5-2021

# Effects of Organizational Climate on Dual Language Teacher Retention

Joseph Lewis

jil17a@acu.edu

This dissertation, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the College of Graduate and Professional Studies of Abilene Christian University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

**Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership**

*Nannette W. Glenn, Ph.D.*

_____

Dr. Nannette Glenn, Dean of
the College of Graduate and
Professional Studies

Date 03/23/2021

Dissertation Committee:

*John Kellmayer*

_____

Dr. John Kellmayer, Chair

*Simone Elias*

_____

Dr. Simone Elias

*E. Owens*

_____

Dr. Emiel Owens

Abilene Christian University

School of Educational Leadership

Effects of Organizational Climate on Dual Language Teacher Retention

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Joseph I. Lewis

May 2021

## Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Iris Lewis, and my father, Ivan Lewis. Thank you for all you have sacrificed to allow me the opportunities I have been afforded.

# Abstract

There has been notable growth in the number of dual language programs across the United States in recent years. Like traditional bilingual programs, dual language programs rely heavily on the adequate staffing of bilingual teachers—a subgroup of educators who are in short supply. Despite notable findings from research regarding bilingual teacher retention, the topic of dual language teacher retention remains relatively unexplored. The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate to what extent a statistically significant association exists between factors related to organizational climate and dual language teacher retention. Using the Organizational Climate Index, the researcher explored four key domains of organizational climate: Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability. Survey results from 86 dual language teachers in the District of Columbia Public Schools were analyzed using a correlational design. The results of this study were calculated using a logistic regression model, which indicated a statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teacher retention intentions. Inversely, no statistically significant association was found between Achievement Press and dual language teacher retention intentions

*Keywords:* dual language, retention, organizational climate, achievement press, institutional vulnerability, professional teacher behavior, collegial leadership

## Table of Contents

# List of Tables

**Chapter 1: Introduction**

Over the last several decades, the number of English-language learners (ELLs) has risen

substantially, primarily due to increased immigration from non-English-speaking countries

(Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008; Hutchison et al., 2015). The United States is home to one-fifth of the

world's total migrants, and approximately 22% of all public school students in the United States

speak a language other than English (Acosta et al., 2019). Furthermore, Acosta et al. (2019)

found that 9.5% of all public school students were identified as ELLs, increasing by 1.4

percentage points over the last 19 years. As the percentage of non-English-speaking students has

increased, schools across the country have had to develop and implement instructional models

that support the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. In response to the increase

in linguistic diversity, bilingual education programs have become more prevalent, especially in

areas with higher numbers of native Spanish speakers (Hutchison et al., 2015). Moreover, Alanís

and Rodríguez (2008) reported that the expansion of the number of nonnative English-speaking

students has required school districts to implement an array of bilingual programs to better

support the unique needs of changing student populations. Of the various types of language

programs, dual language programs have become increasingly popular across K–12 public

schools (Lachance, 2018), focusing on the development of biliteracy and bilingualism among

both native and nonnative English-speaking students. Due to the growing popularity of dual

language programs, it is estimated that the proportion of dual language learners will increase by

nearly 40% by 2030 (Guiberson & Ferris, 2019). The increased prevalence of dual language

programs is often attributed to the goal of the program model, which aims to "promote academic

achievement for ELLs as well as foreign language immersion for English-dominant students"

(Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008, p. 306). As the popularity of dual language programs increases, so

will the need for school-based administrators to ensure they have appropriate staffing of dual language teachers to run dual language programs (Lachance, 2018) successfully. Unfortunately, the sustainability of dual language programs relies immensely on the pipeline of bilingual educators—who are in short supply (Lachance, 2018).

**Statement of the Problem**

Despite the notable expansion of dual language programs, many school districts struggle to maintain or expand such programs due to the national shortage of dual language teachers (Lachance, 2018). Moreover, Hutchison et al. (2015) noted that the rapid expansion of dual language programs has led to the need for additional trained and certified bilingual educators. According to Lachance (2018), "There remains a national concern regarding the availability of qualified teachers who are prepared for the unique requirements of dual language teaching" (p. 3). Furthermore, the extensive need for bilingual teachers has also led to less favorable recruiting methods, such as hiring individuals on emergency certifications (Mason & Swanson, 2018). Dual language teacher shortages have also forced many public school districts to recruit bilingual teachers from other countries, which often proves inadequate, as many of these teachers lack the prerequisite training needed to effectively facilitate instruction in dual language classrooms (Lachance, 2018). Moreover, Mason and Matas (2016) postulated that teacher shortages among bilingual teachers are mostly due to the inability to retain those teachers already employed, which challenges the "efficacy of language education programs" (p. 1). Although bilingual teacher retention is generally an issue across all types of bilingual programs, Lachance (2018) noted that dual language programs are especially prone to retention issues. According to Mason (2017), the most viable way to address the shortage is to promote the retention of bilingual teachers. Research suggests that one of the most notable factors influencing employee retention

is organizational climate (Bindu, 2017). By examining the relationship between organizational climate and dual language teacher retention, school-based administrators may be able to implement school-wide norms, strategies, and policies to promote the retention of dual language educators.

**Purpose of the Research**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine to what extent a statistically significant association exists between the four domains of the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) and dual language teachers' decisions to remain in their current positions. This study addressed K–12 dual language teachers in the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS). Moreover, the study encompassed a sample of teachers across all content areas and dual language program models. In all, this research study was designed to provide school-level administrators with information to use to improve retention rates among their dual language teachers.

**Research Questions**

The following four research questions served as a guide for this study:

RQ1: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?

RQ2: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?

RQ3: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Achievement Press and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability?

RQ4: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Achievement Press?

**Hypotheses**

To address the research questions, the following hypotheses were tested:

$H_1$: A statistically significant association exists between Collegial Leadership and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?

$H_2$: A statistically significant association exists between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current position, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability.

$H_3$: A statistically significant association exists between Achievement Press and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current position, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability.

$H_4$: A statistically significant association exists between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current position, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Achievement Press.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Achievement press.** Achievement Press is the degree to which a school establishes high but achievable academic standards (Dahlkamp et al., 2017).

**Collegial leadership.** Collegial Leadership is a leadership approach that requires school leaders to engage staff members through collaborative methods for decision-making (Singh, 2008).

**Dual language program.** A dual language program is an instructional model in which two languages are utilized for classroom instruction and learning (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008).

**English-language learner.** An ELL is a student whose native language is not English and requires support in English-language proficiency (Hutchison et al., 2015).

**Institutional vulnerability.** Institutional Vulnerability is the degree to which a school is susceptible to parent groups or community organizations (Dahlkamp et al., 2017).

**Job satisfaction.** Job satisfaction is the level of favorability of a job (Dicke et al., 2020).

**Language-minority students.** Language-minority students are students whose native language is not English and may or may not have developed enough language proficiency to navigate academic instruction in English (Thomas & Collier, 2003).

**Organizational climate.** According to Thompson and Siciliano (2021), organizational climate is defined as the collective perceptions among members.

**Professional teacher behavior.** Professional Teacher Behavior is defined by the degree to which staff members demonstrate a commitment to students, team members, mutual cooperation, and support (Hoy et al., 2002).

**Transitional bilingual education.** Transitional bilingual education is an educational program that aims to transition language-minority students to English-only instruction (Murphy, 2014).

**Two-way immersion program.** A two-way immersion program is a dual language program model that combines native English speakers and language-minority students, requiring

the students to engage in academic instruction through two target languages (Hutchison et al., 2015).

**Theoretical Framework**

This quantitative study was framed through the lens of organizational climate theory. Dahlkamp et al. (2017) described organizational climate theory as follows:

> In education, organizational climate commonly refers to a school's features, morale, and persona. More specifically, school climate has included variables such as collegiality and consensus, administration's leadership, influence, support, and teachers' contentment and commitment. (p. 363)

For the purpose of this study, the theoretical framework was centered around the four domains of the organizational climate, as outlined above. The theoretical framework was also centered on the premise that each of these domains directly influences teachers' attitudes and perceptions toward their school's organizational climate. Moreover, I explored how these domains affect dual language teacher retention.

**Summary**

Although the expansion of dual language programs has benefited many students across the United States, the shortage of bilingual educators has hindered the growth of dual language programs, forcing school-based administrators to rely on a smaller pool of qualified candidates. Although there is extensive research on how school climate influences teachers' decisions to remain in the classroom, I sought to understand how Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability influence dual language teacher retention intentions.

**Chapter 2: Literature Review**

Researchers have long investigated the factors that contribute to teacher attrition and retention, and an extensive number of studies have been dedicated to understanding the causes of teacher mobility among a variety of educator demographics (Hammonds, 2017). However, there is limited research regarding the factors that contribute to the retention of bilingual teachers, specifically teachers in dual language programs. In this study, I focused on factors related to organizational climate and their influence on dual language teacher retention. To promote the retention of dual language programs, it is essential to fully understand the degree to which each domain of organizational climate presented in Chapter 1 contributes to dual language teachers' decisions to remain in the profession. This chapter outlines the historical context of bilingual education, the benefits and structures of dual language programs, research on bilingual teacher retention and the organizational climate, and an in-depth review of the theoretical framework.

**Background and Context for the Study**

The adverse effects of low teacher retention rates on overall school functioning and effectiveness are notable and impact teachers of all backgrounds (Hammonds, 2017). For the DCPS system, the reduction of teacher attrition rates has been a primary focus for both school-based and central office administrators. This researcher investigated the retention of dual language teachers. As the number of dual language programs in DCPS continues to expand (currently at 11 as of the 2020–2021 school year), school-based administrators must ensure adequate staffing. This study helped to provide insight into how administrators can leverage particular facets of organizational climate to increase retention rates among dual language educators.

**Historical Background of Bilingual Education**

Although state and local policies and laws influence the goals of bilingual education programs, at the federal level, the aim is to help transition language-minority students to mainstream classrooms. According to Gomez and Cisneros (2020), bilingual education is "utilized for immigrant communities to establish themselves into American culture while also establishing and maintaining their cultural and linguistic heritage without being forced into assimilation" (p. 3). However, this view of bilingual education has been and continues to be the subject of robust debate. In various places and times in the United States, bilingual education programs have encountered many barriers, such as competing political and cultural norms and financial priorities (Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015). Bilingual education policy has witnessed a pendulum of progress and setbacks throughout its history. From fierce activism to draconian laws attempting to undercut bilingual education, these programs have continued to gain popularity across the United States (Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015).

