student attitudes and behavior at 40%.

In a study investigating the significance of leaders in the experience of novice teachers, Wood (2005) conducted research using the case study approach of multiple data sources in five purposively selected elementary and secondary schools in an urban setting. Data for this research were collected via a Likert-type scale survey administered to district principals and focus meetings for both coordinators and mentors in case study schools which included semi-structured questions about the new teacher induction program, leadership role in induction, and leadership influences on standards based instructional practices.

The data indicated building principals have five important leadership roles for novice teachers that include school culture builder, instructional leader, facilitator of mentoring, teacher recruiter, and novice teacher retainer. The results reveal the importance of the role of leaders, especially secondary leaders, in the induction process for new teachers, which is particularly important in urban districts that tend to have a higher rate of attrition for teachers.

Leadership is a critical component of successful change efforts. Poggenpoel (2006) used a qualitative, explorative, descriptive and contextual research design to study how teachers experience their school environment during transition. The research was conducted through observations and focus groups of a teacher sample in secondary schools in urbanized areas in the Gauteng Province of South Africa. The results of the
study indicate poor leadership leads to impediments in teaching and that teachers are frustrated by change. The researchers also concluded that teacher happiness is directly related to being employed and relationships with colleagues. This research is significant because accountability standards have forced schools to change to meet ever increasing student achievement expectations.

An important leadership behavior that positively impacts teacher morale is effective communication skills. A study of urban high school teachers found that the communication style of the principal had a significant effect on teacher satisfaction (Berg, 2009). Berg also found that there is a positive correlation between a principal’s ability to communicate effectively and teacher morale. Berg also indicated that teacher morale can be improved through appropriate leadership behaviors. Teachers who are afforded the opportunity to have a voice in school decisions have a higher level of morale (Million, 2005). In a correlational study of teachers, Jones (1997) found a direct relationship between teacher opportunity to participate in decision-making and high teacher morale. The researcher did not find a correlation between actual participation in shared decision making and student achievement.

Using longitudinal data, Weiss (1999) conducted research that explored the relationships among workplace conditions and morale, professional commitment and teacher retention using data from Schools and Staffing Surveys (SASS) given to first year K-12 teachers from nationally sampled schools during 1987-1988 and 1993-1994. The researcher found that a leader’s ability to foster a school culture that supports collaboration and shared decision-making was strongly related to higher levels of teacher morale.
Similarly, other research has found that shared leadership practices and collective decision to inspire others to act leads to higher levels of morale (Houchard, 2005; Jones, 2000). These researchers corroborate the findings of Jarnagin, who found a somewhat positive correlation between morale and leadership practices as they relate to rapport among teachers and curriculum practices (Jarnagin, 2004).

Similarly, Brockington (2003) employed causal-comparative research design to discover if there were significant differences in the morale of teachers at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Analysis of data found that there were strong disparities among elementary, middle and high school teachers’ perceptions of teacher morale. The researcher concluded that leaders can work to build morale by empowering teachers with shared-decision making opportunities, especially at the middle and elementary level. The researchers suggest that to improve teacher morale, leaders need to provide opportunities for teachers to gain control over their work environment and conditions.

In a study of secondary school principal succession, Meyer, Macmillan, & Northfield (2009) found a relationship between the succession process and both teacher and group morale. The researchers found that the specific process of leadership succession and the new principal’s leadership practices affect individual teacher and institutional morale. This research has implications for districts that experience a high rate of turnover for building leaders. Additionally, a penalty of being perpetually underperforming and failing to make AYP could be replacing the school staff which includes the leadership (NCLB, 2001). Additionally, accountability mandates have inequitably hit urban schools where pressures on leadership may force leaders to flee to less challenging schools.
In research by Leithwood (1994), analysis of data indicated that district leaders are most likely to build the confidence and sense of collective efficacy among building leaders by actively constructing cooperative working relationships in their schools. The emphasis of developing a collaborative community to improve teacher morale is very important for teachers in high need schools. The findings of this research are important because systems leaders can facilitate a building leader’s ability to augment morale. This is noteworthy particularly in high needs schools as Logan (1992) found that the morale of teachers in high needs schools differ from the morale of non-high needs school colleagues based on the support they receive from their school community.

Research on morale reveals a strong correlation between leadership and teacher morale. Research from the United States and abroad illustrates that a leader has a direct impact on a teacher’s morale and overall job satisfaction. In particular, leadership styles that encourage collaborative decision-making in a healthy organizational climate are strongly related to a positive teacher morale and higher job satisfaction. This research provides some helpful strategies for improving teacher morale that can be employed by the leader. Additionally, the results of this research can direct leader preparation programs to include the important skills of improving teacher morale. Further research is needed to identify specific leadership dispositions by gender that can improve morale.

*Gender Influences on Morale and Job Retention*

The effect of gender on morale has been studied at length, with varying results. Some researchers contend that women have an overall higher morale than their male counterparts. Some studies conclude the opposite. Other researchers have not established a relationship between gender and morale. In the teaching profession, there appears to be
a positive correlation between females and job satisfaction.

Using a quantitative research to Ma and McMillian (1999) investigated the influences on teacher job satisfaction using a *Likert*-type scale questionnaire which measured the job satisfaction of teachers and also obtained key demographic information, such as gender and age. The analysis for this research sought to investigate professional satisfaction among teachers with varying demographic characteristics. The most notable conclusion of this study is that females were significantly more satisfied in their profession than their male counterparts and that professional longevity diminished job satisfaction. The research is important because it measured how background demographics impact teacher satisfaction and how various background characteristics behave in different work settings.

In a quantitative study by Timms, Graham, and Caltabiano (2006), the relationship between teacher perceptions of trustworthiness of school leadership and gender was examined. The researcher’s analysis of data found a significant relationship between females and job stress/burnout especially at the primary level of teaching. This research is significant because the majority of the teaching workforce is female, specifically at the primary level.

Eichinger (2000) conducted quantitative research on job stress and satisfaction using a extensive generic stress and satisfaction survey that consisted of the *Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank Number Five*, three *Maslach Burnout Inventory Subscales* (personal accomplishment, depersonalization and emotional exhaustion), a *Special Education Stress Index*, a *Special Education Satisfaction Index*, and the *Bem Sex Role Inventory*. The survey instrument asked subjects to respond to questions about job stress and
satisfaction and social role characteristics. The responses were analyzed in relation to six indices of work related stress and satisfaction.

The results indicated that female special education teachers report more stress than their male counterparts. Another conclusion is that female teachers who are undifferentiated, not assigned to a particular subject or grade, on the job have greater stress levels. The research has implications for teacher preparation programs, leadership behaviors and future research to understand the differences in stress between the genders.

Teacher perceptions of the job may impact morale. Everton et al. (2007) conducted research that was part of a four year mixed methods study on the status of teachers and the teaching profession. The researchers used face to face interviews with over one thousand subjects randomly selected, and stratified by region and socioeconomic factors, to collect data about the status of teaching compared to other professions, general perceptions of teaching and the attractiveness of teaching as a career. Although the research confirmed previous research on the perceptions of teaching as a career, the researchers found that more men than women were likely to view the teaching career attractively.

The research on morale as it relates to gender is inconclusive. Many researchers have found no relationship between morale and gender. Howard (2004) found no difference in morale in the genders. Berg (2009) determined that gender was not a significant factor in perception of leadership as it relates to teacher morale. In her research on morale levels of elementary teachers, Anderson (1999) concurs there is no difference in morale by gender but rather a difference as it relates to workload and age. Logan (1992) found low levels of morale regardless of gender, years of experience or type of
The relationship between gender and morale or job satisfaction is not always clear. Although the research on gender and morale in the review of literature is mixed, it appears that females are more prone to job stress that could decrease job satisfaction and ultimately productivity and efficacy. The area of gender is ripe for more research due to the imbalance of gender in the profession of education. More research on job satisfaction is needed to clarify gender specific causes of low morale.