Since the beginning of bilingual education, politics and public opinion have manifested through various policies and legislation. At various points in U.S. history, support for bilingual education has "shifted from support of literacy and heritage languages to anti-bilingualism through education policy" (Gomez and Cisneros, 2020, p. 2). Moreover, the status of bilingual education has often depended on the advocacy, or lack thereof, demonstrated by policy makers and elected officials. One of the first pieces of legislation aimed at promoting the implementation of bilingual education was the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, signed by President Lydon B. Johnson. The act amended Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1963, mandating that school districts that receive federal funding were required to demonstrate how they were addressing the needs of ELLs (Ackerman & Tazi, 2015). The Bilingual Education Act

was a significant step in supporting ELLs, as the first piece of legislation to mandate some level of accountability for schools to provide adequate linguistic support for students. Despite the progress made from the passage of this act, many states and municipalities refrained from providing sufficient educational opportunities for ELLs. Activists and special interest groups in California raised concerns that the rights of ELLs were being violated because schools were not providing adequate instructional support to ensure that ELLs could access instructional content (Hutchison et al., 2015). The activism on behalf of immigrants' rights activists resulted in a lawsuit; in 1974, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Lau v. Nichols* that insufficient language instruction for language-minority students violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This was a significant victory for bilingual education advocates; however, it was ultimately met with additional opposition. Not long thereafter, other legislation across the United States was introduced to further prohibit or reduce the prevalence and the sustainability of bilingual education. By the end of the 20th century, several pieces of legislation were passed in efforts to stifle the progress made by bilingual education advocates, including three notable anti–bilingual education pieces of state-level legislation introduced during this period: California's Proposition 227, which aimed to ban the use of languages other than English in California public schools; Arizona's Proposition 203, which introduced tighter restrictions in public schools, leading to the reduction of bilingual programs across the state; and Massachusetts' Question 2, which required that all students receive instruction in English (O. García et al., 2018). Despite these examples representing the state level, the resistance to bilingual education extended far beyond local and state municipalities, reaching into national politics. In 1981, then President Ronald Reagan stated,

It is absolutely wrong, and against American concepts to have a bilingual education

program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and

never getting them adequate in English, so they can go out into the market and

participate. (O. García & Sung, 2018, p. 327)

These words, along with the state legislation described above, underscore the competing

agendas, both locally and nationally, regarding the role of bilingual education.

More recently, additional federal legislation has held significant implications for bilingual

education, such as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), a reauthorization of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act that amended numerous provisions. However, it is

important to note that NCLB was not identical to the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act—it included an array of additional amendments. Polanco and Luft de Baker (2018) noted

that NCLB further promoted "English-only" education. According to Menken (2009), NCLB had

adverse effects on ELLs due to its "de facto language policy," which forced ELLs to participate

in standardized tests that were not available in their native language. Although bilingual

education has faced—and continues to face—opposition, the recent Every Student Succeeds Act,

the 2015 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was the first federal

legislation in recent years to promote bilingual education (Polanco & Luft de Baker, 2018).

Under this act, schools were required to demonstrate that they were improving the language

proficiency of ELLs.

Although bilingual education advocates have made notable progress, there continues to

be no change in the goal of federal bilingual education policy—that is, to transition ELLs from

their native language to English (Polanco & Luft de Baker, 2018). Fortunately, many public

school districts across the country have implemented a variety of bilingual programs, despite the lack of effective bilingual education policy at the federal level.

**Transitional Bilingual Education**

Due to the increase of linguistic diversity within U.S. schools, many school districts across the country have implemented various bilingual education programs. Transitional bilingual education, which remains the most common type of bilingual educational model available to students in the United States, focuses on promoting English-language education for nonnative English speakers. Murphy (2014) noted that in transitional bilingual programs, "the home language and English are used as instructional languages on a temporary basis, with the goal of diminishing classroom use of the home language and establishing an English-only environment as quickly as possible" (p. 183). In other words, the fundamental premise of transitional programs centers on the idea that while students will notice a temporary lag in academic achievement, their long-term success will increase through "access to economic opportunities and social mobility" (p. 427). Whereas traditional language programs focus on transitioning students from reading in their native language in primary grades toward English-only instruction, they ultimately share the same goal—transitioning language-minority students from instruction in their native tongue to instruction in English (Polanco & Luft de Baker, 2018).

**English as a Second Language**

English as a second language (ESL) programs aim to teach English to non-English-speaking students. Furthermore, traditional models tend to focus more on language development, than on content-based instruction. There are currently a variety of instructional models for ESL programs. However, two ESL models are most prevalent: the traditional program model and the sheltered instruction program model (Jochum, 2011).

Traditional ESL program models are usually conducted in self-contained classrooms, typically designated for ESL students only. These programs are also taught by certified ESL teachers, most of whom focus solely on providing support to ESL students. In the traditional ESL model, students are separated, usually for a portion of the school day (Jochum, 2011). According to Jochum (2011), "Despite being the least effective model in terms of raising students' overall levels of academic achievement, traditional ESL programs remain prominent in today's schools because they're the easiest and most cost-effective way to educate ESL students" (p. 3).

Sheltered instruction models for ESL are hybrid models that integrate content-based instruction with language development (Jochum, 2011). This type of ESL model requires teachers to be well-versed in language development and possess prerequisite content knowledge to facilitate effective instruction. One of the most popular models to support ESL teachers in facilitating shelter instruction is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (De Jager, 2019; Jochum, 2011), which, according to De Jager (2019), "consists of eight interrelated components: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice/application, lesson delivery, review, and assessment" (p. 46). The components are particularly helpful because they help ensure that ESL teachers provide appropriate instruction that builds students' linguistic and content knowledge.

**Dual Language Immersion Education**

Since the 1980s, the number of dual language programs has increased dramatically (Kim et al., 2015). However, a relatively small number of these programs exist compared to the overall number of schools in the United States (Cardoza & Brown, 2019). Unlike traditional bilingual programs, which focus solely on transitional instructional methods, dual language programs focus on language immersion and developing bilingualism and biliteracy in both languages

simultaneously (O. García et al., 2018). According to Lachance (2018), "The fundamental point in the dual language academic configuration is the presence of language-majority and language-minority students for sustained, additive bilingual instruction" (p. 2). Hutchison et al. (2015) described dual language immersion programs as a means to support language-minority students to achieve additive bilingualism while assisting native English speakers in second-language acquisition. Another critical aspect of this program model is that—unlike in transitional bilingual education—English does not replace the native language (Polanco & Luft de Baker, 2018). Likewise, dual language programs place a strong emphasis on maintaining both languages.

Although there is some skepticism surrounding dual language programs and their ability to achieve appropriate academic outcomes, research has suggested that dual language education can reach the same educational outcomes as mainstream classrooms (Hutchison et al., 2015). Marian et al. (2013) noted that dual language education is beneficial for both subsets of students, and it is widely accepted as the most appropriate means to provide bilingual education that is neither transitional nor remedial (O. García et al., 2018). Furthermore, Cardoza and Brown (2019) postulated that dual language programs are a viable option to support the academic needs of ELLs; however, the implementation of such programs are often stifled by the shortage of bilingual teachers.

**Benefits of Dual Language Education**

The benefits of bilingualism and biliteracy are well established in academic research and literature. Ozfidan (2017) argued that bilingualism can positively influence academic achievement and that access to bilingual education programs has an even more significant impact on minority students' educational outcomes, especially ELLs. Besides benefiting language-minority students, bilingual education programs have also been shown to improve student

achievement among language-majority students. Research suggests that dual language education promotes increased academic success for native and nonnative English speakers, both of whom outperform students in traditional programs (Marian et al., 2013). Additionally, language-minority students demonstrate higher academic performance than their peers in transitional language programs and outperform their peers in traditional monolingual education programs (Marian et al., 2013). Furthermore, research demonstrates that participation in dual language programs leads to increased reading and math achievement among minority- and majority-language students (Collier & Thomas, 2004; Marian et al., 2013).

**Arguments Against Dual Language Programs**

Although research suggests that dual language programs can yield positive academic outcomes for students (Ozfidan, 2017), these programs may have faults and are not always viewed favorably (Cardoza & Brown, 2019). For example, proponents of English-only education argue that ELLs who are enrolled in English-only classes will learn English more quickly and outperform those who spend less time in classes such as ESL. Furthermore, a recent study partially validated this argument. Marian et al. (2013) found that language-minority students who participated in transitional (English-only) classes outperformed students in dual language classes in math and reading. However, it is important to note that the benefits of dual language education are often delayed. Although language-minority students in transition program models performed better in early grades, language-minority students outperformed those in transitional programs in higher grades (Marian et al., 2013). Despite the assertions made by proponents of dual language education, research has established a clear association between participation in dual language programs and higher student achievement (Ozfidan, 2017).

**One-Way Developmental Programs**

One-way developmental programs, also referred to as maintenance bilingual programs, aim to promote bilingualism and biliteracy among students (Roberts, 1995). Such programs enroll students of the same language background, usually ELLs (Christian, 2016), with the goal of fostering additive bilingualism and biliteracy and thus promoting the development of both target languages (Roberts, 1995). According to Roberts (1995),

> In maintenance programs, the learners are transitioned into English content classes, and are given support in their first language, as in transitional programs. However, they also receive language arts in their native language, enabling them to become literate in that language, and they continue to receive content area classes in their first language as well, so that they become literate in both languages. (p. 374)

Although the program structures of one-way developmental programs can vary depending on the needs of the school, most arrange instructional time using one of two models: 90/10 or 50/50. The former is generally used in the early grades (pre-K through first grade) and allocates 90% of instructional time in students' native language. The remaining 10% of instructional time is designated in English. The latter balances both languages by allocating 50% of instructional time to the native language and the remaining 50% to English (Tong, 2008). Furthermore, it is important to note that the transition from 90/10 to 50/50 is not automatic. The percentage of instruction provided in English and the second target language generally begins with an emphasis on the minority language, gradually moving toward an equal emphasis on both languages (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008). For example, many kindergarten and first-grade programs focus 90% of instructional time in the minority language and 10% in English. In the second and third grades, the percentage of instruction in the minority language decreases by 10%

each year: 80/20 in second grade (80% minority language and 20% English) and 70/30 in third grade (70% minority language and 30% English). From fourth grade on, instruction is split equally between both target languages (50% minority language and 50% English) (Tong, 2008).

For one-way developmental programs to be sustainable, they must occur in areas with a large enough population of students of a particular native language (Roberts, 1995). Roberts (1995) noted two factors as critical to the sustainability of maintenance programs: The first is the school's ability to hire bilingual teachers. Simply put, one-way developmental programs cannot exist without teachers who are trained and certified to teach in the students' native language. The second factor, community support, centers around a school's ability to conjure the needed support to ensure adequate enrollment in the program (Roberts, 1995). Support from the community is especially important among the language-minority community. Roberts (1995) stated that large language-minority communities do not automatically translate into high levels of support for one-way developmental programs because some language-minority speakers object to the use of languages besides English. Overall, one-way developmental programs can serve as a viable option for nonnative English-speaking students.

**One-Way Immersion Programs**

One-way immersion programs, also known as foreign language immersion programs, serve a distinct purpose: to present an instructional option for monolingual students interested in additive bilingualism (Christian, 2016). This particular dual language model originated in Canada, and its purpose was to promote additive bilingualism among English-speaking students so that they could learn French (Roberts, 1995). Although one-way immersion programs usually serve students of one native language, some programs may include minority students whose native language is not one of the target languages (Roberts, 1995). Furthermore, one-way

programs provide academic instruction in two languages and "typically include one language group (from a common language background) learning through two languages, rather than students from two different language backgrounds learning together" (p. 2). The target languages of these programs depend heavily on the populations they serve. According to the Center for Applied Linguistics, there are over 600 one-way immersion programs across the globe, including nearly 20 target languages (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2020).

**Two-Way Immersion Programs**

There are a variety of program structures for dual language programs; however, two-way immersion programs are among the most popular. Two-way programs are also frequently referred to as dual language education or bilingual immersion programs (Hutchison et al., 2015). Two-way immersion programs are structured through two linguistic modes of instruction with the goal of developing bilingual, biliterate, and culturally competent scholars (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008; De Jong, 2016). These programs began in the 1960s in Miami, Florida. Initially, two-way programs were created in response to parents of English-speaking students who shared interest in giving their children access to bilingual education (Christian, 2016). Although the level of growth of two-way programs is notable, the expansion of these programs has not been steady or consistent. As pro-bilingual education legislation policies have been implemented, two-way programs have become more prevalent across the country (Christian, 2016). There are currently 340 two-way immersion programs in the United States (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2020).

Two-way immersion programs are considered language enrichment programs because they aim to equip students' linguistic repertoire with a second language. Furthermore, two-way programs foster a bilingual learning environment that brings together both native English-

speakers and minority-language speakers. According to González-Carriedo and Esprívalo Harrell (2018),

> The allocation of time between languages is a programmatic decision made by the school or the school district. On some occasions, time is divided equally by establishing that each language be spoken on certain days. In other instances, this time allocation is balanced by distributing language by subjects. The expectation is that students and teachers interact in only one language at a time. (p. 114)

Although some argue against the implementation of two-way immersion programs, research indicates that students in such programs (native and nonnative English-speaking students) are at or above grade level expectations (González-Carriedo & Esprívalo Harrell, 2018). Moreover, Li et al. (2016) postulated that these higher student outcomes are associated with cognitive psychology, which articulates that bilingualism is associated with increased memory, executive control, and selective attention. These advantages have been pivotal in the increase in demand for two-way programs. Recognizing that the 21st-century economy is becoming increasingly globalized, many parents have opted to enroll their children in two-way immersion programs (Li et al., 2016).

**Heritage Language Programs**

Heritage language programs are a unique approach to bilingual education; however, the structure of heritage language programs depends on the country of origin. In the United States, heritage language programs provide language instruction to students whose home language is one other than English (Hinman & He, 2017). According to Hinman and He (2017), "Community-based heritage language programs can empower culturally and linguistically diverse students and families to construct hybrid practices linking home and school knowledges

to promote learning" (p. 1). Furthermore, these programs are meant for students who speak English and, to some degree, speak or understand their heritage language. Students involved in heritage language programs are often referred to as heritage language learners (HLLs). According to Hinman and He (2017), HLLs are students with ancestral ties to a language other than English. Moreover, the goal of heritage language programs is to empower HLLs to develop and maintain their heritage language, as well as their cultural ties. In addition to assisting students in maintaining their linguistic and cultural identities, heritage language programs have also shown the ability to improve linguistic proficiency, competence, and pride in the heritage language (Hinman & He, 2017). The programs, however, are not particularly prevalent in most public school districts in the United States (Hinman & He, 2017).

**Characteristics of Successful Dual Language Programs**

As with most educational programs, a variety of characteristics are indicative of successful dual language programs. Hutchison et al. (2015) described the following five features as vital to the success of dual language programs: physical resources, trained personnel, appropriate curriculum, adequate staffing, and support from the local community. Schools cannot initiate dual language programs without prioritizing a variety of resources needed for program implementation. Moreover, the successful implementation of dual language programs may require schools to make an array of adjustments to school operations and culture (i.e., staffing, budgeting, instructional delivery, master schedules, training and development, methods of teacher evaluation, grading policies, and community engagement practices) (DeMatthews & Izquierdo, 2018).

Another key characteristic of successful dual language programs is effective training and staff development. DeMatthews and Izquierdo (2018) noted that the professional development

needs of dual language teachers center around the need to "include training and ongoing support in first- and second-language acquisition, teaching and learning through two languages across the curriculum, biliteracy, and strategies for appropriate student grouping and cooperative learning" (p. 64). School-based administrators are ultimately accountable for the quality of their school's dual language programs; therefore, they must provide all dual language teachers with adequate professional development (Mason & Swanson, 2018). Furthermore, the requirements of dual language teachers significantly differ from those of mainstream general education teachers. School leaders must develop robust training and professional development programs for dual language teachers. These trainings must supplement the training given to all staff members and meet the unique needs of dual language teachers. Additionally, research suggests that principal support and knowledge of dual language programs and instruction is critical in ensuring that dual language programs are sustainable (De Jong, 2016). Although there are no requirements that administrators have prior experience as dual language teachers in order to implement or maintain a dual language program, school leaders must have sufficient knowledge of dual language programming and pedagogy.

The existence of any educational programs depends heavily on student enrollment—this is also the case for dual language programs. The lack of exposure many people have had to dual language programs can become a hurdle in meeting enrollment goals, as individuals are less likely to enroll if they are not familiar with such programs (De Jong, 2016). Schools with voluntary enrollment in dual language programs must rely heavily on school marketing campaigns to increase enrollment. According to Olson Beal and Beal (2016), several school-based marketing strategies have demonstrated the ability to increase enrollment efforts in an educational setting, the first of which are formal social networks, including brochures, flyers,

digital letters and email, websites, school presentations, and school fairs. The second marketing strategy is "word-of-mouth." This strategy relies heavily on interpersonal social networks such as friends, neighbors, and community and religious organizations. Olson Beal and Beal (2016) noted that marketing via word-of-mouth can prove to be an effective strategy to increase program enrollment because many families tend to trust it more than official school documents and data. The third marketing strategy is program branding. Olson Beal and Beal (2016) noted that school principals are often critical in the branding of their schools to ensure a favorable view of the school and the programs it offers.

The longevity of dual language programs also depends heavily on the retention of teachers (Alanís & Rodríguez, 2008). The unique qualifications needed to fill dual language teacher vacancies can often adversely impact school leaders' ability to find new teachers to fill those vacancies, especially in schools with high attrition rates. Mason and Swanson (2018) postulated that administrators are ultimately accountable for teacher working conditions. Furthermore, effective leaders can mitigate retention issues. For example, Mason and Matas (2016) noted that effective leadership directly correlates with teachers' decisions to leave or remain in their current roles. Although the job demands of dual language teachers can be high, school leaders have to have the capacity to influence retention rates among dual language teachers.

**Teacher Retention**

Although research has produced substantial knowledge on teacher retention, schools across the country continue to struggle to retain educators. For example, Gunther (2019) reported that nearly 33% of teachers leave the profession in their first 3 years of teaching, and almost 50% leave after 5 years. Teacher attrition also can cast significant financial burdens on educational

institutions. For example, Hammonds (2017) postulated that the financial burden placed on school districts to replace teachers who leave could be upward of $8,700 per teacher. Furthermore, Jones and Walton (2017) noted that the nationwide cost for teacher recruitment, onboarding, and retaining of replacement teachers is approximately $7.34 billion annually. The impact of teacher attrition is vast and has many consequences for school districts, such as teacher shortages and vacancies, increased recruitment costs, and adverse effects on student achievement (Hammond, 2017; Young, 2018). Kamrath and Bradford (2020) summarized the impact of teacher attrition as follows:

> When new teachers are replaced, time is spent acclimating the new faculty member to the school environment, thus interrupting the collaboration and planning that can occur vertically in curricular departments and horizontally within grade levels. A school that loses a good teacher also loses that teacher's familiarity with school practices, the curriculum, and the students, parents, and colleagues. (p. 3)

The side effects of teacher attrition can be extensive and negatively influence nearly every aspect of a school system. However, it is essential to recognize that the prevalence of teacher attrition is often influenced by geography and student demographics. For example, Jones and Watson (2017) also noted that teacher turnover is exceptionally high in schools with lower-income and minority students. These increased rates of teacher attrition in such schools further escalate the already established educational equity issues.

If urban schools, most of which serve lower-income and minority students, cannot maintain adequately staffed schools with effective teachers, achievement gaps between these demographic groups and their White and more affluent counterparts will continue to exist

(Hammonds, 2017). To combat and reduce teacher attrition rates, Hammonds (2017) argued that school leaders must develop and implement strategies to retain teachers.

Moreover, Green and Munos (2016) postulated that "attention to teacher turnover issues could identify contributing organizational factors and lead to the implementation of policy or structural changes to address the problem" (p. 97). The substantial negative impact teacher attrition has on schools and their ability to succeed is precisely the reason why many researchers have dedicated time and effort to resolve this long-standing problem. Existing literature on the factors that contribute to teacher retention or attrition has described the following as some of the most notable: job satisfaction, workplace conditions, administrative leadership and support, student behaviors, professional relationships, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher development (Dicke et al., 2020; Gaikhorst et al., 2015; Holmes et al., 2019; Kamrath & Bradford, 2020).

### *Job Satisfaction*

Dicke et al. (2020) defined job satisfaction as the level of "favorability of a job," which ranges from positive to negative views of one's contentment toward their occupation. Moreover, job satisfaction is multidimensional and exists on a spectrum, which can ultimately be pivotal in whether teachers remain in their current positions. The effects of job satisfaction on teacher attrition were investigated by Green and Munos (2016), who noted that nearly one-third of all respondents expressly indicated job dissatisfaction as the primary reason for leaving their current positions. Furthermore, Dicke et al. (2020) postulated that job satisfaction is particularly crucial among "high-strained occupations" (p. 1061), such as teaching. Dicke et al. (2020) also noted the implications of job satisfaction on teacher retention, noting that job satisfaction is a significant predictor for teacher commitment and retention. Organizational leaders must recognize the vital role teacher job satisfaction plays in retaining teachers. Moreover, it will be difficult for leaders

to positively influence teachers' contentment with their jobs unless actionable strategies and policies are implemented.

Many studies have explored the factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction. For example, Chiong et al. (2017) stated that "supportive institutional leadership" (p. 1087) has a significant relationship with overall teacher morale and job satisfaction. Moreover, a study conducted by Green and Munos (2016) found that teacher job satisfaction is strongly associated with having principals who demonstrate supportive relationships and establish favorable working conditions for teachers. Although job dissatisfaction is a unique phenomenon that exerts a distinct impact on teacher mobility, it cannot be examined in isolation: "It is directly influenced by the working environment" (Dicke et al., 2020, p. 1061). As school-based administrators work to gauge the degree to which teachers are satisfied with their current positions, educational leaders must also examine how existing working conditions influence teacher job satisfaction.

### *Working Conditions*

Many research studies have investigated the relationship between working conditions and teacher retention. Working conditions in the school setting refer to the overall working environment for teachers. Researchers have found that the conditions in which teachers work are strongly associated with teacher attrition (D. García, 2019; Green & Munos, 2016; Holmes et al., 2019; Kamrath & Bradford, 2020). Furthermore, the staffing problems that result from teacher turnover are often related to teachers leaving due to stress caused by adverse working conditions. In addition, studies have indicated that teachers' working conditions can heavily influence teacher stability, causing teachers to leave for alternative work environments they deem more conducive to their professional needs (Dupriez et al., 2016). Moreover, studies suggest that unfavorable working conditions can also lead to physical illness and lower staff attendance.