Literature Summary

The review of literature underscores the importance of monitoring the morale of teachers in public schools as they relate to the changes that accompany NCLB. Several studies outline the association between accountability and teacher morale, teacher retention, leadership, and in some cases gender. These studies provide supporting evidence that teacher morale has been greatly impacted by the stress and pressure of accountability reform and related negative designations. Most notably several studies conclude that low morale is an impediment to the mandated reform of NCLB.

This literature review contains many recent studies that point to a relationship between pressures associated with accountability measures such as high stakes tests and teacher morale. The morale of the teachers is an important consideration given the ever increasing teacher expectations and pressures under NCLB. The research questions for this study were developed using contemporary literature with the intent to add to the body of research on teacher morale.

All of the long and short term influences on the morale of teachers have yet to be discovered. Current literature and the results of this research on teacher morale and
accountability point to a relationship between several contributing morale factors such as gender, efficacy of leadership and on the job stress. The results of this study support and provide a deeper understanding of the findings of other research in the areas of accountability and morale. Although this research and the corresponding review of related literature have exposed the impact of accountability measures on teacher morale, the results point to need for greater research into the relationship between NCLB and its consequences on the morale of teachers.
Chapter III: Methodology

The purpose of this quantitative research was to explore the association between the morale of teachers in public middle schools and federal accountability designations. Using the proposed conceptual framework, the study answers the following four research questions which specifically address the interactions between accountability designations and morale of teachers in public middle schools in New York. The primary research question for this study was:

1. Are there any differences in teacher morale associated with school accountability designations?

Three additional supporting questions guided this study. These questions specifically address the interaction of leadership, teacher retention, and gender with morale of teachers in identified middle schools:

2. Are there any differences in teacher retention associated with school accountability system designations?

3. How do teacher perceptions of their leader’s behavior interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designation?

4. How does gender interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designations?

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of three groups that included a total of nine middle schools purposively selected according to federal accountability designations for the 2007-2008 school year from schools in New York State other than New York City and Buffalo. In New York State, schools failing to make AYP were identified according
to the length of failure to make AYP. The nine schools were purposively selected to
include three schools in three categories of schools – schools identified as “In Good
Standing”, Schools Identified as “In Need of Improvement- Year 1 or 2” or “Requiring
Academic Progress- Year 1 or 2” and Schools “In Restructuring- Year 1 or 2”. The
School “In Need of Improvement” status is given to those schools who receive Federal
Title 1 funds. A non-Title 1 school still is responsible to demonstrate AYP under NCLB.
Failure to do so results in the designation “School Requiring Academic Progress” or
“SRAP” for the school.

Table 1
*Sample Schools by Accountability Designation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools in Good Standing</th>
<th>School in Need of Improvement: Year 1 or Year 2</th>
<th>Restructuring: Year 1 or Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants for this study were certified New York state teachers who were
employed at this time in a New York State public school other than New York City and
Buffalo. The exclusion was made because factors that affect morale in these school
systems may be different due to varying degrees of independence in areas such as
academic programming. The data were collected from December 2008 to May 2009.

*Survey Instrument*

The survey instrument (Appendix A) for this research was a survey instrument on
morale with demonstrated validity and reliability. In four separate studies, the instrument
produced an overall scale with Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient ranging from .89 to .92 (Anderson, 1999). The fifty seven item quantitative survey contained a seven point scale to measure teacher morale levels and their perceptions of the morale levels of their colleagues. Permission was obtained from the developer to use the Teacher Outlook and Perceptions Survey instrument used in this study of morale (Anderson, 1999). The instrument contained forty seven questions on morale specific to the teaching position and an additional ten questions on demographic information that were added to the Teacher Outlook and Perception Survey to be utilized in the analysis of teacher morale.

School Sample

The characteristics of the sample closely approximated the general characteristics of the teaching population in NYS such as median age, years of experience and gender. The data collected were sorted into three groups: “Schools in Good Standing”, “School in Need of Improvement-Year 1 and Year 2/Schools Requiring Academic Progress-Year 1” and “Schools in Restructuring-Year 1 and Year 2” as defined by New York State. The list of schools used to generate the schools whose teachers were invited to participate in this sample was generated by the New York State Department of Education and located on their website. The rationale for using purposive sampling was to ensure proper representation of schools within the three accountability groups. Since the initial and subsequent request for participation did not yield a large enough sample size, a convenience sampling technique was employed to obtain additional research sites.

The sample for this study consisted of 226 currently employed in nine middle schools in New York State. A total of 410 teachers were invited to participate. This study had an overall response rate of 55%. The teachers were 72.9 % female and 29.8% male.
The ethnicities of the participants were 97.3 % Caucasian with remaining participants identifying themselves as African American, Asian, Hispanic, or other. The participants varied in age range with 32.6 % of the respondents aged 30 to 39, 23.2 % aged 40 to 49, 22.6 % aged 50 to 60 and 20.5 % aged 20 to 29. Sixty three and five tenths percent of the teachers indicate that they are married; 29.1 % indicate that they are single, 5.3 % divorced, and 2.1 % indicated “other” for marital status. Additionally, 65.1 % of the teachers indicated that they taught a class that required them to administer a state mandated test.

Data Collection

The data for this study was collected through the distribution of a web-based survey of teacher morale containing 47 questions posted on Survey Monkey. The majority of the questions were 7 pt. Likert-type scale measuring responses from “strongly disagree” to strongly agree.” An additional 10 questions asked factual information such as age, gender, length of employment, and career intentions.

The online survey was piloted in a middle school in Troy, New York, a school currently identified as “In Need of Improvement-Year 1” under NCLB. The purpose of this pilot study was to establish the validity of both the survey instrument and the online testing mechanism. The sample for the pilot was approximately 77 teachers of grades six through eight. The number of respondents for this survey was 49 for a 64 % return rate. The gender breakdown of respondents was 74 % female and 26 % male.

The pilot study was also used to determine the length of time it would take to complete the survey. The pilot group was asked to make comments about the online survey. The comments were used to improve the delivery of the survey with the intention
to maximize the return rate and reliability of data. A Cronbach’s Alpha reliability analysis of the pilot data was $\alpha = .87$.

The participants for this study were provided clear and comprehensive instructions for completing the survey instrument. Definitions and clarifying information for individual items and terms were also provided to participants. The survey directions indicated that the survey would take approximately 10 minutes. The online survey had multiple screens and prompts to indicate the percentage of the survey completed. The purpose of the multiple screens and prompts was to encourage completion of the survey.

Letters were mailed to principals of the identified schools (Appendix B) soliciting involvement of their schools in the study. In some schools, the building principal did not have the authority to approve research requests and research approval was accomplished at the district level. The letter from the researcher asked each building principal of the schools in the selected sample for permission to conduct research by surveying their staff. The letter also asked the principal to encourage teacher participation in this important timely study. The letter indicated that the overall research results would be shared with the faculty both electronically and by hard copy upon conclusion.

The letter asked the principals or systems leaders for an email response that served as permission to conduct research. The letter to the principal or systems leader also included details about the security of the data. The researcher asked that each principal provide email addresses of the entire teaching staff of the selected middle schools. The researcher obtained email addresses of the teachers from the building principals during the initial email communication, subsequent phone conversations or through school websites. In specific cases when the email addresses could not be obtained, the researcher
asked the building principal or designee to forward a link containing the survey directly to their staff.

The researcher sent an email message and the research cover letter (Appendix C) through the Survey Monkey website to the entire teaching staff in their building. Both the cover letter and the email included the purpose of the data collection activities and information about data security. A brief message regarding the importance of participation in the study to the field of education was included in the email communication. In the event the researcher was not authorized to obtain the email addresses for the teaching staff, an email containing a cover letter about the research and a link to the online survey was provided by an administrator at the research site.

The email from the researcher via Survey Monkey asked the teacher recipients to access a Survey Monkey website that contained the morale survey questionnaire and respond to it. A link to the website was included in the email for ease in accessing the survey. A second email was sent out several weeks later to encourage responses from those schools and teachers who had not responded the first time. The list management feature in Survey Monkey enabled the researcher to track respondents to maximize response rate. To increase participation, in addition to completing the survey online, the respondents had the option to print the survey instrument and mail the completed survey to the researcher.

The communication also assured the participants that their data would be anonymous. To protect anonymity of the participants, the researcher used study codes on completed questionnaires instead of recording identifying personal data. A separate document of the codes was locked in a separate location to which only the researcher had
access. All identifiable data on Survey Monkey website was encrypted and all personal
data obtained from the instrument was removed after receiving data. Data documents
were properly stored in locked locations and access to computer records was restricted by
password access both on the computer and the website. At the conclusion of the project,
the researcher properly destroyed and deleted study data and related documents.

Data Analysis

The survey data was collected on Survey Monkey and downloaded into Statistical
Programs for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
was conducted on the data to assess whether the means of groups of schools were
statistically different from each other. The data analysis for the primary question in this
study included a one way ANOVA and a post-hoc Tukey test to measure the morale in
schools currently not in “Good Standing” as defined by NCLB compared to schools
currently in “Good Standing” as defined by NCLB and how the length and level of
identification impacted the morale of teachers. The analysis for the supporting questions
included regression analysis, descriptive analysis and t-test. The analysis of data is
displayed in tables and figures in Chapter IV.

Limitations

Although the interaction between the levels of teacher morale and federal
accountability designations was explored, there was no attempt to address the efficacy of
school accountability. There are multiple sources of research on the impact of
accountability systems, specifically high stakes testing on student achievement and
teacher practices. This research does not add to the research about the effectiveness of
accountability systems rather the potential implications on teachers as a result of
accountability systems.

The timeline for collecting data was also a limitation of this study. Data were collected over a period of several months, due to the research approval process. Over the course of collecting the data, New York State went through a very difficult budget crisis that has had a great impact on schools. The impact of the New York state fiscal crisis may have had a deleterious impact on the spirits of the teachers and on individual schools.

Another limitation was that the sample for this study was not randomly selected due to the difficulty in getting permission to survey schools that were initially randomly selected. This study utilized purposive sampling to identify the schools that received an invitation to participate. As a result of the purposive sampling technique utilized in this study, the sample did not represent the entire State of New York but instead was primarily concentrated in the Capital District and upstate of New York. The purposive sampling narrowed the demographic characteristics of the research participants therefore limiting the generalizability of the results.

Although an online web-based survey was useful, its use instead of traditional paper and pencil surveys could have limited respondents to people who have frequent access and comfort level with email and the internet. In addition, there was no way to assess how many of the teachers did not ever receive the email or a related technology issue, such as lack of email access or delivery failure.

There were also some demographic limitations to this study; the sample primarily consisted of urban schools with the exception of one rural school in the category of schools in “Good Standing”. Also, the respondents in this study were predominantly Caucasian, with 97.3% of the respondents identifying themselves as such. This limited
the generalizability of the results to other ethnicities.

Time and setting may have also been a limitation of this study. The time and date of the week that the participant accessed the survey might have altered the responses from the participants. The answers may have been different depending on the time or day or even the setting when the survey was taken.

An additional limitation of this study is leadership turnover. In three of the schools sampled, there was a leadership transition. Meyer et al. (2009) found that leadership transition does have an impact on morale. The results on teacher morale could have been influenced by the leadership transition or the succession process that was not addressed in this study.

A final limitation is the definition of a middle school for the purpose of this research. The researcher conducted research at schools that were categorized as middle schools by New York State because they offered the New York State ELA Assessments. The list was generated by New York State. The schools in this sample may be a nontraditional middle school such as K-12 setting, or a junior high/senior high school.
Chapter IV: Data Analysis

Data analysis and results

The first section of this chapter will discuss the demographic distribution and the return rates of the participants and their schools. The second section will discuss the analysis of data that will answer the research questions presented in chapter one. Thorough discussion of the analysis of data will be presented along with recommendations for further research.

The data for this research was analyzed using SPSS version 16 computer software. The respondents were placed into three groups: 1) Schools “In Good Standing”, 2) Schools in “Improvement” and 3) Schools in “Restructuring”. Comparisons between groups were used for to answer the research questions. In addition to the grouping by accountability designation, the school size, NRC, suspension rate, teacher turnover rates and class size are presented (Table 2).

School A is a small urban school in the Capital Region, educates 478 students and has an accountability designation of “In Good Standing”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of three, an annual suspension rate of 18 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of experience of 11 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 5 %, and an average class size of 19 in core academic classes.

School B, a rural school in Central New York, educates 166 students and has an accountability designation of “In Good Standing”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of five, an annual suspension rate of 8 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of
Table 2

Accountability Status and Related Indicators for Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Accountability Designation</th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>NRC</th>
<th>Suspension Rate</th>
<th>Turnover Rate of Teachers with Fewer than Five Years of Experience</th>
<th>Teacher Turnover for the entire staff</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>In Good Standing</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>In Good Standing</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>In Good Standing</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>SRAP-Year 1</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>SINI-Year 1</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SINI-Year 2</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Restructuring-Year 2</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Restructuring-Year 1</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Restructuring-Year 2</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Taken from the New York Education Department School Report Card for 2007-2008*
experience of 14 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 15 %, and an average class size of six in core academic classes.

School C, a small city school located within the Capital Region, educates 223 students and has an accountability designation of “In Good Standing”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of three, an annual suspension rate of 15 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of experience of 0 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 0 % and an average class size of 14.5 in core academic classes.

School D, a school located in the Adirondack Region of Northern New York, educates 611 students and has an accountability designation of “SRAP-Year 1”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of four, an annual suspension rate of 9 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of experience of 20 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 0 %, and an average class size of 14.5 in core academic classes.

School E, a small city school located in Central New York, educates 516 students and has an accountability designation of “SINI-Year 1”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of three, an annual suspension rate of 7 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of experience of 0 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 7 %, and an average class size of 18.8 in core academic classes.

School F, a small city school located within the Capital Region, educates 205 students at the middle school level and has an accountability designation of “SINI-Year 2”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of three, an annual
suspension rate of 18 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of experience of 33%, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 15 %, and an average class size of 18 in core academic classes.

School G, an urban school located within the Capital Region, educates 565 students and has an accountability designation of in “Restructuring-Year 2”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of three, an annual suspension rate of 25%, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of experience of 25 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 28 %, and an average class size of 18.5 in core academic classes.

School H, an urban school located within the Capital Region, educates 584 students and has an accountability designation of in “Restructuring-Year 2”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of three, an annual suspension rate of 33 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than five years of experience of 26 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 28 % and an average class size of 23 in core academic classes.

School I, an urban school located within the Capital Region, educates 341 students and has an accountability designation of in “Restructuring-Year 2”. This school has a need to resource capacity (NRC) designation of three, an annual suspension rate of 25 %, a turnover rate of teachers with fewer than 5 years of experience of 47 %, a teacher turnover for the entire staff of 31 %, and an average class size of 18 in core academic classes.