According to Geiger and Pivovarova (2018), "Negative working conditions can lead to increased amounts of stress, leading to physical illness. The impact of such illness cannot just negatively affect a teacher's job performance but can ultimately result in teacher attrition" (p. 607). Conversely, organizational contexts that promote favorable working conditions can strengthen teachers' working conditions and foster more positive working relationships. According to Chiong et al. (2017), positive working conditions, which positively influence teacher retention, are also associated with higher levels of teacher commitment and loyalty. Through effective leadership, school administrators can foster a working environment where teachers experience positive working relationships, a higher degree of trust, and enhanced collaboration between colleagues.

### *Administrative Leadership and Support*

The primary function of school administrators is to positively influence the educational outcomes of students. However, regardless of how pedagogically sound their plans are, school-based administrators cannot achieve these goals alone. Through effective leadership, administrators can develop educational environments that support teachers in improving student achievement. Regarding teacher retention, administrative support has often been studied through the lens of teacher perceptions—that is, the association between administrators' level of perceived support and the likelihood of teachers remaining in their positions. Kamrath and Bradford (2020) defined administrative support "as the administrators' ability to make a teacher's job more feasible, and the ability to help teachers improve their teaching" (p. 4). Moreover, Jones and Watson (2017) posited that "principals' behaviors have been undeniably connected to teacher retention" (p. 47) and that administrative behaviors such as accessibility, trust, and proactive leadership are connected with teacher retention. In addition, Holmes et al.

(2019) postulated that increased administrative support is strongly associated with lower levels of teacher attrition. Kamrath and Bradford (2020) noted that teacher perceptions of school leadership are the single most influential factor in whether they remain in their current position. D. García (2019) described the relationship between administrator leadership and teacher retention as follows:

> School leadership [was] the most consistently relevant measure of working conditions in regard to teacher departure, and high-quality leadership was associated with lower levels of leaving intentions. Teacher perception of leadership was the only significant predictor of teachers' leaving intentions. (p. 112)

D. García (2019) also noted that research on the specific qualities associated with teacher retention is limited; however, studies have indicated that school leaders do have the capacity to influence teacher mobility through their leadership. Redding et al. (2019) found the following five administrator behaviors to influence teacher retention: administrator expectations, encouragement, overall administrator support, enforcement of school rules, and a collaborative environment. Additionally, staff recognition has been found to impact teachers' perceptions of effective leadership and support through the establishment of systems for teacher recognition. According to D. García (2019), principal leadership that promotes a positive school culture by recognizing staff accomplishments is associated with teacher commitment. Furthermore, Kamrath and Bradford (2020) indicated that teacher recognition is significant in teacher perceptions of administrative leadership. Kamrath and Bradford (2020) also found similar trends, noting that administrators' influence on teachers' working conditions is a primary reason for teacher departure. Holmes et al. (2019) indicated that teachers who view administrators as

absolved of providing support with student discipline problems and promoting a collegial atmosphere were more likely to leave than those with more supportive leaders.

### Student Behaviors

Administrators are vital in minimizing undesired student behaviors. Research has found that student behavior directly impacts teachers' stress levels, job satisfaction, and overall retention rates (Holmes et al., 2019). According to Holmes et al. (2019),

> Student behavior in schools with staffing challenges is a familiar factor that teachers confront. Teachers often encounter student behaviors exhibited through acts of defiance, disruption of the classroom environment, use of inappropriate language and gestures, and engagement in confrontations, show of disrespect and insubordination, physical altercations, and even large-scale assault. Hostile behaviors exhibited by students comprise school culture and raise the stress levels of teachers throughout the day. (p. 28)

Appropriate systems and structures to address challenging student behaviors can alleviate teacher stress and discomfort and ultimately improve retention rates (Holmes et al., 2019).

### Professional Relationships

Although relationships between staff members are complex and influenced by various factors, organizational leaders must understand their role in fostering positive professional relationships, especially as a means of improving overall organizational effectiveness. According to Kamrath and Bradford (2020), schools whose teachers exhibit positive, collaborative, trusting, and collegial relationships are significantly more likely to retain their teachers. Inversely, schools that are unable to maintain professional relationships between teachers struggle to keep their teachers. Moreover, teachers who feel comfortable confiding in colleagues for support are also more likely to remain in their current roles than their counterparts who experience more isolated

workplace relationships. Research has also cited teacher collaboration as an essential facet in promoting positive professional relationships. D. García (2019) defined professional collaboration as "teachers working together in groups or teams to improve educational processes and outcomes" (p. 112). In addition to improving student outcomes, teacher collaboration can also enhance relationships between staff members. Furthermore, D. García (2019) stated that specific collaborative activities, such as joint teaching, peer-reviewing, and professional discussions improve perceived levels of teacher collaboration. Overall, schools with higher levels of staff collegiality also witness increased levels of teacher retention (D. García, 2019; Holmes et al., 2019).

### Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teacher efficacy is defined as a teacher's belief in their ability to fulfill their job responsibilities as educators (Gaikhorst et al., 2015). Futhermore, Gaikhorst et al. (2015) noted that self-efficacy impacts both teacher effort and effectiveness, as well as their ability to deal with demanding or stressful situations. Ultimately, low self-efficacy can cause increased teacher burnout, leading to higher rates of teacher attrition.

### Teacher Development

Previous studies have explored the degree to which professional development influences teacher retention. According to Gaikhorst et al. (2015), teachers who participate in ongoing professional development programs are more likely to remain in the profession than teachers who do not partake in similar development programs. Despite the apparent relationship between teacher development and teacher retention, it is unclear which types of professional development are most effective in retaining teachers (Gaikhorst et al., 2015). However, findings regarding the relationship between teacher development and retention underscore the need for school-based

administrators to implement ongoing and effective professional development to enhance teachers' instructional practices.

**Bilingual Teacher Retention**

Although teacher attrition is a phenomenon that affects teachers across all grade levels and content areas, attrition rates among bilingual educators are some of the highest across teaching categories (Huff & Swanson, 2010; Mason & Swanson, 2018). Additionally, research suggests that the attrition of bilingual teachers is one of the most significant factors contributing to the shortage of bilingual teachers (Mason, 2017; Mason & Swanson, 2018; Swanson, 2012). Teacher burnout, alienation, and withdrawal; low levels of self-efficacy; and a lack of value for bilingual education, leadership, and professional support are among the factors that contribute to bilingual teachers leaving the classroom (Mason & Matas, 2016; Schrier, 2008; Swanson, 2012). In addition, Mason and Swanson (2018) postulated that increased professional relationships between bilingual educators and the greater school community could improve bilingual teachers' retention rates. Although prior research has indicated that positive professional relationships are correlated with higher rates of teacher retention, bilingual teacher retention rates are especially impacted by collegial workplace relationships. Due to the uniqueness of their jobs, bilingual teachers are often exposed to a heightened sense of professional isolation (Mason & Swanson, 2018). According to Mason and Matas (2016), foreign language teachers who perceived themselves as being professionally valued were more likely to remain in their current positions. These studies underscore the importance of intentionally fostering an environment that promotes teacher collaboration, especially among bilingual teachers.

**Dual Language Teacher Retention**

Although dual language teachers fall under the umbrella of bilingual educators, their jobs are very distinct and have not been subject to the same level of research regarding retention. Nevertheless, research has noted the barriers many dual language programs face in ensuring adequate staffing. For example, Lachance (2018) stated that school-based administrators struggle to maintain proper staffing of dual language programs, which often leads to filling vacancies with teachers from other countries, many of whom lack the required training and preparation to be successful. Moreover, Lachance (2018) postulated that the lack of effective dual language teachers could also result in declining enrollments and potential program elimination. Despite the clear advantages of dual language programs, one of the most significant issues facing these programs is the issue of bilingual teacher attrition and overall bilingual teacher shortages.

**Organizational Climate**

Organizational climate, a permutation of individual members' perceptions based on experiences within the work environment, is arguably one of the most significant indicators of the success of any organization (Ascorra et al., 2019). Khan (2019) described organizational climate as a group of characteristics in an organization's environment. These characteristics are viewed as a vital part of the organization that influences employee behavior. Alqarni (2020) described an organizational climate as follows:

> Organizational climate can be said to represent the collective perceptions of how school members experience the internal atmosphere, how they understand their relationships, and how they behave, interact, and influence each other. . . . It comprises school members' experiences, interactive relationships, as well as shared perceptions, attitudes, and feelings they have about the school. "School culture" is defined as "the long-term

physical and social environment, as well as the values or beliefs of the school shared across individuals and time." (p. 15)

Additionally, Khan (2019) detailed that within an educational setting, organizational climate is defined by shared beliefs, values, and attitudes influencing the relationships between students, teachers, and administrators. An organizational climate conducive to positive interactions and behaviors can improve overall organizational effectiveness (Ascorra et al., 2019). Research suggests that a positive organizational climate can improve staff well-being and retention (Ascorra et al., 2019; Khan, 2019). According to Khan (2019), job satisfaction and organizational commitment are heavily influenced by a positive organizational climate. Conversely, Khan (2019) stated that an unhealthy organizational climate could reduce the level of teacher commitment to their schools, underscoring the necessity for school leaders to "consider teacher perceptions about their school climate" (p. 329).

Organizational climate has been researched since the 1960s and has been frequently used in research to measure organizational effectiveness (Ascorra, 2019). Despite a plethora of research dedicated to organizational climate, researchers have not reached a consensus regarding the elements that define it (Olsen et al., 2018). Thapa et al. (2013) noted the following:

> There is not a national or international consensus about how to define school climate, a positive and sustained school climate, or the school climate process and the dimensions that need to be regularly measured in school climate research and improvement efforts. (p. 371)

Researchers have investigated the factors shown to impact organizational climate and have categorized them into dimensions or elements, such as the four distinct domains that define

the OCI, as described in Chapter 1 (Hoy et al., 2002). For the purpose of this study, I applied the OCI as the theoretical framework for this study.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework of this quantitative study is based on the four domains of the OCI.

*Collegial Leadership*

Collegial Leadership is a multidimensional approach that requires school leaders to embrace collaborative methods for decision-making (Singh, 2008). By implementing systems to foster shared decision-making, collegial leaders aim to assimilate individual members' visions into the organization's overall vision (Singh, 2008). Furthermore, Dahlkamp et al. (2017) postulated that a collegial leader is effective because they focus on the faculty's social needs to achieve the school's goals. Hoy et al. (2002) noted that collegial leaders maintain open and friendly relationships with staff members while setting and maintaining clear expectations for staff. For leaders to engage in Collegial Leadership, administrators must be able to navigate relationships with subordinates through a multidimensional approach to shared decision-making. This leadership approach requires leaders to build partnerships with staff, creating a working environment that enables teachers and staff to engage in collaborative methods for shared decision-making. According to Singh (2008), "Collegial strategies tend to be more lateral or horizontal rather than being vertical and hierarchical, reflecting the view that all stakeholders should be involved in decision-making and 'own' the outcome of discussions" (p. 73). Unlike in a hierarchical leadership structure, collegial leaders distribute power among members by "flattening hierarchies" and creating a school environment conducive to collaboration and shared leadership (Singh, 2008). Moreover, Singh (2008) postulated that collegial leaders aim to foster

an environment where principals, in conjunction with teachers, develop shared common values and goals, accountability, and an overall sense of trust among all school community members. Through the development of stakeholder leadership capacity, Collegial Leadership can enhance well-being and promote enfranchisement among employees (Singh, 2008).