The gender of the participants, along with sample size, number of surveys returned, and overall return rate by school are displayed in Table 3.
Table 3

*Return Rate and Gender of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th># Returned</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% not identifying gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the time the data was collected, the research participants were working with students who participated in the New York State intermediate level (grades six, seven, and eight) assessments. All teachers teaching intermediate level students were invited to participate. All of the responses were anonymous.

The research participants were asked to answer ten demographic questions that included gender, age, years experience teaching, years employed at current school, ethnicity, marital status, individual annual income before taxes, career intentions, and whether they taught a class that required the administration of a state mandated test.

The participants were asked to identify their age range. The ages of the research participants are listed in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Respondents</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years old</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 years old</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were asked to indicate their years of experience in teaching. A total of 189 participants indicated the number of years of teaching experience for the research participants is listed in Table 5.
Table 5

*Years of Experience in Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience in teaching</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were asked to indicate their length of employment in their current school. A total of 190 participants that indicated their length of employment at their current school as listed in Table 6.

Table 6

*Length of Employment at Current School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Employment at current school</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants were asked to identify their ethnicity. Table 7 is the classification of the ethnicity for 187 participants.

Table 7

*Ethnicity of the Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were asked to identify their marital status. A total of 189 participants indicated their marital status as listed in Table 8.

Table 8

*Marital Status of the Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 189
skipped question 6
The participants were asked to identify their individual annual income. A total of 182 respondents identified their individual annual income as listed in Table 9.

Table 9

*Percentage of Individual Annual Income*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Annual Income</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $25,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 to $40,000</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 to $55,000</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,001 to $70,000</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 to $85,000</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $85,001</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were asked to indicate the career intentions. A total of 191 participants indicated their career intentions as listed in Table 10.

Table 10

*Career Intentions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Plan</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staying in the teaching profession at this school</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in the teaching profession in a different school</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving the teaching profession within three years</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving the teaching profession as soon as possible</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving the teaching profession but staying in education (counseling, administration, etc.)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants were asked to identify if they taught a class that required the administration of a state test. A total of 189 participants identified whether or not they taught a class that required the administration of a state test as listed in Table 11.

Table 11

Percentage of Teachers that Teach a Class Requiring the Administration of a State Mandated Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teach a class that requires administration of a state test</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Instrumentation

All teachers within the respondent schools received an invitation to participate in the research. The 47 questions seven point. Likert-type survey instrument (Appendix A) contained several questions that were grouped into the following categories:

1) Administrative issues
2) Peer support
3) Teacher and classroom experiences,
4) Teacher autonomy and influence,
5) Peer support
6) Crisis
7) Workload
8) Anticipated Job Outlook

For the 47 statements from the Teacher Outlook and Perception Survey, the respondents were asked the degree to which they agreed using the following rating systems:

1) Strongly Disagree
2) Mostly Disagree
3) Slightly disagree
4) Undecided
5) Slightly agree
6) Mostly disagree
7) Strongly agree
Data Analysis

The Teacher Outlook and Perception Survey (Anderson, 1999) was administered via an online survey hosted at www.surveymonkey.com. The participants were invited to identify the degree to which they agree with 47 statements reflecting a teacher’s employment experiences. The survey data was downloaded into Microsoft Excel and subsequently imported into SPSS version 16 computer software for analysis. Several analytical techniques were employed to answer the following research questions:

1) Are there any differences in teacher morale associated with school accountability designations?

2) Are there any differences in teacher retention associated with school accountability system designations?

3) How do teacher perceptions of their leader’s behavior interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designations?

4) How does gender interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designations? For the purpose of answering research questions about accountability, the participants were grouped into three groups.

Primary Research Question

Question #1 - Are there any differences in teacher morale associated with school accountability designations?

The participants were asked to respond to the statement “My level of morale is high” using a 7 pt Likert scale where 1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Mostly Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Undecided, 5 = Slightly Agree, 6 =Mostly Disagree, and 7= Strongly Agree. Table 12 identifies the mean by school for teacher’s individual morale.
Table 12

*Summary of Morale by School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Grouped Median</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.424</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>2.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>3.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.738</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 13, 14 and 15, along with figure 1, 2, 3 and 4, illustrate the summary of morale by accountability group. The respondents were asked to respond to the statement “My level of morale is high.” The results are displayed in Table 13 (Figure 1).

For schools identified as in “Good Standing”, 3.6% of the respondents (N=2) indicated that they “Strongly Disagree;” 0% of the respondents (N=0) indicated that they “Mostly Disagree”, 7.3% of the respondents (N=4) indicated that the “Slightly Disagree”, 3.6% of the respondents (N=2) indicated that they were “Undecided”, 14.5% of the respondents (N=8) indicated that the “Slightly Agree”, 54.5% of the respondents (N=30) indicated that the “Mostly Agree”, and 16.4% of the respondents (N=9) indicated that the “Strongly Agree”. Zero participants from schools in “Good Standing” failed to respond to this statement.
Table 13

*Summary of Morale for Schools in “Good Standing”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My level of morale is high</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Undecided</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Slightly Agree</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Mostly Agree</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Summary of Morale for Schools in “Good Standing”*
The respondents from schools in “Improvement” were asked to respond to the statement “My level of morale is high.” The results are displayed in Table 14 (Figure 2).

Table 14

Summary of Morale by Schools for Schools in “Improvement”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My level of morale is high</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Undecided</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Slightly Agree</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Mostly Agree</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Summary of Morale by Schools for Schools in “Improvement”
For schools identified as in “Improvement”, 8.3% of the respondents (N=8) indicated that they “Strongly Disagree”, 10.4% of the respondents (N=10) indicated that they “Mostly Disagree”, 13.5% of the respondents (N=13) indicated that they “Slightly Disagree”, 0% of the respondents (N=0) indicated that they were “Undecided”, 19.8% of the respondents (N=19) indicated that the “Slightly Agree”, 19.8% of the respondents (N=19) indicated that the “Mostly Agree”, and 35.4% of the respondents (N=34) indicated that the “Strongly Agree”. Two participants from schools in “Improvement” failed to respond to this statement.

The respondents from schools in “Restructuring” were asked to respond to the statement “My level of morale is high.” The results are displayed in Table 15 and Figure 3.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My level of morale is high.</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Undecided</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Slightly Agree</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Mostly Agree</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Summary of Morale by Schools for Schools in “Restructuring”

For schools identified as in “Restructuring”, 14.9% of the respondents (N=11) indicated that they “Strongly Disagree”, 14.9% of the respondents (N=11) indicated that they “Mostly Disagree”, 14.9% of the respondents (N=11) indicated that they “Slightly Disagree”, 4.1% of the respondents (N=3) indicated that they were “Undecided”, 18.9% of the respondents (N=14) indicated that the “Slightly Agree”, 24.3% of the respondents (N=18) indicated that the “Mostly Agree”, and 8.1% of the respondents (N=6) indicated that the “Strongly Agree”. Zero participants from schools in “Restructuring” failed to respond to this statement.

A comparison of level of morale was made by accountability grouping. Table 16 along with Figure 4, illustrate the contrasts in level of morale by accountability group.
### Summary of Morale by Accountability Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My level of morale is high</th>
<th>Schools in “Good Standing” Response %</th>
<th>School in “Improvement” Response %</th>
<th>Schools in “Restructuring” Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Undecided</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Slightly Agree</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Mostly Agree</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Morale by Accountability Group**

![Morale by Accountability Group](image)
The participants were grouped by accountability designation: Schools in “Good Standing”, schools in “Improvement” and schools in “Restructuring.” Each group contained participants from three schools. The researcher used an ANOVA analysis to analyze the means for the question “My morale is high” as seen in Table 17.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean morale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Good Standing</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Improvement</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Restructuring</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean morale for schools designated as in “Good Standing” was 5.61 and was statistically significant at a p< .001. The mean morale for schools in “Improvement” was 4.73 and is statistically significant at p=.008. The mean morale for schools in “Restructuring” was 4.03 and is statistically significant at p< .008. The results for this analysis were statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$. The mean morale by accountability group is displayed in Figure 5.
There is a significant difference between the three accountability groups for research question 1. The mean for the schools categorized as in “Good standing” was significantly higher than the schools in some level of improvement. Although the results of the ANOVA analysis indicated that there was a significant difference in mean morale, the test did not indicate which groups were significantly different from each other. A Post Hoc Tukey test was conducted to determine which accountability groups are significantly different from each other (Table 18).

Table 18

A Post Hoc Tukey Test: Levels of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools in Good Standing</th>
<th>Schools in Improvement</th>
<th>Schools in Restructuring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Good Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Improvement</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Restructuring</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the relationship between teacher morale and school accountability designation proved significant, the *post hoc Tukey test* further revealed that the relationship between schools identified as in “Good Standing” and schools that were identified as in “Restructuring” at a p< .001 and between schools identified as in “Good Standing” and schools that were in “Improvement” status at a significance level of p= .038. Morale ratings for teachers in schools in “Good Standing” were significantly different from the morale ratings by teachers both in schools in “improvement” p = .038, and the schools in “Restructuring”, p < .001. However, there were no significant differences in teacher ratings of moral between schools in “Improvement” and schools in “Restructuring”, p = .86.

*Supporting Research Question*

*Question #2 - Are there any differences in teacher retention associated with school accountability designations?*

In schools that are identified as in “Good standing”, 77.8% of the teachers indicated that they were likely to remain in the teaching profession at their school. This is in sharp contrast to the schools that are identified as in “Restructuring”. Table 19 (Figure 6) show a comparison of career plans by accountability designation group.
Table 19

*Career Plans by Federal Accountability Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Plan</th>
<th>In Good Standing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SINI</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Restructuring</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staying in the teaching profession at this school</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in the teaching profession in a different school</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving the teaching profession within three years</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving the teaching profession as soon as possible</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving the teaching profession but staying in education (counseling, administration, etc.)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Career Intention by Accountability Group
Only 56.8% (N= 42) of the respondents from schools in “Restructuring” indicated that they were planning to stay in their teaching position in their school. In schools identified as in “Good Standing”, 11.2% (N=6) indicated that they were planning on leaving the profession. For schools that are identified as in restructuring, 33.8% (n= 25) planned on a career change.

An analysis of the career plans of teacher respondents of varying ages was conducted. Several participants (N= 46) indicated that they did not plan to stay in their current position. The responses for the participants who were planning on a career change are separated by the respondents’ age range. The results are displayed in Table 20.

An investigation of the intent to leave the school did not indicate a specific age range that was more likely to leave the profession. An important consideration of the responses to this question is the state of the economy on the local, state and national level during the collection of the data.

Supporting Research Question

Question 3: How do teacher perceptions of their leader’s behavior interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designation?

For this study, leadership behaviors were divided into 10 individual behaviors that were considered in a regression model. These 10 leadership behaviors were considered as predictors of teacher morale by accountability group: (1) the administration at my building listens to an attends to my concerns; (2) my suggestions for school improvement are basically ignored; (3) I am uncertain about the direction our building is heading academically; (4) there is a sense of order in my building; (5) my principal is aware of my strengths and abilities; (6) in disciplinary matters my administrator supports me; (7) I feel
### Table 20

**Career Plan by Age Range**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>staying in the teaching profession in a different school</th>
<th>leaving the teaching profession within three years</th>
<th>Leaving the teaching profession as soon as possible</th>
<th>Leaving the teaching profession but staying in education (counseling, administration, etc.)</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
uncomfortable discussing school problems with my principal; (8) There is a sense of belonging in my school; (9) the principal in my building values my input on school issues; and, (10) my work is easier and more enjoyable because of my principal.

Leadership items 2, 3, and 7 were reverse scaled due the negative wording of the statement. The reverse scaling was conducted in SPSS.

To determine the relationship between teacher morale and leadership, a regression analysis was conducted on each of the ten statements regarding leadership behaviors. For this regression analysis, morale was the dependent variable and the leadership behaviors were the independent variables. The regression analysis was conducted on the same dependent and independent variables for the three accountability groups (Table 21).

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Group</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Good Standing</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Need of Improvement</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Restructuring</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: P<0.05.*

The regression analysis of all ten leadership behaviors for the schools in “Good Standing” produced an “r” value of .596 and an r² value of .355. The relationship between teacher morale and the ten leadership behaviors were not significant at a level of p = .096. The regression analysis of all ten leadership behaviors for the schools in “Improvement” status produced an “r” value of .714 and an r² value of .510. The ten leadership behaviors
were significant at a level of \( p < .001 \). The regression analysis of all ten leadership behaviors for the schools in “restructuring” status produced an “r” value of .679 and an \( r^2 \) value of .462. The ten leadership behaviors were significant at a level of \( p < .001 \).

A comparison by accountability grouping of the regression analysis for the ten leadership behaviors is displayed in Table 22.

Table 22

*Summary of Regression Analysis of Leadership Behaviors by School Accountability Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership behaviors</th>
<th>Schools in Good Standing</th>
<th>Schools in Improvement</th>
<th>Schools in Restructuring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administration at my building listens to and attends to my concerns.</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My suggestions for school improvement are basically ignored.</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am uncertain about the direction our building is heading academically.</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a sense of order in my building.</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is aware of my strengths and abilities.</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In disciplinary matters, my administrator supports me.</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable discussing school problems with my principal.</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a sense of belonging in my school.</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal at my building values my input on school issues.</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work is easier and more enjoyable because of my principal.</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( P<0.05 \); Dependent Variable is: “My Level of morale is high”
For schools identified as in “Good Standing,” none of the ratings of the ten leadership behaviors was statistically significant when related to morale. For schools identified as in “Improvement,” three of the ten leadership behaviors were statistically significant at p= .05 when related to morale. Specifically, the statement “my suggestions for school improvement are basically ignored” was statistically significant at p= .038, “there is a sense of belonging in my school” is significant at p <.001, and “my work is easier and more enjoyable because of my principal” is statistically significant at p= .036 when related to morale. For schools identified as in “restructuring,” three of the ten leadership behaviors were statistically significant when related to morale. Specifically, the statement “the administration at my building listens to and attends to my concerns” is significant at p<.001, “there is a sense of order in my building” is significant at p=.002, and “the principal at my building values my input on school issues” is significant at a p= .005, when related to morale.

Supporting Research Question

Question 4: How does gender interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designations?

The participants were asked to identify their gender. The responses of all respondents to the statement “My level of morale is high” was presented by gender. The number and percentage of each response to the morale statement is reported for female teachers, male teachers and for all respondents (Table 23).
For the respondents that indicated that they “Strongly Disagree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 9% (N=12) were female and 9% (N=9) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Mostly Disagree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 8% (N=11) were female and 11% (N=9) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Slightly Disagree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 14% (N=18) were female and 9% (N=5) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they were “Undecided”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 2% (N=2) were female and 5% (N=3) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Slightly Agree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 19% (N=25) were female and 16% (N=9) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Mostly Agree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 38% (N=50) were female and 34% (N=19) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Strongly Agree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 11% (N=14) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Strongly Disagree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 9% (N=12) were female and 9% (N=9) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Mostly Disagree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 8% (N=11) were female and 11% (N=9) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Slightly Disagree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 14% (N=18) were female and 9% (N=5) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they were “Undecided”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 2% (N=2) were female and 5% (N=3) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Slightly Agree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 19% (N=25) were female and 16% (N=9) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Mostly Agree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 38% (N=50) were female and 34% (N=19) were male. For the respondents that indicated that they “Strongly Agree”, with the statement “My level of morale is high”, 11% (N=14) were male.
female and 16% (N=9) were male.