There is relatively little research on the relationship between Collegial Leadership and teacher retention; however, a study conducted by Dahlkamp et al. (2017) showed no evidence that Collegial Leadership had any statistically significant influence on teachers' decisions to remain at their schools. However, Khan (2019) found that Collegial Leadership was a predictor of teachers' commitment to the school. Considering the relationship between teacher commitment and retention, Khan (2019) suggested that additional research is needed to determine whether Collegial Leadership affects teachers' decisions to leave the classroom.

### Professional Teacher Behavior

Professional Teacher Behavior refers to four types of behaviors that lead to a collegial working environment among stakeholders: respect for colleague competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgment, and mutual cooperation and support. Furthermore, Hoy et al. (2002) stated that Professional Teacher Behavior is founded on teachers' commitment to students, team members' competence, mutual cooperation, and support.

According to Dahlkamp et al. (2017), there is little evidence to suggest that professional behaviors such as colleague competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgment, or mutual support influence teacher retention. In addition, Khan (2019) found no correlation between teacher professionalism and commitment to the school. The evidence in these two studies suggests that Professional Teacher Behavior does not influence overall teacher retention. However, further research is needed to corroborate these findings.

*Achievement Press*

Achievement Press is defined as the degree to which a school establishes high but achievable academic standards (Dahlkamp et al., 2017). Achievement Press also plays a pivotal role in organizational climate because the establishment of high academic expectations can also impact students' self-efficacy and pursuits for achievement (Dahlkamp et al., 2017). Moreover, Smith and Kearney (2013) stated that schools with teachers and administrators who set high but attainable academic standards for students often have high levels of Achievement Press. Smith and Kearney (2013) also noted that Achievement Press is a key element in fostering and maintaining organizational effectiveness. For example, Khan (2019) found that Achievement Press has a significant correlation with teachers' commitment to their schools. Smith and Kearney (2013) also found Achievement Press to have a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. These findings demonstrate the influence Achievement Press has on the effectiveness of a school. However, Dahlkamp et al. (2017) found that Achievement Press does not significantly influence teacher retention.

*Institutional Vulnerability*

Institutional Vulnerability refers to interactions between internal and external stakeholders in the educational setting. According to Dahlkamp et al. (2017), "Institutional Vulnerability examines the relationship between the school and the community; looking more specifically at the extent to which the school is susceptible to vocal parent and citizen groups" (p. 368). Moreover, Khan (2019) defined Institutional Vulnerability as the degree to which internal stakeholders in a school are susceptible to pressure from external stakeholders. It is important to note that Institutional Vulnerability does not refer to warranted external stakeholder involvement in a school, such as parent-teacher organizations; instead, it relates to individuals outside the

organization who are overly critical and wish to exert undue pressure on teachers and school leaders to meet their demands. Schools with high Institutional Vulnerability often leave teachers and administrators feeling unprotected and defensive (Hoy et al., 2002). Research suggests that Institutional Vulnerability has a significant negative relationship with teachers' commitment to the school and teacher retention (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Khan, 2019).

**Summary**

Despite the immense level of pushback bilingual education programs have faced at the state, local, and national levels, improvements in the quality and availability of bilingual education have continued to increase across the country. As bilingual programs have continued to become more prevalent, dual language programs have emerged as one of the most practical and effective bilingual education models. Research suggests that dual language programs bring additive benefits for schools; these include increasing student achievement for minority and majority-language students and providing schools with marketable programs to increase student enrollment. Despite the clear benefits of these programs, many dual language programs are faced with the difficult task of filling vacant positions due to a shortage of trained and certified bilingual teachers. Without adequate staffing, dual language programs will continue to face issues regarding sustainability and efficacy. Research suggests that one of the most effective ways to combat teacher shortages is to retain those already in the profession. However, little research has been conducted on dual language teacher retention.

As outlined in this chapter, this researcher investigated the retention of dual language educators through the lens of organizational climate. Using the OCI, I explored the relationship between the four domains of organizational climate outlined above and the retention intentions of

dual language teachers in DCPS. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology utilized to conduct this

study.

**Chapter 3: Research Methods**

This chapter outlines the methodology and research design utilized to investigate the impact of the four domains of the OCI on dual language teacher retention. Moreover, this chapter details the hypotheses and null hypotheses, design and methodology, population, sample, instrumentation, researcher's role, assumptions and delimitations, limitations, validity and reliability, data collection, procedures, and data analysis of the study.

**Research Questions**

To guide this study, four research questions were posed.

RQ1: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?

RQ2: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?

RQ3: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Achievement Press and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability?

RQ4: To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Achievement Press?

**Null Hypotheses**

To address the research questions, the following null hypotheses were tested. Several null hypotheses were developed to explain the relationship between organizational climate and dual language teacher retention intentions. The null hypotheses indicated that there would not be an effect. The null hypotheses for this study were as follows:

$HO_1$: There is no statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?

$HO_2$: There is no statistically significant association between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current position, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability.

$HO_3$: There is no statistically significant association between Achievement Press and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current position, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability.

$HO_4$: There is no statistically significant association between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current position, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Achievement Press.

**Research Design and Methodology**

This study explored the relationship between the four elements of organizational climate and dual language teacher retention intentions. The quantitative data used for this study were obtained using the OCI survey, which was administered using Microsoft Forms. The survey provided an overview of teachers' perceptions of their school's organizational climate. A logistic regression analysis was conducted to compare the results from the OCI with dual language

teacher retention intentions. My goal was to examine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the four domains of organizational climate and teachers' intent to stay in their current roles. To achieve this, I analyzed the regression coefficients to determine the association between organizational climate and participants' intent to remain in their current positions.

## Population

The target population of this study focused on dual language teachers in DCPS. Within DCPS, there are currently 11 schools with dual language programs; however, only six of these schools opted to participate in this study. This study included dual language teachers across all grade levels (K–12) and content areas.

## Sample

According to Cohen (1988), the larger the sample size, the smaller the margin of error within the results of a study. To ensure reliability and precision in the results of this study, a participation rate of approximately 70% was needed to ensure a 90% confidence level. Of the 121 dual language teachers who received invitations to participate in this study, 86 individuals (71%) successfully completed the online questionnaire.

## Instrumentation

This study's instrumentation comprised a 27-item descriptive questionnaire, the OCI, which measures the four domains of organizational climate. Each domain was measured using a 4-point Likert scale. Respondents were asked to identify the frequency of each question, ranging from *rarely occurs* to *very frequently occurs*. The OCI in its entirety can be found in Appendix A. The data were collected using Microsoft Forms, an online survey platform. The data collected through the questionnaire were then managed and stored in SPSS.

**Researcher Role**

It is worth noting my role within the organization in which this study was conducted. I served as an assistant principal in DCPS, which previously noted, was the setting for this study. It is also important to note that the sample of individuals selected to participate in this study may have included teachers whom I supervise. In addition, I also had a vested interest in the outcomes of this study because I serve at a school with a dual language program. However, my role in this study remained objective, following all requirements and memorandum agreements established by Abilene Christian University's Institutional Review Board and DCPS.

**Assumptions and Delimitations**

This study encompassed several key assumptions, as follows: Prior to engaging in this study, participants were notified that their responses were anonymous and would not be disclosed to others; all participants engaged in the study voluntarily; participants responded to the questionnaire truthfully; and only dual language teachers participated in the study. The scope of this study was delimited to dual language teachers in one school district (DCPS), and the scope of organizational climate was delimited to the four domains in the OCI.

**Limitations**

Despite the benefits of conducting this study, a variety of research limitations may exist. One possible limitation may derive from the relatively limited sample size. Due to the limited number of schools with dual language programs within DCPS, the sample size consisted of only 86 participants. The data analysis portion of this study occurred in the fall of the 2020–2021 school year, which may present resource limitations; this particular phase of the school year is relatively busy, increasing the likelihood that participants may have issues completing the survey. Additionally, limitations due to the COVID-19 pandemic were also of concern. Although all

materials needed for data analysis were sent electronically, respondents may have been under additional stress as they navigated distance or hybrid learning, which could have altered their views of the organizational climate of their school. The competing priorities might have also reduced the number of participants. Overall, uncertainty surrounding the pandemic could have unduly influenced respondents' retention intentions.

**Data Collection**

Once approval was received from the DCPS research committee, each of the principals of the 11 dual language schools in DCPS was contacted via email for permission to share the recruitment email with their dual language teachers. Once approval was obtained from the principals who opted to participate in the study, I was granted access to the email addresses of the dual language teachers from the participating schools. The recruitment email served as an introduction and outlined the purpose of this research study. In addition, the recruitment email also included the questionnaire.

**Validity and Reliability**

Validity and reliability, both of which involve measurement, determine how well the needed quantitative data are measured (Muijs, 2011). There are several types of validity, the first of which is content validity, which refers to "whether or not the content of the manifest variables is right to measure the latent concept that we are trying to measure" (Muijs, 2011, p. 57). In regard to this study, the OCI contains content validity, as it adequately measures the factors related to organizational climate theory.

The second type of validity, criterion validity, encompasses two criteria: predictive validity and concurrent validity (Muijs, 2011). Of the two, predictive validity may align more closely with the instrumentation, as the OCI has been shown to predict the expected theoretical

outcomes. Furthermore, Hoy et al. (2002) conducted a factor analysis that supported the construct validity of the concept of organizational climate. The questionnaire has a relatively high degree of reliability. This instrument incorporated repeated measurement, which helps to ascertain if each individual's response is consistent or has changed. Utilizing the test–retest method ultimately provided a higher degree of reliability for the instruments used in the study. Furthermore, Hoy et al. (2002) noted that the alpha coefficients of reliability for this instrumentation are quite reliable: Collegial Leadership (.94), Professional Teacher Behavior (.88), Achievement Press (.92), and Institutional Vulnerability (.87).

**Procedures**

This study commenced once approval was received from Abilene Christian University's Institutional Review Board and DCPS's research proposal committee. The data collection process began in January 2021 and lasted approximately 4 weeks. As a part of the memorandum of agreement between DCPS and Abilene Christian University, I was required to obtain permission from each principal to send the recruitment communication to prospective participants. Within the email communication, I introduced myself and the purpose of this study. The recruitment email also indicated the significance of this study and how its findings would benefit dual language programs within DCPS. Based on the data collected from the participants' responses, the sum of the items within each domain was tabulated to calculate the domain score. This process occurred for each response. Once the scores for each element were calculated, they were entered and stored in SPSS.