The level of morale by gender and accountability designation is displayed in table 24. An examination of teacher morale by gender and accountability did indicate some variations (Figure 7).
Table 24

*My Level of Morale is High Percentage by Gender and Designation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good Standing</th>
<th></th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th></th>
<th>Restructuring</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Slightly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Mostly Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7

My Level of Morale is High Percentage by Gender and Designation

My Level of Morale is High by Gender and Accountability Designation

Percent Response

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Mostly Disagree
3=Slightly Disagree
4=Undecided
5=Slightly Agree
6=Mostly Agree
7=Strongly Agree
The trend of the responses by gender to the statement “my level of morale is high”, are similar for the schools in “Good Standing” and “Improvement. Seventy nine percent the females from schools in “Good Standing” strongly or mostly agreed that their morale was high in contrast to the 55% of males that strongly or mostly agreed that their morale was high. In schools that in “Improvement” status, the percentage of both females and males from school in “Good Standing” indicated they strongly or mostly agreed that their morale was high decreased, with 48% and 52% of the participants respectively strongly or mostly agreed that their morale was high. In both the “Good Standing” and “Improvement” groups, the females reported higher morale than the males. The morale differences appeared in the “restructuring” group, where males reported higher morale than females. For schools in “Restructuring” the percentage of males that indicated that they strongly or mostly agreed that their morale was high 48% where 23% of females strongly or mostly agreed that their morale was high. Females from schools in “Restructuring” report the lowest morale by gender and designation.

A regression analysis for the interaction of teacher morale with gender and accountability designation is displayed in Table 25.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression analysis for interaction of teacher morale with gender and accountability designation produced an “r” value of .263 and an r² value of .069. The regression analysis indicated that the relationship between teacher morale and specific
leadership behaviors was significant at p < .001. Although the p value indicates a strong statistical significance of the interaction of teacher morale with gender and accountability designation, the $r^2$ value indicates that there is no practical significance. In this instance less than seven percent of the variation in morale can be predicted by gender and accountability.

This supports the results of an independent samples t−test of morale and gender on the entire sample (Table 26).

Table 26

*Independent Samples T-Test for Morale by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>p = .887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a comparison of the relationship between morale and gender of the entire sample, the results are not statistically significant at p = .887.
Chapter V: Conclusions

Summary of Findings

The role of the classroom teacher has changed since the inception of the No Child Left Behind Law of 2001. A school’s ability to successfully carry out the NCLB mandates has become a principal focus for teachers and leaders, because failure to do so results in devastating consequences for schools. The primary responsibility of getting students to achievement mastery has been fallen on the shoulders of the teacher. Teachers at many grades levels are accountable for student achievement based on the results of one or more mandated standardized tests. The research supports that this changing job responsibilities and expectations have had many unintended negative consequences for teachers such as decreasing teacher morale, increasing anxiety and lowering job satisfaction (Mehrens, 1998; Gilman & Reynolds, 1991; Nichols and Berlinger, 2005).

The primary intent of this research to explore the relationship between federal accountability designations and teacher morale, the 226 participants answered 47 questions from the Teacher Outlook and Perception Survey (Anderson, 1999) and ten additional demographics questions. The analysis for this quantitative research included ANOVA, t-test and regression as well as descriptive analysis. Using these analysis techniques, the research sought to answer the following research questions,

1) Are there any differences in teacher morale associated with school accountability designations?

2) Are there any differences in teacher retention associated with school accountability system designations?

3) How do teacher perceptions of their leader’s behavior interact with teacher
morale and federal accountability designation?

4) How does gender interact with teacher morale and federal accountability designations?

This study had 226 participants from nine middle schools Northern, Central and the Capital Region of New York who participated in an online survey hosted at www.surveymonkey.com. This study used a non-experimental research design to collect quantitative data for analysis.

The primary finding for this research is that there are highly significant differences in morale between schools in “Good Standing” and schools that are indentified as underperforming under NCLB, “Schools in Need of Improvement” and “Schools in Restructuring”. An initial ANOVA was utilized to determine whether there was significant differences teacher morale by accountability grouping. After a difference was determined, a post hoc Tukey test found that the mean morale score for teachers from schools in “Good Standing” was significantly different from schools in “Improvement” at p= .038. The mean score for the difference between teachers from schools in “Good Standing” and schools in “Restructuring” is highly significant at p< .001. The differences mean differences between the schools in “Improvement” and schools in “Restructuring” was not significant in terms of teacher morale. The results from the post hoc Tukey test reveal they the level and length of identification as underperforming was associated with diminishing morale of teachers.

Additionally, there is a significant difference between the teacher career plans and the length and level of the schools identification as underperforming. Descriptive statistics indicate that 77.8% of teachers from Schools in “Good Standing” indicated that
they are intending to stay in their current position at their current school. The percentage of teachers intending to stay in their current position greatly diminishes for teachers in “Improvement” and “Restructuring”, 70.2 % and 56.8% respectively. Teachers in schools identified as in “Restructuring” were almost four times as likely to indicate that they intend to seek teaching employment in a different school than teachers from schools in “Good Standing.”

The review of literature points to the importance of leadership in teacher morale. The participants were asked to respond to several statements about leadership behaviors. A regression analysis identified several leadership behaviors that appeared to be related to teacher morale in underperforming schools. Leadership behaviors are related to teacher morale at a significance of p > .001 for schools in “Improvement” and “Restructuring” status. The results of this research demonstrate that leadership behaviors such as effective communication and shared decision making are associated with teacher morale.

The researcher found no significant differences in morale or retention by gender. A t-test and descriptive analysis showed that there were no significant differences in teacher morale by gender for the entire sample or by accountability designation. These findings are similar to the body of literature on the association of gender and morale, in that the results are varied.

A moderate to strong relationship between teacher morale and federal accountability designations was identified. Teacher retention and leadership behaviors appear to interact with a federal identification for being underperforming.
Conclusions

Teacher Morale and School Accountability Designations

The accountability designation of a school appears to be related to the morale of middle school teachers. The morale of teachers of schools considered to be in “Good Standing” is significantly higher than the morale of teachers who work in schools that had been identified as underperforming. Additionally, the level and length of identification is also associated with decreased teacher morale, with the lowest level of morale associated with the group of schools that have been designated as underperforming for the longest length. Although teachers in schools that have the “Improvement” accountability designation have lower morale than teachers employed in schools that are in “Good Sanding”, their morale is higher than that of teachers employed in schools that are in “Restructuring “though the differences between the two are not significant. These findings support research by Nicols and Berlinger, (2005); McCartney, 2008; and Finnigan and Gross, (2007).

Some of the findings, notably those associations between morale and accountability designation are statistically and practically significant. The importance of morale has been well documented. Gilmans & Reynolds (1991) and Mehrens (1998) found that reforms associated with accountability have had the unintended outcome of lowering teacher morale. These results are very important for building and systems leaders. Leaders must be aware of the how accountability measures such as high stakes tests and school accountability designations influence teacher morale. In addition to impacting how teachers feel about their profession, Moblo (2005) found that low morale has a negative effect on assessment scores. The importance of this finding is that leaders,
especially leaders of schools that have been identified as underperforming, need to be cognizant that lower-morale and student achievement are related (Bolin, 2007). Leaders need to be aware that the process of becoming identified as underperforming may become a cycle where the negative identification lowers morale and subsequently trigger diminishing student achievement (Figure 7). Appropriate leadership behaviors and a positive school climate can help to mitigate the influence of accountability on teacher morale.

*Teacher Retention and School Accountability Designations*

A descriptive analysis of the data points to substantial differences in teachers’ plans to stay in their current school based on the accountability designation of the school in which they are employed. For schools identified as in “Good Standing”, 78.8% of the respondents indicated that they were planning to stay in their current position at their current school. In schools identified as in “Improvement”, 70.2% of the respondents indicated that they were planning to stay in their current position at their current school. In schools identified as in “Restructuring,” only 56.8% on the participants indicated that they were planning to remain in their current school.

The levels of identification, and therefore the number of years of identification, appear to be related to teacher career intentions. The percentage of teachers from schools in “Improvement” planning to remain in their current school is 70.2%, down slightly from 78.8% of teachers from schools in “Good Standing”. The percentage of teachers from schools identified as in “Restructuring” planning to remain in their current school is 56.8%, down considerably from 78.8% of teachers from schools in “Good Standing”. Also, 21.6% of teachers from schools in “Restructuring” indicated that they were
planning to remain in teaching but in a different school. This was substantially higher than the 5.6% of teachers from school in “Good Standing” and the 4.3% of teachers working in schools in “Improvement.” The data for teachers planning for a career change did not reveal a particular age range that would be more likely to leave. Although this is contrary to research by Darling-Hammond (2007); Finnigan & Gross (2007); and Kopkowski (2008), the deteriorating state of the economy both nationally, and in New York State, as well as high unemployment rates, may have influenced the responses of the participants.

The results of the current study support other research conducted in this area. Tawil (2008); Ingersoll (2001); and Moore & Waltman (2006) found that many factors related to accountability, including morale, were related to a teacher’s intention to leave the profession. This should be an area of great concern for educational leaders, especially of schools in some phase of reform to increase student achievement. Reform is challenging for educators, and will be very difficult to sustain if a significant population of teachers is planning to leave. It is unlikely that these teachers will fully invest in the reform needed to improve student achievement and therefore move the school to improved performance.

**Leadership Behaviors and Accountability Designations**

The regression analysis of several leadership behaviors conducted for the three accountability groups revealed that leadership behaviors are related to teacher morale. Although the leadership behaviors were not significantly related to teacher morale for schools in “Good Standing”, they were significant for schools in “Improvement” at p < .001 and for schools in “Restructuring” at p < .001.
For schools in need of “Improvement”, the respondents identified that having a sense of belonging in the school and a having a principal that makes work easier and enjoyable is directly related to teacher morale. More specifically, The respondents from schools in “Restructuring” identified that having an administration that listens and attends to concerns, having a sense of order in the building and having a principal that values input on school issues is directly associated with teacher morale.

The findings of this research, support research on leadership behaviors that promote teacher morale and teacher job satisfaction. A leader’s ability to communicate effectively has a positive correlation with teacher morale (Berg, 2009). Also, this research supports the findings by Million (2005); Houchard (2005); Jones (2000); and Brockington (2003), that a teacher’s inclusion in the shared decision-making process is associated with higher teacher morale. The results of this study may also support the Logan’s (1992) findings who show that the morale of teachers that work in high needs schools differ from the morale needs of their counterparts in non-high need schools, as all schools in the “Improvement” and “Restructuring” groups are schools with higher than average needs.

*Teacher Morale and School Accountability Designations by Gender*

In this current study, there was no association identified between gender and morale. The literature in this area has yielded mixed results and there is no conclusion that can be drawn other than gender does not appear to be related to morale. This is consistent with research on gender relationship with morale by Anderson (1999) and Howard (2004).
Summary

The results of this research further support the argument that diminishing teacher morale is one of the unintentional consequences of high stakes testing and accountability practices that are a result of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The research found a strong correlation between teaching in a school that is identified as an underperforming school and lower teacher morale when self-ratings of morale are compared to ratings of teachers in districts not described as underperforming. Lower teacher morale may increase teacher attrition, as well as stifle the ability to institute and sustain wide scale reform in school (Figure 8).

Figure 8. Accountability Influences Diagram
This research does point to several leadership practices that are associated with teacher morale both positively and negatively in schools identified as underperforming. Practices of collaborative leadership, where a leader creates a positive school climate, has a positive relationship with morale. Conversely, a leader that excludes teachers from the decision-making has been shown to lower morale. Further research into confounding variables such as compensation, student population, parents, community and resource allocation is needed in the area of leadership behaviors.

Although this research did not find a relationship between gender and morale by accountability group, gender still may be an important factor in reform and leadership practices that needs to be considered. A longitudinal study of morale by gender over time would be needed to determine if gender has an impact morale of teachers of organizations undergoing reform.

Recommendations

With almost a decade of reforms under No Child Left Behind, there is now much of data on the long term influences of accountability practices on teacher morale. Leaders and policy makers need to gain a clearer understanding as to the implications for schools that have a teacher morale issue. Although, previous research has focused on traditional factors that influence teacher morale such as work environment and teacher salary, the influence of accountability practices on teacher morale needs further research.

The importance and implications of teacher morale need to be considered by leadership preparation programs and state education departments that govern school Improvement plans for schools in some level of federal identification as a result of NCLB. Teaching is unique to other professions in that tenure affords a person job
protection even though the school may be identified as underperforming. As teachers begin to feel the pressure to improve student achievement, the importance of teacher morale will be vital be leaders. The practical significance of this research is that leaders can utilize well established morale survey instruments to gather morale information specific to their faculty that may help them increase teacher motivation and hopefully student achievement.

Recommendation for Future Research

There are several factors that contribute to the complicated subject of teacher morale. The level and length of negative accountability designation is significantly related to the morale of teachers that are employed in those schools. In addition to being useful in secondary schools, the insights into morale could be used in other industries. Due to the complex and complicated nature of morale, there is much more research that needs to be conducted.

Further research is needed on the association between teacher morale and the socioeconomic status of school, school size and how teacher morale relates to teacher expectations. As newer accountability directives assimilate into the school cultures such as “Response to Intervention” and “Value Added”, the pressure on individual teachers will grow. The continued pressures are sure to have an effect on teacher morale that needs further study.
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Appendix A

Teacher Outlook and Perceptions Survey (Anderson, 1999)

Directions: Thank you for your participation in this study on the association of teacher morale and federal accountability designation. Please respond to your perceptions of the following statements.

For the purposes of this study, morale is defined as your opinion on a variety of factors that affect the way a teacher feels about their profession as a teacher.

1. I have enough materials to meet my student’s needs.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

2. When needed, I can rely on my colleagues for assistance.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

3. I am supervised closely to ensure that I follow procedures carefully.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

4. My students appreciate my efforts.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

5. I feel pressured by my colleagues to be consistent with their practices in the classroom, even if I disagree with them.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

6. My students are achieving at what I consider their expected level.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

7. I feel that I am successful in my teaching endeavors.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

My level of morale is high.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

9. Other teachers have utilized my ideas in their classroom.
   - 1=Strongly Disagree
   - 2=Mostly Disagree
   - 3=Slightly Disagree
   - 4=Undecided Agree
   - 5=Slightly Agree
   - 6=Mostly Agree
   - 7=Strongly Agree

10. I feel in charge when I teach.
    - 1=Strongly Disagree
    - 2=Mostly Disagree
    - 3=Slightly Disagree
    - 4=Undecided Agree
    - 5=Slightly Agree
    - 6=Mostly Agree
    - 7=Strongly Agree

11. The administration at my building listens to and attends to my concerns.
    - 1=Strongly Disagree
    - 2=Mostly Disagree
    - 3=Slightly Disagree
    - 4=Undecided Agree
    - 5=Slightly Agree
    - 6=Mostly Agree
    - 7=Strongly Agree