**Data Analysis**

*Logistic Regression*

A logistic regression was used to analyze the relationship between dual language teachers' retention intentions, a dichotomous dependent variable, and each of the four domains of organizational climate, all of which are the predictor variables. According to Muijs (2011), a logistic regression produces odds ratios, which are related to a corresponding predictor value. Furthermore, the odds of an event occurring are determined by dividing the probability of the event occurring by the probability of the event not occurring (Muijs, 2011). To control for Type I errors, also referred to as false positives, a one-model logistic regression was conducted to ensure the efficacy of each *p* value. I examined Research Questions 1–4 to determine whether a statistically significant association exists between dual language teacher perceptions of organizational climate and retention intentions. Using the logistic regression, I explored whether a relationship existed between the variables by utilizing an *F* test to determine *p* values.

**Summary**

All ethical considerations were addressed prior to each step in the research process. Additionally, all participants' information remained confidential and was not shared with individuals outside the scope of this study. Additionally, all participants were provided with informed consent, ensuring that each participant was aware that they were not obligated to participate in this study. Furthermore, I investigated whether organizational climate had a statistically significant association with retention among dual language teachers. The logistic regression model provided greater insight into the relationship of dual language teacher perceptions of their school's organizational climate to their retention intentions. Furthermore, this study allowed further investigation on how each of the four domains of organizational climate

influence dual language teacher intentions to stay in their current positions. The results of this

study are detailed in Chapter 4.

**Chapter 4: Results**

This chapter outlines the findings of the relationship between the four domains of organizational climate and dual language teacher retention intentions. Furthermore, this chapter reports descriptive statistics, logistic regression results, odds ratios, and the tested hypotheses and null hypotheses. The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine to what extent statistically significant associations exist between the four domains of the OCI and dual language teacher retention intentions. A logistic regression was applied in each categorical analysis; the results of these analyses are presented below.

**Presentation and Analysis of the Data**

As shown in Table 1, the descriptive statistics outline the mean, standard deviation, total number of participants ($n = 86$), and the minimum and maximum score for each predictor. The descriptive statistics for Collegial Leadership (CL) reveal an overall mean score of 21.85 ($SD = 5.01$), which indicates positive perceptions toward Collegial Leadership among participants. The descriptive statistics for Professional Teacher Behavior (PTB) reveal an overall mean score of 23.43 ($SD = 4.03$), which indicates positive perceptions toward Professional Teacher Behavior among participants. The descriptive statistics for Achievement Press (AP) reveal an overall mean score of 22.84 ($SD = 4.48$), which indicates positive perceptions toward Achievement Press among participants. Lastly, the descriptive statistics for Institutional Vulnerability (IV) reveal an overall mean score of 10.93 ($SD = 2.84$), which indicates neutral perceptions toward Intuitional Vulnerability among participants.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics by Predictor*

|  |  | *M* | *SD* | *n* | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Retention | CL | 21.85 | 5.01 | 86 | 7 | 28 |
|  | PTB | 23.43 | 4.03 | 86 | 7 | 28 |
|  | AP | 22.84 | 4.48 | 86 | 8 | 32 |
|  | IV | 10.93 | 2.84 | 86 | 5 | 20 |

The descriptive statistics shown in Table 2 differentiate the data by attrition and retention. The data in Table 2 include the mean, standard deviation, number of responses, and the minimum and maximum scores. The descriptive statistics among participants who indicated an intent to leave their current position reveal the following: Collegial Leadership ($M = 17.44$, $SD = 7.6$), Professional Teacher Behavior ($M = 18.56$, $SD = 6.17$), Achievement Press ($M = 21.78$, $SD = 6.92$), and Institutional Vulnerability ($M = 16.11$, $SD = 2.93$). The descriptive statistics among participants who indicated an intent to remain in their current position reveal the following: Collegial Leadership ($M = 22.26$, $SD = 4.41$), Professional Teacher Behavior ($M = 24.00$, $SD = 3.32$), Achievement Press ($M = 22.96$, $SD = 4.15$), and Institutional Vulnerability ($M = 10.44$, $SD = 2.40$).

The findings demonstrate that participants who indicated their intent to remain in their current positions reported higher ratings for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Achievement Press. Inversely, this same group of participants reported lower ratings for Institutional Vulnerability. In addition, the findings reveal that participants who indicated their intent to leave their current position had larger standard deviations among each of the predictors—demonstrating a higher degree of variability among their responses.

**Table 2**

*Descriptive Statistics by Retention Intentions*

|  |  | *M* | *SD* | *n* | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attrition | CL | 17.44 | 7.6 | 9 | 7 | 28 |
|  | PTB | 18.56 | 6.17 | 9 | 7 | 28 |
|  | AP | 21.78 | 6.92 | 9 | 8 | 32 |
|  | IV | 16.11 | 2.93 | 9 | 5 | 20 |
| Retention | CL | 22.26 | 4.41 | 77 | 7 | 28 |
|  | PTB | 24.00 | 3.32 | 77 | 7 | 28 |
|  | AP | 22.96 | 4.15 | 77 | 8 | 32 |
|  | IV | 10.44 | 2.40 | 77 | 5 | 20 |

### *Research Question 1*

To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability? A logistic regression analysis was utilized to measure the association between Collegial Leadership and dual language teacher retention intentions. The results, B (86) = .171, *SE* = .070, Wald = 6.016, and *p* = .014, indicated a modest, positive relationship that is statistically significant. Furthermore, the odds ratio of 1.19 represents the treatment group (those who intend to return) and indicates that they are 1.19 times more likely to return than the reference group (those who intend to leave). In all, participants who noted higher levels of Collegial Leadership were more likely to remain in their current position. The null hypothesis for this research question (*A statistically significant association does not exist between Collegial Leadership and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions*) can be rejected.

***Research Question 2***

To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability? A logistic regression analysis was utilized to measure the association between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teacher retention intentions. The results, B (86) = .339, *SE* = .105, Wald = 10.370, and *p* = .001, indicated a modest, positive relationship that is statistically significant. Furthermore, the odds ratio of 1.14 represents the treatment group (those who intend to return) and indicates that they are 1.14 times more likely to return than the reference group (those who intend to leave). In all, participants who noted higher levels of Professional Teacher Behavior were more likely to remain in their current position. Given the results of this calculation, the null hypothesis for this research question (*A statistically significant association does not exist between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions*) can be rejected.

***Research Question 3***

To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Achievement Press and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability? A logistic regression analysis was utilized to measure the association between Achievement Press and dual language teacher retention intentions. The results, B (86) = .095, *SE* = .079, Wald = 1.454, and *p* = .228, indicated a weak, positive relationship that is not statistically significant. The null hypothesis for this research question (*A statistically significant association does not exist*

*between Achievement Press and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current position*) could not be rejected.

### Research Question 4

To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Achievement Press? A logistic regression analysis was utilized to measure the association between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teacher retention intentions. The results, B (86) = –1.303, *SE* = .505, Wald = 6.645, and *p* = .010, indicated a moderate, negative relationship that is statistically significant. Furthermore, the findings indicate an odds ratio of .272, which suggests that as Institutional Vulnerability increases, so do the odds of dual language teachers intending to leave. Therefore, participants who indicated higher levels of Institutional Vulnerability within their organization were more likely to intend to leave their current position. Given the results of this calculation, the null hypothesis for this research question (*A statistically significant association does not exist between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions*) can be rejected (Table 3).

**Table 3**

*Logistic Regression Results*

|  |  | B | SE | Wald | Sig. | Exp(B) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | Collegial Leadership | 0.171 | .070 | 6.016 | .014 | 1.186 |
|  | Professional Teacher Behavior | 0.339 | .105 | 10.370 | .001 | 1.403 |
|  | Achievement Press | 0.095 | .079 | 1.454 | .228 | 1.100 |
|  | Institutional Vulnerability | −1.303 | .505 | 6.645 | .010 | 0.272 |

**Summary**

This chapter presented the results from the logistic regression for each of the four research questions. The logistic regression results indicate a statistically significant association between three of the four OCI domains and dual language teacher retention intentions. Collegial Leadership, which had an odds ratio of 1.9, was found to positively influence dual language teachers' retention intentions. Professional Teacher Behavior, which had an odds ratio of 1.4, was also found to positively influence dual language teachers' retention intention. Inversely, Institutional Vulnerability, which had an odds ratio of .272, was found to influence dual language teachers' retention intentions negatively. Lastly, the results indicated no statistically significant correlation between Achievement Press and dual language teacher retention intentions. A discussion of the results and limitations of this study, as well as recommendations for future research, are provided in the next chapter.

**Chapter 5: Discussion**

It is well documented that teacher attrition remains one of the most significant issues facing K–12 educational institutions across the United States; teacher retention, a widely explored topic in academic literature, has been found to have substantial implications for the success and overall functioning of schools (Hammond, 2017; Young, 2018). In recent years, academic literature on teacher retention has expanded into more specific teacher subgroups, such as bilingual educators. The exploration of teacher retention within particular subgroups of teachers often provides differentiated insights into the factors that contribute to the attrition or retention of said subgroups. As such, this study has aimed to further academic research by investigating the topic of teacher retention among dual language educators.

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine to what extent Collegial Leadership, Achievement Press, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability influence dual language teacher retention intentions. This final chapter explores the relationship between the findings and previous literature and further outlines the study's limitations, as well as recommendations for future research.

**Interpretation of the Findings**

Ensuring the adequate staffing of dual language programs has become of increased concern due to the growing popularity of dual language programs across the country (Lachance, 2018). The findings from this study indicate a statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teacher retention intentions, while no statistically significant association was found between Achievement Press and dual language teacher retention intentions.

*Research Question 1*

As previously noted, the first research question focused on Collegial Leadership, one of the domains of the OCI. Due to recent findings in Khan (2019), which postulated that there is a relationship between Collegial Leadership and teacher commitment, I hypothesized that there would be an association between Collegial Leadership and dual language teacher retention intentions. The first research question was, "To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Professional Teacher Behavior, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?" The results suggest that there is a statistically significant association between Collegial Leadership and participants' retention intentions. This quantitative analysis contrasts with previous studies that showed no relationship between Collegial Leadership and teacher retention (Dahlkamp et al., 2017).

*Research Question 2*

Previous studies regarding the impact of Professional Teacher Behavior have yielded conflicting results. For example, Hoy et al. (2002) noted that Professional Teacher Behavior influences teachers' commitment to their students and team members; however, Khan (2019) found that there was no evidence indicating that a relationship exists between Professional Teacher Behavior and teacher commitment. Regarding teacher retention, Dahlkamp et al. (2017) stated that there was not enough evidence to suggest that professional teacher behavior influenced teacher retention. However, Mason and Swanson (2018) noted that increased professional relationships can influence retention rates among bilingual educators. Despite the conflicting outcomes of previous research, I hypothesized that there would be a statistically significant association between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teacher

retention intentions. The second research question was, "To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Achievement Press, and Institutional Vulnerability?" As noted previously, the findings indicated a modest, positive relationship between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teacher retention intentions, which supports previous results that also indicate a relationship between supportive professional relationships and foreign language teacher retention (Mason & Swanson, 2018).