12. My suggestions for school improvement are basically ignored.
    - 1=Strongly Disagree
    - 2=Mostly Disagree
    - 3=Slightly Disagree
    - 4=Undecided Agree
    - 5=Slightly Agree
    - 6=Mostly Agree
    - 7=Strongly Agree

13. I enjoy teaching my students.
    - 1=Strongly Disagree
    - 2=Mostly Disagree
    - 3=Slightly Disagree
    - 4=Undecided Agree
    - 5=Slightly Agree
    - 6=Mostly Agree
    - 7=Strongly Agree

14. There are teachers in my building that I consider close friends.
    - 1=Strongly Disagree
    - 2=Mostly Disagree
    - 3=Slightly Disagree
    - 4=Undecided Agree
    - 5=Slightly Agree
    - 6=Mostly Agree
    - 7=Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1=Strongly</th>
<th>2=Mostly</th>
<th>3=Slightly</th>
<th>4=Undecided</th>
<th>5=Weakly</th>
<th>6=Moderately</th>
<th>7=Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. The administration at my building adheres strictly to discipline policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am uncertain about the direction our building is heading academically.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There is a sense of order in my building.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Each year I teach, I look forward to trying new things in the classroom.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There is little opportunity for growth in my position.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am pleased with the possible changes ahead for my school.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My principal is aware of my strengths and abilities.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching is limited by budget constraints.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The overall morale exhibited by my colleagues seems low.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In disciplinary matters, my administrator supports me.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Required paperwork and red tape absorb an unreasonable amount of time.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I feel uncomfortable discussing school problems with my principal.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The curriculum I use needs a great deal of modification.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. There is a sense of belonging in my school.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. For the most part, my work with students is highly satisfying and rewarding.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The principal at my building values my input on school issues.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am given the flexibility to alter the curriculum to meet my students' needs.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1=Strongly</td>
<td>2=Mostly</td>
<td>3=Slightly</td>
<td>4=Undecided</td>
<td>5=Slightly</td>
<td>6=Mostly</td>
<td>7=Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I often feel that my efforts to reach my students are futile.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I have an adequate amount of planning time.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Student threats to staff are a concern in my building.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I see the district placing unreasonable demands on teachers in the future.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Changes proposed for our school will do little to help solve the present problems.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I frequently feel irritated by my students’ actions.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I made the right decision in choosing a career in education.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. My work is easier and more enjoyable because of my principal.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. There is a great deal of bickering and taking sides among our staff.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My principal has realistic expectations of the teachers in this building.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I expect student behavior to decline in the years ahead.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I experience an undue amount of stress and strain from teaching.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I have an unreasonable work load.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. My students are generally friendly and pleasant to interact with.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. My colleagues do not provide encouragement.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I am optimistic about changes in our school.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. What is your gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
49. What is your age?
- Female
- Male

- 20-29 years old
- 30-39 years old
- 40-49 years old
- 50-60 years old
- 60-64 years old
- 65 years and over

50. How long have you been teaching?
- 0-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- more than 20 years

51. How long have you worked at this school?
- 0-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- more than 20 years

52. What is your ethnicity?
- Caucasian
- African-American
- Hispanic
- Asian
- Other

53. What is your marital status?
- Single
- Married
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Other

54. What is your individual annual income before taxes?
- $0 to $25,000
- $25,001 to $40,000
- $40,001 to $55,000
- $55,001 to $70,000
- $70,001 to $85,000
- More than $85,001

55. What is your career plan?
- staying in the teaching profession at this school
- staying in the teaching profession in a different school
- leaving the teaching profession within three years
- Leaving the teaching profession as soon as possible
- Leaving the teaching profession but staying in education(counseling, administration, etc.)
- not sure

56. Do you teach a class that requires you to administer a state mandated test?
- Yes
- No

57. What is the name of the school where you teach?
Appendix B

Email seeking participation to conduct research

Dear Middle School Principal:

My name is Angelina Bergin and I am a doctoral candidate from Sage College in Albany, NY. This email is requesting your permission to conduct research on the morale of teachers in your middle school. I am carrying out research titled “The Association Between Federal Accountability Designations and the Morale of Teachers in Public Middle Schools.” I am working under the direction of Dr. James Butterworth, professor of Educational Leadership. In my research, I am interested in obtaining survey data on teacher morale from your teachers using an online survey. This research is intended to inform leaders on the factors that impact teacher morale.

In the attachments below you will find all of the information about the survey and the actual survey. If you need any additional information, I will be glad to provide it for you.

Participation in this survey requires minimal effort from you. Beyond your permission to conduct research with your staff, all you need to do is to assist me in communicating with the staff and to encourage participation in the research. You can forward a list of the teacher emails to me so that I can invite the teachers to the online survey hosted by the Survey Monkey website that contains the morale survey questionnaire to your entire teaching staff via email. The online survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete and can be accessed from any location.

The survey is confidential. All identifiable data on the Survey Monkey website will be encrypted and all personal data obtained from the instrument will be removed upon receipt of data. All study data and related documents will be properly destroyed and/or deleted. Data documents will be properly stored in locked locations and access to computer records will be restricted by password access both on the computer and the website. Additional information is in the attached research proposal and a cover letter to your teachers. Please feel free to contact me at (518) 753-4057 or bergia@sage.edu if you have any questions.

Please consider participation in this research. Upon conclusion of the research, the results with be provided to both you and your staff both electronically and in hard copy through the mail. Please respond to me via email at bergia@sage.edu your willingness to participate in this research. I thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Angelina Bergin
Appendix C

Email to middle school requesting participation

Dear Middle School Teacher:

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Angelina Bergin from Sage College in Albany, NY. The purpose of this study is to study the association between federal accountability designations and the morale of teachers in public middle schools. This study will contribute to the student’s completion of her doctorate in Educational Leadership.

What is the purpose of the study?

The purpose of this relational quantitative research is to study the association between federal accountability designations and the morale of teachers in public middle schools.

What will happen during the survey?

You will use the link in this email to access an online survey of teacher morale hosted at [link]. The survey consists of 57 multiple-choice questions. Ten of these questions are demographic questions. All data will be entered directly into the website without identifying information except for the name of the school. All data is Anonymous. The principal of your school has granted permission to conduct the survey.

How long will the survey take?

This survey should take approximately 10 minutes and can be accessed from any computer with Internet access.

Is it safe?

This is an anonymous survey. All identifiable data on the Survey Monkey website will be encrypted and all personal data obtained from the instrument will be removed upon receipt of data. All study data and related documents will be properly destroyed and/or deleted. Data documents will be properly stored in locked locations and access to computer records will be restricted by password access both on the computer and the website. Although research results will be shared with the participating schools, no individual responses will be provided to the principals.

Why have I been chosen?

You are a teacher of a middle designated as “In Good Standing”, “School in Need of Improvement-Year 1” or “Restructuring Year-1”.

Why should I participate?

This is an important and timely study for teachers throughout the United States. Potential benefits from participation in this study include obtaining knowledge as to the effects of the morale of teachers. The results of the study will be shared with your school both in electronic form and in written form through the building principal.

In this email you will find a link to access the survey.

Questions about the Study

If you have questions or concerns during the time of your participation in this study, or after its completion or you would like to receive a copy of the final aggregate results of this study, please contact:

Dr. James Butterworth
Sage Graduate School
Sage College School of Education
45 Ferry Street Troy 12180
518-469-5032
butte@sage.edu

Angelina Bergin
24 Matala Drive
Schaghticoke NY 12154
518-753-4057
bergia@sage.edu

Thank you for your participation.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP WITH THIS RESEARCH