### Research Question 3

Noted previously, Achievement Press is defined as the degree to which a school's learning community "exerts pressure for high achievement and school improvement" (Smith & Kearney, 2013). While Khan (2019) found that Achievement Press influenced teacher commitment, Dahlkamp et al. (2017) did not find a statistically significant association between Achievement Press and teacher retention. The third research questions was, "To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Achievement Press and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability?" Similar to the findings in previous research, the findings from this study indicated that there is no statistically significant association between Achievement Press and dual language teacher retention intentions.

### Research Question 4

According to Dahlkamp et al. (2017), "Institutional Vulnerability examines the relationship between the school and the community . . . looking more specifically at the extent to which the school is susceptible to vocal parent and citizen groups" (p. 368). Khan (2019) noted the negative relationship that Institutional Vulnerability has with teacher commitment. Moreover,

Dahlkamp et al. (2017) postulated that Institutional Vulnerability also has a significant negative association with teacher retention. The fourth research questions was, "To what extent is there a statistically significant association between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teachers' intent to remain in their current positions, after controlling for Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Achievement Press?" The findings indicated a moderate, negative relationship between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teacher retention.

**Impact on Dual Language Programs**

Whereas the purpose of this study has been to explore whether a statistically significant association exists between the domains of organizational climate and dual language teacher retention intentions, the findings can be translated into practical application within existing or future dual language programs. Of the four domains of organizational climate, particular emphasis should be placed on the relationship between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teacher retention intentions. Moreover, the findings in this study suggest that Professional Teacher Behavior may influence dual language teachers' retention intentions more significantly than other types of educators. The enhancement of programmatic structures that foster mutual support and collaboration among dual language teachers may positively influence this domain, thus potentially increasing the likelihood of retention.

**Limitations**

In addition to the limitation noted in Chapter 3, I discovered a variety of additional limitations.

*COVID-19 Pandemic*

Limitations due to the COVID-19 pandemic have significantly altered the educational landscape, moving many teachers to virtual learning and others to a hybrid model of virtual and

in-person instruction. The impact these sudden changes have had on educational settings is significant and cannot be overstated. Ideally, this study would have commenced under typical circumstances, allowing participants to share their perspectives on their respective schools' organizational climate in a more conventional context. However, the nature of the pandemic has forced teachers to adopt new methods and strategies to navigate virtual instruction. In fact, a study recently completed by Sari and Nayır (2020) found the lack of organizational infrastructure and resources caused by the transition to virtual learning to be among the top challenges facing educators. Altered perceptions toward organizational climate were likely to have impacted the outcomes investigated in this study.

Increased stress and an overall decrease in well-being have permeated into the lives of nearly everyone throughout the current pandemic. According to Pollock (2020), "The well-being of teaching staff and paraprofessionals associated with the school is also a concern as many face health, family, and financial issues related to the virus" (p. 41). It remains to be seen what impact stress factors caused by the pandemic have had on overall retention rates; however, prior research is clear on the association between stress and teacher retention rates (Kamrath & Bradford, 2020). Furthermore, recent studies on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on teacher retention intentions suggest a strong positive association between teachers' sense of "connectedness" and their intentions to return (Sokal et al., 2021). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is possible that the adverse effects on teachers' overall mental health, stress levels, and general well-being might have, in comparison to the prepandemic working conditions, had an outsize influence on their retention intentions.

It would also be practical to acknowledge some of the traditional environmental factors that have historically led to increased teacher attrition but are no longer a factor due to virtual

learning. One of the most notable is the impact of negative classroom environments caused by undesirable student behaviors or poor classroom management. Harris et al. (2019) postulated that poor working conditions, which are influenced partially by student behavior, are associated with teachers' thoughts on leaving the profession. Due to the nature of virtual learning, teachers are no longer faced with the same types of behavior. Therefore, some teachers may have found the working conditions of virtual learning more ideal; such perceptions could influence retention intentions.

Another possible limitation is the varying organizational context among participants in this study. Similar to many districts across the United States, DCPS began efforts to reopen schools in November 2020. This initiative prioritized elementary schools, which accounted for approximately 60% of the pool of possible participants. The remaining 40% of participants were dual language teachers in secondary schools, all of which remained virtual throughout the entirety of the data collection phase of this study. The differing experiences of elementary and secondary teachers could have impacted their perceptions of their school's organizational climate and retention intentions.

### *Differing Organizational Experiences*

For this study, the only criterion for eligibility to participate in this study was that the participants needed to be a dual language teacher in one of the six participating schools. This approach came with possible limitations centering around the differing organizational and programmatic experiences of the participants. First, it is important to note the organizational differences among elementary and secondary schools. Differences between these types of educational settings range from variations in student–teacher social interactions, the structure of

daily lessons, and operational responsibilities. These organizational differences may have varying levels of influence on teacher perceptions of a school's organizational climate.

Another example of differing organizational experiences relates to the programmatic differences among various types of dual language programs. The pool of individuals invited to participate in this study encompassed dual language teachers among one-way immersion, two-way immersion, and one-way development programs. However, the composition of the participant sample is uncertain because demographic information was not collected. Nevertheless, there may have been limitations due to varying perceptions among various types of dual language teachers. There is a possibility that the association between organizational climate and dual language teacher retentions could differ by program type.

## Recommendations

The recommendations presented in this chapter are outlined for practical application at the campus and district levels, as well as in future research. The recommendations for practical application are intended to improve school-based and central office administrators' ability to increase retention rates among dual language teachers. Additionally, the recommendations for future research are intended to guide researchers toward possible avenues for study within the topic of organizational climate and dual language teacher retention.

### *Recommendations for School-Based Administrators*

Given the results of this study, particularly the findings that suggest that Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability influence Dual language teachers' retention intentions, it is recommended that administrators examine their existing systems and structures within each of these domains to promote the retention of teachers in their dual language programs. Specifically, the principal researcher of this study suggests that

administrators explore the utilization of specific structures related to professional learning communities and opportunities for common planning to foster a school environment that promotes Professional Teacher Behavior. Additionally, given the positive association found between Collegial Leadership and dual language teacher retention intentions, administrators should explore how aspects of Collegial Leadership can be translated into their own leadership characteristics. Given the strong emphasis Collegial Leadership places on shared decision-making, it may be prudent for administrators to evaluate the degree to which their dual language programs foster an environment conducive to shared decision-making. Furthermore, the strong negative association between Institutional Vulnerability and dual language teacher retention intentions suggests that administrators should identify and implement strategies to mitigate teachers' exposure to external pressures.

### *Recommendations for District-Level Administrators*

Although district-level administrators have no direct impact on the organizational climate of individual schools, they do have influence over the district-level policies, allocation of resources, and the selection of school leadership, which can significantly impact the quality of the organizational climate among schools. It is recommended that district-level administrators examine how district-level decisions and policies influence the organization climate domains, namely Collegial Leadership, Professional Teacher Behavior, and Institutional Vulnerability.

### *Recommendations for Further Research*

Whereas the results of this study correlated with findings from prior research, they also unveiled the possibility that particular domains of organizational climate might impact dual language teachers to a differing degree than the overall teaching population. Of the four domains of the OCI, Professional Teacher Behavior was the only domain in which the findings of this

study contrasted with prior research, such as that of Dahlkamp et al. (2017), which explored the relationship between organizational climate and teacher retention. Despite this contrast, prior research on bilingual teacher retention supports the findings of this study. For example, Mason and Swanson (2018) postulated that the unique needs of bilingual teachers may explain why these factors have such an influence on bilingual teachers. Future research should further explore the relationship between Professional Teacher Behavior and dual language teacher retention intentions.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, only six of the 11 DCPS dual language schools opted to participate in this research study, significantly shrinking the available pool of participants. Future studies could replicate the methodological approach from this study but increase the sample size by including participants in non-DCPS dual language schools. Additionally, it would be beneficial to obtain demographic data, such as grade level, certification type, and type of dual language program. One possible approach for future studies would be a multivariate analysis allowing the investigator to explore possible trends across various demographics of dual language teachers. Lastly, a qualitative approach would be another valuable addition to this study. A mixed-methods study including semistructured interviews and focus groups could explore teacher experiences and perceptions on a deeper level.

**Conclusions**

The retention of dual language teachers remains a relatively unexplored area within academic research; thus, I found it essential to begin investigating this topic. As a former teacher and current administrator of a school with a dual language program, I sincerely hoped that this study's findings would result in useful and actionable information for organizational and programmatic decision-making in both existing and future dual language programs. As noted in

this chapter, the findings in this study indicate several statistically significant associations between particular domains of organizational climate and dual language teacher retention intentions. Despite the limitations previously noted, this study has built upon and contributed to existing research, outlining specific recommendations for school-based and district-level administrators, as well as recommendations for future research. Overall, this study took a notable and much-needed first step toward better understanding how district- and school-based administrators can influence higher retention rates among dual language teachers.

# References

Ackerman, D. J., & Tazi, Z. (2015). Enhancing young Hispanic dual language learners'
achievement: Exploring strategies and addressing challenges. *ETS Research Report
Series, 2015*(1), 1–39.

Acosta, J., Williams, J., III, & Hunt, B. (2019). Dual language program models and English
language learners: An analysis of the literacy results from a 50/50 and a 90/10 model in
two California schools. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 5(2), 1–12.
https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v5i2.14747

Alanís, I., & Rodríguez, M. (2008). Sustaining a dual language immersion program: Features of
success. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, *7*(4), 305–319.
https://doi.org/10.1080/15348430802143378

Alqarni, S. A. Y. (2020). How school climate predicts teachers' organizational silence.
*International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, *12*(1), 12–27.

Ascorra, P., Álvarez-Figueroa, F., & Queupil, J. P. (2019). Managing school climate issues at the
school district level: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Universitas Psychologica*,
*18*(5), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy18-5.msci

Bindu, H. (2017). Factors influencing employee retention: A study in select service sector
organizations. *Indian Journal of Management*, *10*, 25–30.

Cardoza, J. A., & Brown, K. M. (2020). Supporting newly arrived Latinx students in upper
elementary mathematics through one-way dual-language approaches. *TESOL Journal*,
*11*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.487

Center for Applied Linguistics. (2018). *Directory of foreign language immersion programs in
U.S. schools*. http://webapp.cal.org/Immersion/

Chiong, C., Menzies, L., & Parameshwaran, M. (2017). Why do long-serving teachers stay in the teaching profession? Analyzing the motivations of teachers with 10 or more years' experience in England. *British Educational Research Journal*, *43*(6), 1083–1110. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3302

Christian, D. (2016). Dual language education: Current research perspectives. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1118666

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). L. Erlbaum Associates.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *2*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.20117.1394858

Dahlkamp, S., Peters, M. L., & Schumacher, G. (2017). Principal self-efficacy, school climate, and teacher retention: A multi-level analysis. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *63*(4), 357–376.

De Jager, T. (2019). Are principles of the sheltered instruction observation protocol model promoting ESL teaching and learning? *International Journal of Pedagogy & Curriculum*, *26*(1), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7963/CGP/v26i01/43-58

De Jong, E. J. (2016). Two-way immersion for the next generation: Models, policies, and principles. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 6–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1118667

DeMatthews, D., & Izquierdo, E. (2018). The importance of principals supporting dual language education: A social justice leadership framework. *Journal of Latinos & Education*, *17*(1), 53–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2017.1282365

Dicke, T., Marsh, H. W., Parker, P. D., Guo, J., Riley, P., & Waldeyer, J. (2020). Job satisfaction of teachers and their principals in relation to climate and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *112*(5), 1061–1073. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000409.supp

Dupriez, V., Delvaux, B., & Lothaire, S. (2016). Teacher shortage and attrition: Why do they leave? *British Educational Research Journal*, *42*(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3193

Gaikhorst, L., Beishuizen, J., Zijlstra, H., & Volman, L. (2015). Contribution of a professional development programme to the quality and retention of teachers in an urban environment. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2014.902439

García, D. (2019). Distributed leadership, professional collaboration, and teachers' job satisfaction in U.S. schools. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *79*, 111–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.12.001

García, O., Sánchez, M. T., & Solorza, C. (2018). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *41*(1), 37–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1405098

García, O., & Sung, K. K. (2018). Critically assessing the 1968 Bilingual Education Act at 50 years: Taming tongues and Latinx communities. *Bilingual Research Journal, 41*(4), 318–333. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1529642

Geiger, T., & Pivovarova, M. (2018). The effects of working conditions on teacher retention.

    *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *24*(6), 604–625.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1457524

Goldenberg, C., & Wagner, K. (2015). Bilingual education: Reviving an American tradition.

    *American Educator*, *39*(3), 28–32.

Gomez, L. M., & Cisneros, J. (2020). Dual language programs: Questions of access in the state

    of Arizona. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *28*(18), 1–20.

    https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.4680

González-Carriedo, R., & Esprívalo Harrell, P. (2018). Teachers' attitudes toward technology in a

    two-way dual-language program. *Computers in the Schools*, *35*(2), 111–133.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2018.1462634

Green, A. M., & Munos, M. A. (2016). Predictors of new teacher satisfaction in urban schools.

    *Journal of School Leadership*, *26*(1), 92–123.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461602600104

Guiberson, M., & Ferris, K. P. (2019). Early language interventions for young dual language

    learners: A scoping review. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *28*(3),

    945–963. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_AJSLP-IDLL-18-0251

Gunther, J. (2019). Quantifying the value teachers place on non-monetary factors when

    evaluating job opportunities. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *27*(44–46), 1–31.

    https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.4276

Hammonds, T. (2017). High teacher turnover: strategies school leaders implement to retain

    teachers in urban elementary schools. *National Teacher Education Journal*, *10*(2), 63–72.

Harris, S. P., Davies, R. S., Christensen, S. S., Hanks, J., & Bowles, B. (2019). Teacher attrition: Differences in stakeholder perceptions of teacher work conditions. *Education Sciences, 9*(4), 300. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9040300

Hinman, T., & He, Y. (2017). Hybrid practices in the alternative learning spaces of community-based heritage language programs. *New Waves—Educational Research and Development Journal*, *20*(1), 1–22.

Holmes, B., Parker, D., & Gibson, J. (2019). Rethinking teacher retention in hard-to-staff schools. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, *12*(1), 27–30.

Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *High School Journal*, *86*(2), 38. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2002.0023

Huff, R., & Swanson, P. (2010). The relationship of Georgia's rural foreign language teachers' sense of efficacy to teacher attrition. *Rural Educator*, *31*(3), 16.

Hutchison, L. A., Kim, Y. K., & Winsler, A. (2015). Bilingual education in the United States: An historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Educational Review*, *67*(2), 236–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.865593

Jochum, C. (2011). ESL program models and court cases: An overview for administrators. *Academic Leadership*, *9*(3), 1–8.

Jones, D., & Watson, S. B. (2017). The relationship between administrative leadership behaviors and teacher retention in Christian schools. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, *26*(1), 44–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10656219.2017.1282903

Kamrath, B., & Bradford, K. R. (2020). A case study of teacher turnover and retention in an urban elementary school. *Educational Considerations*, *45*(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.2181

Khan, N. (2019). The impact of organizational climate on teachers commitment. *Journal of Education & Educational Development*, *6*(2), 327–342.

Kim, Y. K., Hutchison, L. A., & Winsler, A. (2015). Bilingual education in the United States: An historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Educational Review*, *67*(2), 236–252.

Lachance, J. (2018). A case study of dual language teaching in science class: Implications for middle level teachers. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, *41*(5), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2018.1460231

Li, J., Steele, J., Slater, R., Bacon, M., & Miller, T. (2016). Teaching practices and language use in two-way dual language immersion programs in a large public school district. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *10*(1), 31–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2016.1118669

Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-way immersion programs benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *36*(2), 167–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2013.818075

Mason, S. (2017). Foreign language teacher attrition and retention research: A meta-analysis. *NECTFL Review*, *80*, 47–68.

Mason, S., & Matas, C. (2016). Social capital: A vital ingredient for retaining foreign language teachers. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second & Foreign Language Education*, *1*, 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0008-5

Mason, S., & Swanson, P. (2018). The world language teacher shortage: Taking a new direction. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*(1), 251–262. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12321

Menken, K. (2009). No Child Left Behind and its effects on language policy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *29*, 103. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190509090096

Muijs, D. (2011). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. Sage.

Murphy, A. F. (2014). The effect of dual-language and transitional-bilingual education instructional models on Spanish proficiency for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(2), 182–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.934971

Olsen, J., Preston, A. I., Algozzine, B., Algozzine, K., & Cusumano, D. (2018). A review and analysis of selected school climate measures. *Clearing House*, *91*(2), 47. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2017.1385999

Olson Beal, H. K., & Beal, B. D. (2016). Assessing the impact of school-based marketing efforts: A case study of a foreign language immersion program in a school-choice environment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *91*(1), 81–99.

Ozfidan, B. (2017). Academic value of bilingual education: Factors in learning on culture and language. *Revista de Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala*, *59*, 34–47.

Polanco, P., & Luft de Baker, D. (2018). Transitional bilingual education and two-way immersion programs: Comparison of reading outcomes for English learners in the United States. *Athens Journal of Education*, *5*(4), 423–444.

Pollock, K. (2020). School leaders' work during the COVID-19 pandemic: A two-pronged approach. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, *48*(3), 38–44.

Redding, C., Booker, L. N., Smith, T. M., & Desimone, L. M. (2019). School administrators' direct and indirect influences on middle school math teachers' turnover. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *57*(6), 708–730.

Roberts, C. A. (1995). Bilingual education program models: A framework for understanding. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *19*(3–4), 369–378.

Sari, T., & Nayır, F. (2020). Challenges in distance education during the (COVID-19) pandemic period. *Qualitative Research in Education*, *9*(3), 328–360. https://doi.org/10.17583/qre.2020.5872

Schrier, L. (2008). The overwhelmed generation and foreign language teacher preparation: Developing strategies to work with the mental health challenges of preservice teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, *41*(2), 282–309. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03293.x

Singh, P. (2008). Emotional intelligence begets collegial leadership in education. *International Journal of Learning, 15*(1), 73–88. https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9494/CGP/v15i01/45575

Smith, P. A., & Kearney, W. S. (2013). The impact of achievement press on student success in elementary schools. *International Journal of Educational Management, 27*(4), 387–401. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541311316322

Sokal, L., Trudel, L. E., & Babb, J. (2021). I've had it! Factors associated with burnout and low organizational commitment in Canadian teachers during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open, 2*, 100023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100023

Swanson, P. (2012). Second/foreign language teacher efficacy and its relationship to professional attrition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *68*(1), 78–101. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.68.1.078

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 357. https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-21-1119-2021

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2003). The multiple benefits of dual language. *Educational Leadership, 61*(2), 61–64.

Thompson, J. R., & Siciliano, M. D. (2021). The "levels" problem in assessing organizational climate: Evidence from the federal employee viewpoint survey. *Public Personnel Management*, *50*(1), 133–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026020917710

Tong, F., Irby, B. J., Lara-Alecio, R., & Mathes, P. G. (2008). English and Spanish acquisition by Hispanic second graders in developmental bilingual programs: A 3-year longitudinal randomized study. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *30*(4), 500–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986308324980

Young, S. (2018). Teacher retention and student achievement: How to hire and retain effective Teachers. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *84*(3), 16–21.

## Appendix A: Organizational Climate Index

1.  The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.

2.  A few vocal parents can change school policy.

3.  The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal.

4.  The learning environment is orderly and serious.

5.  The principal is friendly and approachable.

6.  Select citizen groups that are influential with the board.

7.  The school sets high standards for academic performance.

8.  Teachers help and support each other.

9.  The principal responds to pressure from parents.

10. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them.

11. Students respect others who get good grades.

12. Teachers feel pressure from the community.

13. The principal maintains definite standards of performance.

14. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.

15. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.

16. Parents exert pressure to maintain high standards.

17. Students try hard to improve on previous work.

18. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.

19. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.

20. The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation.

21. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.

22. Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them.

23. The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.

24. Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them.

25. Teachers in this school exercise professional judgement.

26. The school is vulnerable to outside pressures.

27. The principal is willing to make changes.

28. Teachers "go the extra mile" with their students.

29. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.

30. Teachers are committed to their students.

**Appendix B: Permission to Use Survey**

Wayne Hoy <███████████████>           Jul 7,

2020, 9:38 AM

Dear Mr. Lewis,

You have my permission to use the OCI in your research.

Best wishes.

On Jul 7, 2020, at 2:29 AM, Joseph Lewis <███████████████> wrote:

Dr. Hoy,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Joseph, and I am a doctoral candidate at ACU. I am

contacting you in hopes to gain permission to use the Organizational Climate Index survey for

my research study.

In addition to the OCI, I plan to include additional survey items to identify teacher demographics

in order to explore correlational trends. However, I would not alter the OCI survey items. With

this in mind, would you be able to grant me permission to use the OCI for my study?

I look forward to hearing from you,

Joseph I. Lewis

**Appendix C: IRB Approval**

**ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY**
*Educating Students for Christian Service and Leadership Throughout the World*

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
320 Hardin Administration Building, ACU Box 29103, Abilene, Texas 79699-9103
325-674-2885

October 5, 2020

Joseph Lewis
Department of Education
Abilene Christian University

Dear Joseph,

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board, I am pleased to inform you that your project titled
"Organizational Leadership and Dual Language Teacher Retention",

(IRB# 20-153    )is exempt from review under Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects.

If at any time the details of this project change, please resubmit to the IRB so the committee can determine whether or not the exempt status is still applicable.

I wish you well with your work.

Sincerely,

*Megan Roth*

Megan Roth, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Sponsored Programs